HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 4 July 1996

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ORGANS FOR TRANSPLANTATION

Ms GREIG (Reynell): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the committee be extended until Thursday 1 August 1996.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON PETROL MULTI SITE FRANCHISING

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the committee be extended until Thursday 1 August 1996.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON WOMEN IN PARLIAMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Greig:

That the final report of the committee be noted.

(Continued from 6 June. Page 1734.)

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Politics has been for so long an interest of mine that I have forgotten exactly what time in my life it could be identified as a definable passion. I can remember exactly when my enthusiasm for science began. It was when I moved from Mount Gambier to Adelaide at about 10 years of age. The Children's Library here seemed so big and confusing and initially I could not find the fiction section, and I stumbled on the science area and picked up a book by Isaac Asimov on atomic physics. I was enthralled and have always retained that sense of excitement about new frontiers of science. Now, however, I have achieved careers in both of these passions, although I never got to split atoms. When I was a child neither of these passions was considered a woman's area. Girls went into teaching, nursing or clerical jobs. Now there are many women in science, and many prominent women such as Alexandra Pucci. Nearly all the barriers are well and truly down.

In politics it is a different story. The numbers of women are low and there is a strong perception at least that many barriers still exist. This report describes accurately the current situation for women and outlines those barriers. When I embarked on a political career it was with the idea that I would make my career in the back room, behind the scenes, and I thought that when I started that would entirely satisfy my ambitions to be involved in the political cut and thrust. That proved not to be the case, but the fact that I eventually ran for preselection depended on several people who were influential in persuading me that the time had come and who were also, fortunately, influential in mustering the numbers to ensure that I would win. In many respects, I passed through that first group of barriers with relative ease, and I freely admit that this was not so much because my natural talent shone through but more because my faction had, since its inception, been willing to promote women. Much of this was due to the influence of the Shop Distributors Union and its Secretary, Don Farrell. A union with a high proportion of women among its members, it is still fairly unusual in the high proportion of women that it helps to put into senior positions. For me, the hard bit was to come. In some ways I was so focused on gaining preselection, then winning a seat, that I did not properly scrutinise the consequences. Having got through some of the barriers identified in the report without unusual trouble, I will dwell more on the other barriers.

When I entered Parliament in December 1993 my son was five years old and about to complete his first year of school. Up until that time I had either not worked, or worked part-time. Once I entered Parliament any semblance of normal family life began to disappear. When Parliament first sat my son was extremely distressed to have his mother disappear from early Tuesday morning to late Thursday night. We briefly saw each other as we were rushing around in the morning having breakfast and getting off to school. He reacted by waking up at 2 or 3 a.m., getting into our bed to say 'Hello' and squirming around for the rest of the night. We had quite a few late nights in Parliament at that time, and I began to wonder whether I had made a dramatic mistake. My son was sick on a couple of days and I could not stay home to look after him; so, there was frantic phoning around to friends and relatives to see who could look after a sick child.

Later, we organised for my son to come into Parliament some nights. In the beginning, he ran around and made too much noise, but some of my colleagues were also bringing in their young children and it did not seem so bad. My husband is a talented computer software and firmware developer. In the end, he gave up his job to work part-time and from home. This allowed us much more flexibility. My son still hates the late nights, and this was brought home again to me during Estimates. One day I was on in the morning and then again after the dinner break. So, I went home and had an early dinner with my family and then came back in. My son was perfectly happy with this arrangement, because he had a chance to talk to me and show me his homework, etc.

I am resigned to the fact that we will probably never get any adjustment to the sitting hours while we have a Liberal Government. I understand that the new Federal Liberal Government has extended sitting hours in Federal Parliament. There are many things I do not understand about the Liberals, and this attachment to long sitting hours is one of them. However, when the interim report came out I was quite hopeful that the recommendation about not having parliamentary sittings during school holidays might be implemented.

When I eagerly picked up the sittings schedule last time my hopes were dashed again; however, I am not entirely in despair. I have in my mind's eye a picture of the Cabinet room when the Deputy Premier comes in with the next sitting schedule. The Cabinet takes a cursory look at the schedule and, all of a sudden, the Minister for Education and Children's Services says, 'Hang on a minute, these breaks do not fit in with the school holidays,' and the times are quickly altered by a short, friendly discussion.

I have had young women ask me about entering Parliament, and I always try to be enthusiastic and, most importantly, helpful. But if they have young children or are contemplating having children I feel it would be dishonest and wrong of me not to indicate some of the logistical problems. It grieves me to do it, because there are talented

women in Parliament who should not have to make these choices but who do.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I will speak briefly in support of the report and in particular the facilities and services for members with families. I strongly support the interim recommendations about issues such as a family room in the Parliament which would enable members with young families to bring their young children into the Parliament. Quite often I have my wife and young family with me in the Parliament, so I would very much appreciate having such a facility. I am very disappointed that the Government appears not to have picked up on that recommendation. I would have thought that, with all the expenditure on the refurbishment of the building, including Old Parliament House, space could certainly have been provided for use as a family room.

I for one would have been more than pleased to see the billiard room or another room in this Parliament utilised in such a way. Some members may not like the idea of using the billiard room, but I am flexible—it could be another room. We need those facilities. Quite frankly, in this day and age, in a modern Parliament, in a modern work environment, where we are required as workers in this place to be here late into the evening, night after night, week after week, month after month, the least we could have is services and facilities to support our families.

There have been some slight changes, including now being able to take our families into the private dining room. I am glad that decision was taken, but I can certainly say from my perspective that I would like some place where my family could enjoy this Parliament, other than having to walk the corridors as my young boys do and cause all sorts of mayhem around the place.

Linked with that is the issue of sitting hours. I worked for some years in this Parliament as an adviser before being elected as a member, and I cannot understand the logic of the sitting hours. Some members may be happy with the notion that we start work at 2 p.m. in this place, but to me it is somewhat bizarre. Attempts have been made in Canberra to introduce more normal working hours. Surely we could rearrange the sitting times of our committees and other such duties of Parliament to provide some semblance of normal working hours.

That may mean that members of Parliament will find themselves away from home in the evenings anyway, attending community functions, but at least we would have the ability to spend more time with our family if we had more sensible working hours. I do not know what the tradition or great problem is with reforming Parliament's sitting times. I suspect that some members of Parliament, those perhaps who make the decisions, think it is quaint that we start at 2 p.m. and finish at 1 a.m. I find that neither quaint nor particularly stimulating. I would have thought in this modern day and age that we could at least have sitting hours that somehow resemble normal working conditions. That would enable all members, who are put under enough stress in this job, to spend more time at home with their families.

I return to the provision of child-care facilities in the Parliament. It would be so easy to simply set aside space for such a facility. I do not know whether the report looked at providing child care within the facility, but I would have thought that it would not be an unreasonable expenditure to have in this place some sort of a child-care facility in the evenings which would allow husbands and wives to spend some time together while the children participated in activities in the creche.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Plenty of employer groups are doing this now, including some of the leading companies in Australia.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: There are some very progressive multi-national companies in this nation who are installing child-care facilities in their workplace. I heard a stunning speech the other night by Anita Roddick, the worldwide Manager and owner of The Body Shop, which is a $500 million a year multi-national company from England. That company employees 2 500 people in its factory, and it has a fully supervised child-care facility on site.

Ms Greig: And Westpac.

Mr FOLEY: That's right, Westpac is doing it: the taxpayer funded Westpac Loan Centre in Adelaide has a child-care facility. Surely, this Parliament—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Exactly. If we can fund a child-care facility for Westpac, we could fund a child-care centre of some sort in the Parliament. It would be only a part-time facility. I urge you, Mr Speaker, as an officer of this House, to give due consideration to this matter. The Parliament now has many members with this requirement. As there may have been a requirement 30 years ago to have pool tables, there is now a requirement to provide a facility where families with young children can enjoy some time together. On the odd occasion, the children could stay in the creche whilst Mum and Dad enjoyed a bit of time together in the dining room. It is not an unusual request. In Canberra they have the Rolls Royce of everything, including meditation rooms. I am not suggesting that, but I do suggest that some sort of modest reform be undertaken.

Mr Speaker, you are a man who gives consideration to the various views of members of Parliament. I appeal to your better judgment as an officer of this Parliament to reconsider this issue. The Chairman of Committees is also a compassionate person who is prepared to listen. I ask both of you to consider putting in place some decent child-care facilities, so that when our young children come in in the evening they can be entertained. Otherwise, Mr Speaker, you might see the Foley kids running around underneath the tables in the dining room—and so be it. I will try my best to keep them in check, but—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Not at all. I'm just—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: No, it's not. My children are very well behaved.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I hear the honourable member behind me making the comment that grandparents could also bring in their grandchildren, and I agree. There is the member for Giles and the member for Torrens, who might not want me to alert members to her status as a grandmother. But, seriously, this is not a jocular issue—it is something to which we should give serious thought. I urge you, Mr Speaker, with your well-known, well-understood and well-respected view for making a fair deal and for giving a fair go, for not being one who simply dismisses an issue out of hand—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Well, to quote the member for Mawson, my little eight-year-old will remember you, Mr Speaker, as the first Speaker that he met. I would like him to be able to come

in here and look at your portrait on the wall and say, 'That is the person who gave me a child-care facility at Dad's work.' There is no greater honour that you could do for the young generations—of all our young children and grandchildren—than to reconsider that decision and put in place this very important service.

Mrs HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I move:

That—

(a) this House notes the creation of 16 parliamentary secretaries by the Premier and that they represent their respective Ministers at designated functions and in meeting with companies and other organisations on behalf of Ministers; and consequently,

(b) that Standing Orders be so far suspended to allow questions without notice to be directed to parliamentary secretaries; and

(c) this House calls on all parliamentary secretaries to resign forthwith from standing committees constituted by either House because of potential ministerial conflicts of interest.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to move this motion today and ask a number of questions to which we would like a few answers. Like many members, certainly all members on this side, I was somewhat stunned when we found out that another 16 prizes were to be handed out by this Government. The first question I asked myself when that happened was who would get what. I knew straight away that some people would get nothing. Some people's face does not fit around this Government and they will get nothing. I was very pleased to see that my great friend the member for Unley actually got a guernsey this time.

Mr Atkinson: You wouldn't have expected it.

Mr QUIRKE: I didn't expect it, no; I lost money on that one. Although not being a betting man, I did have a few quid on the possibility that the member for Unley would wind up the usual way—stone, motherless last. I was wrong; I freely tell the House that. He is the education secretary, and he is doing a fine job in that area. I must say that, given that the House has complimented everyone here. His past sins in a number of areas were obviously forgiven; either that or he was the window-dressing in a package that primarily looked after the wet faction around here.

Mr Cummins interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: The member for Norwood says that he is a good piece of window dressing. I understand the member for Norwood's interest in this as well, and I understand that he is also to be congratulated. Despite the fact that he sits behind that pillar making terrible, inane objections to members on this side—his former friends, some of whom are more friendly to him than others, depending on which side of the Labor Party he was on—the member for Norwood also won a prize. That leaves us with 14 other prizes. In a small jurisdiction such as this, we have 69 members. We elect a Speaker, and of course that is you, Sir; and in the other place we elect a President, so that takes us down to 67 players. From 67 players we pick a couple of deputies, and that brings us down to 65 players.

Of those 65 players, the Opposition Party has something like 20 members, and we are now down to 45 players. We have six standing committees and six Chairs of those standing committees, which brings the number down to 39 players, and that is not too bad. But then we take out 12 Ministers and the Premier and we are down to 26 players. We need to construct a backbench from those 26 players: we must find one from somewhere.

We have a bigger problem with that because, after all, there are 12 of us on the front benches in both Houses and we must have some semblance of a backbench. I must say that, as an instrument to try to control an unwieldy backbench, creating 16 positions out of that number means that 10 people do not get a prize. I am sure that, if we were to look at those 10 people, we would find that some have something to offer. When this announcement was made I put the fairness test to it, and I found that those 10 people might not have included Mr Brindal but certainly included most of his tea club who drink in the bar opposite, and some of my great friends, such as the member for Fawlty, and a few others who somehow have not been able to catch the eye of the Premier, at least favourably.

I thought, 'That's fine. On days when the Ministers will not present themselves for Question Time, for whatever reason (they are usually somewhere else), we can ask the parliamentary secretaries what is going on.' We were told that the parliamentary secretaries were given an intensive period of briefing, that when Ministers were not available they would be Ministers *in absentia*, that they would represent Ministers at social functions, and do this, that and the other. But, as soon as we asked one of them a question in this House, we found that they could not do that.

I have no doubt that that situation is covered by Standing Orders, and the interpretation of that is fine, but it is somewhat surprising that we have not seen a motion before the relevant and appropriate bodies to change that arrangement. Obviously, Sir, you have interpreted the rules as they are. I would suggest that, if we have 16 parliamentary secretaries, the Government needs to address seriously what useful purpose they can play. A cynic in this place, which I am not, would suggest that 16 parliamentary secretaries means 16 more votes for the Government on contentious issues in the Party room, and a few other places.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: I know that is the theory. The member for Unley jumps in and says that I do not understand his Party room. No, I do not, but I have just been listening to the member for Hart talk about child-care facilities, and I have some understanding of roughly how it works. Every Tuesday, around 12 noon, a number of members leave that meeting and fall over each other to come to my office to tell me all about it.

Members interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: Mr Speaker, can I have some protection from my own friends?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Playford has the call. I do not think he needs any assistance.

Members interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: The member for Mawson said that I had better say my prayers tonight. I must say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Mawson to order.

Mr QUIRKE: I would be on my knees to be a parliamentary secretary too. There is a pool of talent in this area into which the Government has not yet tapped. It has promoted parliamentary secretaries from the wet faction and one or two from the dry faction because they ran out of positions. A number of members on this side of the House could be

parliamentary secretaries as well and, I must say, when the Ministers are not at functions and we are, we are happy to deputise for them. After all, there is no reason why we in the Labor Party cannot be parliamentary secretaries.

Let us look at two of the features of parliamentary secretaries. First, who are they responsible to? The answer is, no-one. We cannot ask them a question: they do not have to hold the line, the flag, or anything else. Therefore, there would be no problem with one of us being a parliamentary secretary. I announce to the House that we are prepared to deputise as parliamentary secretaries, if required, at functions. Secondly, another important concern is that parliamentary secretaries do not have any legislative responsibilities (as we have seen in the House) because, if they did, then we could ask them a question. We are in the same position as they and we are very happy to serve in this role.

The other element of this motion concerns parliamentary secretaries and standing committees. We saw the press release when it came out on that fateful Thursday. We were waiting for a big announcement. We were told on the Monday that big stuff would happen on the Thursday. We were not sure what was to happen, that is, whether it was to be a new power station, selling off the old power station, flogging or outsourcing something else, or any one of a number of decisions that are likely to be made by this Government. For instance, we did not know whether there would be more or fewer prawn trawlers or whether or not the net caught prawns, but it was to be a big announcement and the media told us to be ready for it on Thursday. What we got was the announcement of the parliamentary secretaries and we were ready and waiting to see the resignations from the standing committees.

For instance, how can a parliamentary secretary represent a Minister who, by statute, is not allowed to be on a standing committee? Then we find that only one of the parliamentary secretaries has the honesty to hold their hand up and say, 'Look, I do not want to be on a standing committee any more because this will create a conflict of interest.' I would have thought a number of other members would say immediately, 'Look, I think I have to stand down from these standing committees.' Certainly, that is what should have happened but, no, not with members of this Liberal Government. That did not happen, and I am somewhat shocked and surprised at that. Besides, it would have solved another one of the Premier's problems: how to incorporate the dry faction in his Government. Because what could have happened immediately is that all those poor blokes who have had their noses rubbed in it over the past couple of years could have been given a paid guernsey on a standing committee, instead of just the member for Unley, who is a notable dry and economic rationalist around here—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: Well, you are wet-dry; you have a wet nose and the rest of you is dry. At the end of the day, the member for Unley could have had some of his mates on standing committees. Some of the 10 members who have been left out and are getting nothing out of this Government could have been included. I well remember when I was at university the psychology department had a problem determining its quota for the next year. So, the lecturer in charge of the faculty that year, the first year at university, counted the number of rats that had bred in the cages over the Christmas period. As each rat was looked after by two students, put in a box, fed and eventually electrocuted, along with all the other things they did to them, he counted the number of rats, multiplied that figure by two, and then rang the Vice-Chancellor and said that is what the quota will be for psychology next year.

One wonders how 16 became the number. I am somewhat puzzled as to why 16 parliamentary secretaries were chosen. Did it involve a system of counting the number of portfolios and members to be attached to them or was it based, say, on the number of stairs (perhaps there are there 16) between the thirteenth and fourteenth floors in the Premier's Department? Is that how it came about? I am puzzled about the role that these secretaries are playing, but I do know that some of them are taking it very seriously. I have seen a couple of parliamentary secretaries, who now do not fit through the door as easily as they used to, getting up and telling the world of their new important positions. They get up at Estimates Committees and try to give the Opposition a hard time, as one did recently. There was the analogy of the organ grinder and the monkey, and that episode showed that that parliamentary secretary took his role very seriously. There are one or two others who are taking it very seriously and, of course, it looks good on the CV sheet.

If any member of the Opposition is appointed a parliamentary secretary, we will resign from our standing committees forthwith. That is the first thing we will do, because we are people of integrity and we will not be taking with the one hand a guernsey like this and, on the other hand, keeping what we already have. So, I commend the motion to the House. The motion has been moved in all sincerity and with serious intent because, obviously, this is a matter that the Premier needs to take on board at his earliest opportunity.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

PLAYFORD, SIR THOMAS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House, on the one hundredth anniversary of his birth, acknowledges the enormous contribution of Sir Thomas Playford to the development of South Australia, and his commitment to the public ownership of important community assets such as the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the South Australian Housing Trust.

Yesterday, we celebrated the hanging of the portrait of Sir Thomas Playford and I stressed in the House that it was important to recognise South Australia's heroes, including great Premiers of this State like Sir Thomas Playford and Don Dunstan. It is important to recognise the massive contribution that Playford made to the development of this State, particularly his commitment, against his own Party in many instances, to public ownership of the Electricity Trust, of our engineering and water supply operations and of the Housing Trust of South Australia. Unfortunately, I am unable to attend the unveiling of the statue on Sunday due to family reasons, but I certainly wish the proceedings well. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot do that.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: If I cannot do that, I will continue. Yesterday, the Premier and I spoke strongly in terms of Playford's commitment. However, I was very surprised at the rather petty reaction of the Premier, when I mentioned Don Dunstan, and to hear his comments across the House. Tom Playford was a bigger person than that and would equally have recognised Don Dunstan's massive contribution to the development of South Australia, just as Don Dunstan has repeatedly recognised the massive contribu-

tion of Sir Thomas Playford to the development of this State. They were two sides of one coin, that coin being South Australia, and it is important for mature political leaders to recognise that both sides of politics make a contribution to the development of this State. Some matters are bipartisan, where we put the interests of South Australia ahead of Party and petty concerns.

To some of the comments made about Don Dunstan across this House yesterday, I make one response: when you look at greats like Playford and Dunstan, the contributions made by the Premier of this State and others across this House yesterday are puny by comparison and will be at the end of their tenure. With great pleasure on behalf of the Labor Party, I pay tribute and honour the memory of Thomas Playford, a great South Australian who had the courtesy to recognise that there were differences, the courtesy to recognise the importance of the Opposition and the decency to believe in proper public and private relations between Government and Opposition—a commitment to bipartisanship on important issues affecting the future of this State.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I wish to move an amendment to this motion, which will go to the spirit of the proposition more precisely than did the Leader of the Opposition in the form of words he has used, in which he seeks to mislead us into thinking that Sir Thomas Playford was really a communist. He was not. I therefore move:

To delete 'commitment to the public ownership of' and insert in lieu thereof 'determination to establish and operate in the public interest, by developing this State's economy in an open accountable way.

The important distinction between the motion moved by the Leader and my amended motion is that Sir Thomas Playford was not committed to the public ownership of important community assets for the sake of having them owned by the public. He was committed to the establishment of assets that were essential to the development of the State's economy and, if that meant doing it through the mechanism of public ownership, then that was the way he did it.

He did not believe that it was necessary to own important community assets in the public name. He simply knew that, if he was going to be able in those circumstances prevailing at the time, to provide the necessary electricity as energy in such quantities as would enable the State's economy to develop rapidly, he had to take over the Adelaide Electric Supply Company. The State did not have the capital from within the economy for it to have otherwise been transferred in ownership and, therefore, in operation to increase its generating capacity in a way that would enable new industries to be recruited here because of the competitive prices at which that energy would then be offered to them as substantial consumers.

Moreover, he knew that there must be the involvement of the State Government in the rapid development of cheap housing stock for people returning from the Second World War to enable them to set up their homes and, after choosing a life partner, establish families in those homes and in the process of so doing work in their personal interests and in the interests of the rest of their fellow South Australians, and indeed Australians, in those new industries that Sir Thomas chose to recruit here.

It was not possible to obtain the capital from the private sector to do that. The simplest and most sensible way to do it in an open and accountable fashion was to establish the South Australian Housing Trust. Mr Deputy Speaker, you and I both know that Sir Thomas was not a communist; he was not committed to the views that the public had to own everything. He was committed to the understanding that, if he did not expand the housing stock in South Australia rapidly, people would not come and settle here after the Second World War, that people would not come and settle here after they had left Europe, which was devastated by that war, to find homes and new lives. He knew that the State was doomed unless that happened and happened rapidly.

It was therefore necessary, since no other capital resource was available, for it to be done by the Government itself, through public ownership. There was no philosophical belief in Sir Thomas's mind that there was greater merit in the Government owning enterprises than private corporations or individual citizens owning those enterprises. He did not set out to establish communal orchards. He did not believe that that would be wise. He did not set out to establish communal farmland and grazing. He knew that was not wise. All he did was build the State's infrastructure as quickly as possible knowing that as a Government he could go into the financial marketplace by arrangement with the Federal Government and obtain those funds rapidly, which no other corporation could do and apply them to that purpose; so that people returning from the war, people migrating here from Europe, would have homes to live in. They would choose to stay in South Australia.

By so doing and doing concurrently with the development of a plan for providing energy to industry and providing sites on which industry could develop, and providing financial assistance to industry to transfer its production capacity from war effort to peace effort in the range of products that could then be made, he built this State's economy faster than any other State's. It was out of a motivation to see the State's economy grow and grow rapidly that he chose that pathway. It was not about any commitment to public ownership; it was the necessity for the State's economy to grow quickly.

Were Sir Thomas Playford alive today I am sure he would endorse the view that we now need to remove the assets of the kind that have been in public ownership and put them in the hands of the private citizens of the State and the nation, especially after the debacle to which we have been subject over the last seven or eight years by the former Labor Government in the way in which it allowed executives in Government guaranteed instrumentalities to simply go wild, and blow away this State's sound economic base that he had created and leave us with enormous debt.

The debt that Sir Thomas Playford took this State into was only taken to develop its infrastructure. There was material evidence of solid infrastructure there for every pound that was spent, whereas in the case of the Labor Government in the late 1980s there was evidence of exactly the opposite. There was nothing for what was squandered—nothing whatever. What the Government was seeking to do there was to enter into enterprise in the belief that it could run that enterprise in competition with the private sector making profits and through those profits in competition with its own tax base not have to raise taxes. You cannot have it both ways. They did not understand that they were not expanding the economic base by doing that; they were simply slicing the pie differently. They took risks and allowed the executives to take risks which were bad.

I therefore commend Sir Thomas Playford for what he did and I commend to the House the amendment to the motion, which will more accurately reflect the desire and intention of the man than the proposition put by the Leader. Sir Thomas

did not have a commitment to public ownership: he had a commitment to grow the State's economy, and he had a commitment to honest and open accountability for all those kinds of enterprises in which he engaged, whereas the previous Government had none of that.

Mr BECKER (Peake): It is unfortunate that I do not have a copy of the amendment.

Mr Rossi: You'll get one.

Mr BECKER: It is all very well for the member for Lee to say that I will get one, but other members of this House have complained bitterly on occasions that there are no copies of amendments that have been moved. I will go no further than that while this important motion is before the House, but it would have been nice to have the opportunity to speak yesterday.

My first dealings with Sir Thomas Playford were when I was President of the South Australian Division of the Australian Bank Officials Association. That division merged into a Federal body and became the South Australian-Northern Territory Division of the Australian Bank Officials Association, and it eventually became the Australian Bank Employees Union. As a person involved in industrial relations and as a union leader, it was my daunting task to approach Sir Thomas, who was then Premier of South Australia, for a bank holiday.

We in the banking industry always had a problem over the Christmas period, particularly with Proclamation Day being a public holiday, because bank officers would have to come back to work on odd days, and then there would be a day off, and then back again we would come. It always made sense to us to periodically approach the Government of the day, and in this case Sir Thomas Playford happened to be the Premier of South Australia. As President of the union, it was my job to lead a deputation to see him to apply for a special bank holiday so that bank officers throughout South Australia were given sometimes a three or four-day break. It gave those officers the opportunity to be with their families over the Christmas period, and in the country that was extremely important. It was also important for members of the banking industry who, having been recruited in the country and then employed in the city, could return to the country. Sir Thomas understood that very well.

It not only affected bank officers but people in the insurance industry, police officers and some public servants. Indeed, a whole range of white collar workers were affected by any change in the bank holiday period. Strange as it seems, and upon reflection, it was far easier for me as President of the union to get an appointment to see Sir Thomas Playford as Premier than it has been for me as a member of the Government to see my own Premier. It was far easier to see Sir Thomas Playford as Premier than it was to see Tonkin (when he was Premier) or than it is to see Brown. That is how accessible Sir Thomas was. John White, his Secretary, was extremely helpful and no doubt was the backbone of the success of Sir Thomas Playford.

On the first occasion when I led such a deputation, we met him in his office in the old Treasury building. It was a huge room with a little desk and three large chairs. You talked to Sir Thomas, and he would then get up from behind his desk, sit down alongside you and explain the reasons why the Government could do this or why it could not do that. On one occasion we were successful and on another occasion we were unsuccessful.

It was my job as a Bank of Adelaide officer to welcome new migrants to South Australia. I visited the new migrants and advised them that their money had arrived. Working in the bank at Collinswood and looking after the areas from Collinswood to Modbury and Tea Tree Gully, I met migrants who were arriving in South Australia, and it was obvious that they were not of a conservative persuasion; they were not Liberals. On one occasion I met with the Premier and said, 'Sir Thomas, I think we have problems.'

As far as I am concerned, Sir Thomas's greatest contribution—and there were many—to the people of South Australia was the establishment and expansion of the role of the South Australian Housing Trust. As a banker but also as a citizen, I saw how Sir Thomas Playford made it possible for newly married couples, young people and migrants to be able to own their first home. Through the Housing Trust program selected land was purchased, developed and sold at cost to the new home buyers; the Housing Trust allowed them to choose a design of a house and then supervised its construction.

That was the greatest ever kick start that any married couple could receive, and it is a pity that the program was never continued in that respect; it is a pity that some Government does not pick it up today and say to newly married couples, 'We will sell you the land at cost, construct the house and supervise its construction for you without profit and, after it is established, you can sell it after a certain number of years if you wish'—and no doubt there was a capital gain. Every young South Australian who took that opportunity was able to capitalise on it, and many went from strength to strength in home ownership. That is why we have the highest home ownership rate in Australia—or did have—and I would like to see that position maintained.

I have always had a wonderful admiration for Sir Thomas Playford. After my union days when I was elected as a member of Parliament, Bill Nankivell (a member of this House at the time) brought him to see me and Sir Thomas said, 'I understand you're interested in the Auditor-General's Report and looking at all aspects of it; you must be one of the first members ever to read it.' I was then given the benefit of some of his advice—where to look, how to look—and he suggested what I should do in relation to the finances of the State.

I will never forget those helpful hints and comments. He remembered me from my union days as nothing but a bit of an agitator and a stirrer, and for me to be suddenly on the Liberal side of politics looking at State finances, perhaps he was a little worried about what I might find! However, Sir Thomas would always encourage members, and his simple philosophy, which I have always followed, was, 'If you look after the people, the people will look after you, and never let the people down.' It is a wonderful honour and tribute to Sir Thomas not only for us to be celebrating the centenary of his birth but also to have his portrait hung in this Chamber on the right-hand side of the Chair. I support the motion.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

GREEK CYPRIOTS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House requests the Federal Government to actively support the United Nations Committee for Missing People in their work in Cyprus and for Australia to raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the need for Turkey and the Denktash regime to assist the UN both with the location of the bodies of missing

Greek Cypriots and in investigating the circumstances of their deaths.

Today in this House I am calling for the support of all South Australian members of Parliament to help play a small but important role in fighting for justice for Cyprus. My motion calls upon the Federal Government to give strong support to the United Nations Committee for Missing People and their work in Cyprus. I am calling for the Australian Government to raise in the General Assembly of the United Nations the need for Turkey and the illegal Denktash regime in Northern Cyprus to assist the United Nations in locating the bodies of missing Greek Cypriots and in investigating the circumstances of their tragic deaths.

Members will know that I have previously raised in this Parliament issues affecting Cyprus and the Cypriot people. Last year I visited Cyprus for meetings with the political leaders of the legitimate administration of Cyprus. I was the guest of the President of Cyprus, Mr Clerides, following an invitation from the Minister of Finance, Mr Christoudoulou, who visited Australia and Adelaide this time last year. I met with Acting President, Mr Galanos; with the Interior Minister, Mr Michaelides; with former President George Vasiliou; with the leaders of AKEL and with Mr Lyssarides, Leader of the Socialist party; with His Beatitude the Archbishop of Cyprus; with the Mayor of Nicosia; and with senior United Nations peacekeeping representatives. I was very grateful for the assistance given to me by Con Marinos of the Justice for Cyprus Committee here in South Australia.

A few days after I left Cyprus, in Greece I met with the President of Cyprus (Mr Clerides) who was in Thessalonica. Like my predecessor Don Dunstan I have very strong views about Cyprus. I learned about Cyprus from talking with Don Dunstan when I was on his staff in the late 1970s. Don Dunstan always spoke with passion—and still does—when talking about his experiences in visiting Cyprus back in 1957, when Cyprus was in flames. There he saw the injustices being perpetrated on the people of Cyprus by the British administration, and acted as a mediator and negotiator on behalf of Greek Cypriots for their freedom. He then went to London to argue the case before senior British parliamentary representatives. So, I thought it important that I also visit Cyprus, to see for myself what has happened there.

In addition to the 35 000 Turkish troops still illegally occupying the northern part of the island, the Turkish Government is still pursuing a settlement program that has already seen tens of thousands of Turkish migrants being encouraged to settle in the occupied zone. They are not legitimate migrants: they are being brought there to change the ethnic base of the island. The ethnic and population mix of Cyprus is being manipulated by the Turkish Government, which is practising, through a puppet regime headed by Mr Denktash, a form of apartheid in Cyprus. Meanwhile, Turkish Cypriots actually born in Cyprus continue to vote with their feet, continue to leave the island, migrating in large numbers to countries around the world, including Australia. That is the confidence they have in the Turkish Government's puppet regime in northern Cyprus.

Recently, the House of Commons in Britain was told that the very character of Cyprus was being deliberately changed as Turkish Cypriot citizens have been replaced by settlers. Epiki, those settlers brought in from Turkey, will soon outnumber real and genuine Turkish Cypriots living in northern Cyprus. This ethnic engineering in the occupied zone is deliberately designed to make it more difficult to resolve the Cyprus issue. It was revealed in the House of Commons that the ratio of troops to the general population in the northern part of Cyprus, the Turkish occupied zone, is now greater in northern Cyprus than it was in Northern Ireland during the peak of the troubles of Belfast in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Over the years, it is quite clear that attempts to secure meaningful talks have been frustrated by what appears to be a lack of genuine commitment by Turkey to withdraw troops and actively seek some negotiated settlement.

This month is the twenty-second anniversary of the 1974 invasion that began Turkey's illegal occupation of the northern part of Cyprus, and 1 619 Greek Cypriots are still missing since the invasion and the appalling atrocities that followed. The fate of these missing people remains one of the great tragedies of modern Cyprus. Wives do not know the fate of their husbands. Husbands do not know the fate of their wives. Mothers do not know what happened to their sons and daughters. Brothers do not know the fate of their sisters; sisters do not know the fate of their brothers. This uncertainty and heartache continues to haunt thousands of Greek Cypriot families in both Cyprus and around the world.

Mr Denktash has recently, in the most appalling and cynical way, confirmed to the world what we all suspected: he announced publicly earlier this year that 1 600 missing Greek-Cypriots were killed by Turkish troops or Turkish-Cypriot paramilitaries in 1974. This issue has not been resolved in any way by Mr Denktash's confession. Greek-Cypriot families have the right to know how and why their loved ones were killed and where they are buried. They also have the right to locate the remains of their relatives and give them a proper Christian burial. Families also have a moral right to know who was responsible for the killings and these atrocities and what action has been taken to bring the perpetrators, who were clearly involved in ethnic cleansing, to international justice.

Too often when we talk about Cyprus we talk about the political problems, but we must never forget the human problems. Apart from the missing people, many thousands of Cypriots are not allowed to visit their homes, now inhabited by squatters. Tens of thousands of Greek-Cypriots could not be buried in the villages which were the homes not only of themselves and their parents but of their ancestors for generations. Many people have told me that the Cyprus problem cannot be resolved. They say that it is intractable; that the issue is too hard. I reject this position. Who could have predicted in the early 1980s that Soviet Communism would end, that the Eastern Bloc would break up and that the Berlin Wall would be torn down. So what can be done?

Cypriot leaders in Government and in Opposition in Nicosia are keen to secure Australian support for Cyprus's application to join the European Union. This was reiterated to me time and again during my visit to Cyprus with Mr Marinos. In Nicosia there is a strong view that European Union membership will provide greater security and would be helpful in securing a resolution to the Cyprus issue. I firmly believe that European Union membership is essential for Cyprus. In doing so, I strongly oppose the views of those who say that Cyprus can only join the European Union if the Cyprus issue has been resolved and Cyprus is unified. That approach would simply give Turkey and the Denktash regime the right of veto over the legitimate Government of Cyprus's application to join the European Union. The Turkish Government would be delighted to have that kind of power over the future of free Cyprus. It would simply veto the application by

making sure that there was no resolution of the issue in order to keep Cyprus out of the European Union. That must not be allowed to happen.

I would rather take an alternative view. Turkey also wants to join the European Union. It is now vital that members of the European Union, particularly Britain, should resolve that Turkey will never be allowed to join the European Union unless it withdraws its troops and obeys clear international law and United Nations resolutions in respect of Cyprus. Satisfactory resolution of the Cyprus problem should be a pre-condition to Turkey's entry into the European Union. We must use European Union membership as a lever to secure concessions from the Turkish Government—a lever to secure that Turkey obeys international law.

Both Britain and the United States must play a crucial role in resolving the Cyprus issue. Britain must exercise its clear responsibilities: it is a former colonial power in Cyprus, it has sovereign military bases within Cyprus and it is a guarantor power of Cyprus. Britain has strong cultural links with Cyprus. Cyprus is a Commonwealth nation, and no-one in Australia should forget our allies and those ties. Britain must now play a leading role in resolving the Cyprus problem. In the past, Britain has not taken seriously its international obligations towards Cyprus. During the 1974 Turkish invasion Britain sat on its hands even though it was a guarantor power with massive air bases on the island. In a most shameful denial of its clear moral and legal responsibilities, Britain failed to act in the moment of crisis. It is now time for Britain to make amends by taking the lead in assisting Cyprus to join the European Union and in agreeing to its own inquiry into the fate of the missing persons. I am pleased that legislation to establish a commission of inquiry into the whereabouts of missing persons in Cyprus has been introduced into the British Parliament. It deserves the strong support of the British Government.

The European Union has agreed to begin negotiations for Cyprus and Malta to join the European Union within six months of the end of the International Governmental Conference in mid 1997. Technically, it is feasible for Cyprus to join the European Union at the end of next year. I would like to hear the British Government announce that it not only supports Cyprus's admission into the European Union but that it also pledges not to support Turkish entry until the Cyprus issue is resolved. The United States must also show much greater leadership. I believe that President Clinton does have a more genuine commitment to resolving the Cyprus issue than his predecessors. I am pleased that he has appointed Richard Holbrooke and Richard Beattie as his special envoys on this issue. But, until now, the US has largely paid lip service to the Cyprus issue. The reasons for that are quite clear: Turkey is an important military ally of the US, and for years US foreign policy has seen Turkey as a major buffer in the Middle East against the spread of Islamic fundamentalism.

During my visit to Cyprus, the important role that the US played was repeatedly emphasised. I will visit the United States in late August where I intend to raise with key US political leaders the need for greater action on the Cyprus issue. Indeed, during my visit to Washington I will arrange to have my paper on the Cyprus issue presented to Vice-President Al Gore; Secretary of State Warren Christopher; key congressional leaders including Senator Edward Kennedy; Democrat congressional leader Richard Gephart; and other key US foreign policy leaders including Richard Holbrooke, Richard Beattie and former Massachusetts Governor Michael Dukakis. With national elections looming in the United States in November, I believe it is now time to press very firmly for strong US action. I am convinced that greater United States pressure on Turkey, along with US support for Cyprus's bid to enter the European Union, is of critical importance to the cause of justice in Cyprus.

Australia, however, can play an important role, and I have written to Australia's Foreign Minister, Alexander Downer, asking the Howard Government to renew Australia's commitment to a continued presence by Australian police in the UN peacekeeping force in Cyprus; to seek the Australian Government's support for Cyprus's application to join the European Union to provide greater security; and to continue to raise the Turkish Government's illegal occupation of part of Cyprus within the UN, the Commonwealth and all other international forums. It is also important for Australia to raise the issue of the missing people of Cyprus at the UN. I will raise these issues during my visit to Washington and Greece later this year.

Last year, following my return from Cyprus, I was criticised by the Turkish Ambassador for the comments I made at the Green Line and at a news conference in Nicosia. His attitude towards me and his conduct in my office could be described only as disgraceful. The Denktash regime also complained to Premier Dean Brown about my statements in Cyprus. It wrote to him directly. I indicate to the House that I will never apologise for fighting for justice in Cyprus, and I will continue my campaign here, in Canberra and overseas.

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I have pleasure in supporting the motion. I have spoken at least twice in this House on the situation in Cyprus. The first occasion was Thursday 6 July 1995 when I supported the motion of the member for Peake in condemning what the Turks have done in Cyprus, and again on Tuesday 4 June 1996 when I dealt with the church in Trimithi in northern Cyprus, which the Turks had advertised for sale in a British newspaper. How low can a government go, when it advertises in a paper in England that it is selling a church which had a long history in Cyprus from the middle Byzantine period and is part of the Cypriot register of ancient monuments? This is the sort of level the Turkish Government has reached in Cyprus.

I have mentioned previously the Commission of Human Rights on the atrocities of Turkey in Cyprus, a copy of which I have in front of me, and I want to return to it, because we should never forget the atrocities committed by Turkey in Cyprus. I will deal with some of the aspects that the commission looked at and some of its findings in relation to the atrocities committed by Turkey in Cyprus. It is well known that the Turks have refused to allow the return of more than 170 000 Greek Cypriot refugees to their homes in the north of Cyprus. In other words, they were totally dispossessed by the Turkish invaders in 1974.

They have separated Greek Cypriot families due to displacement, so people still do not know where some people are. They confined thousands of Greek Cypriots to detention centres established in schools and churches. They are responsible for the detention of Greek Cypriot military personnel and the mass murder of Greek Cypriot civilians on a large scale. There is an admission that 1 600 were killed—I would have thought that is a very conservative admission.

I support the intent of the motion, but I really believe that we should be going further, and that is something this House should consider. In my view, at some stage a tribunal should be established to investigate the persecution and murder of

the Greek Cypriot people. It is not good enough to ask the United Nations to do things and raise matters in that forum. The people who committed these atrocities should be chased to the ends of the earth, tried and jailed, because people who carry on like this have no right to live in a civilised society. I believe that this motion does not go far enough. I believe it should also support the establishment of a crimes tribunal to investigate the crimes perpetuated by Turkey in Cyprus. Perhaps I will raise that with the Leader of the Opposition and also the member for Peake, who I understand intends to speak on this motion.

The commission's report found that rapes and other acts of inhumane treatment took place, including injuries to men, women and children; and an adequate supply of food, drinking water and medical treatment was withheld from Greek Cypriot prisoners. It is not only a question of the Turks invading and killing—they are fundamentally denying what any civilised society would require and what the tenets of the United Nations would demand. They are not only barbarians in the sense of invading Cyprus when they had no right in law to do so but their behaviour since then, it seems to me, has indicated that they are beyond the pale.

I have pleasure in supporting the motion, although I do not think it goes far enough. I do not believe that Turkey has learnt a lesson from what they have done, and I do not believe they will. It appears the only language they understand is the sort of treatment they have been giving to people; and that is clear, as I have said, from the fact that they advertised that the church in the village of Trimithi was for sale. Fundamentally, that is an attack on the very basis of the Greek Orthodox religion. Not only are they a people who have murdered, raped, pillaged and dispossessed but they are also a nation that apparently is prepared to attack the very basis of another culture. We as parliamentarians and, hopefully, world citizens should not tolerate that sort of behaviour.

I commend the Leader for his motion and, as I have said, I also commend the member for Peake, because he first raised this issue in this House in 1995. I supported the member for Peake then, as I well remember the Leader of the Opposition and, I think, some other members did also. I commend this motion to the House but, as I said, I believe that it must go further. We must start to investigate what I call crimes committed by the Turkish Government. The perpetrators of these crimes must be brought to justice, and the international community, as it is doing in Bosnia, should ensure that that happens. It is not good enough simply to ask that the matter be raised by the United Nations: we must pursue these people to the ends of the earth and give them clear notice that this sort of behaviour in the civilised twentieth century will not be tolerated by the international community, and that those people who engage in this sort of behaviour will be brought to justice and put in gaol where they belong.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I support the comments of the Leader. As he has already made a comprehensive speech, I will not seek to cover all the ground that he has covered so well. However, it is worth dwelling a bit further on the invasion and occupation of the northern part of Cyprus by Turkey 22 years ago this month and looking at the claims of the Cypriot Government. One would think from listening to the Turkish Government that these legitimate claims by the Cypriot Government are over the top—beyond the pale. Cyprus is a unified nation and is recognised as such by the international community, and the Government in Nicosia is recognised as the legitimate Government of all the people of Cyprus by all the nations of the world bar one.

That Government, which is democratically elected by its people, wants to be able to find out on behalf of its citizens the whereabouts of the 1 600 missing persons, so that those who lost their loved ones during the invasion can give them a Christian burial with a memorial and the like. Is it too much to ask that the international community force the Turkish Government out of Cyprus?

We should also dwell considerably on the role played by the major powers at the time of the invasion of Cyprus in 1974. As the Leader has already pointed out, Britain's role was shameful, as was the role of the United States because, although they were prepared to adopt the high moral ground with respect to the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq with a very swift response to expel the Iraqis from Kuwait, and in spite of their firm approach to the issue of Cyprus, one could be cynical and say that, if Cyprus had a lot of oil under its ground, the action of the major powers to expel the Turkish invaders would have been a lot swifter, particularly, when Britain had, as the Leader has pointed out, sovereign rights to air force bases on Cyprus and the United States had and still has enormous influence over the Turkish Government. But, because Turkey was a member of NATO and because of the Cold War between the Soviet Union and the West, basically, Cyprus was a pawn. The major powers said, effectively, that, because it was on the southern flank of the Soviet Union, keeping Turkey on side was more important to them than was the moral right of the Cypriot people to be one nation, ruled by their own democratically elected Government without outside interference.

One also remembers that leading up to the invasion by Turkey was the political instability in Greece when it was under the control of the military junta, which was supported by the Government of the United States. The destabilisation of the Cypriot Government, which Government was led by the late Archbishop Makarios, saw him undermined internally by pro-junta forces, which had the support of the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States. A power vacuum then followed the attempted *coup d'etat* in Cyprus. The Turks seized that opportunity to invade Cyprus and occupy the northern part of that nation—all without a whimper from the United States or Britain, except for a few pious words.

The people of Cyprus have waited 22 years for the international community to do something decisive. Resolutions are all very well, but they need to be backed up by concerted action. I well remember the arguments used by a number of conservative politicians in this country that, with respect to South Africa, we could never force a change on the South African (then apartheid) regime by the imposition of economic sanctions. It was deemed all too difficult, all too hard. However, notwithstanding the fact that economic sanctions were imposed and were breached by a number of major corporations and countries that did not honour the UN resolutions in that regard, sufficient economic pressure was brought to bear on South Africa to see the ending of apartheid and the election of Nelson Mandela as President on 10 May 1994.

As the Leader has pointed out, Turkey is very keen on getting into the European Union. Obviously, it sees it as a major economic benefit to itself. But there is a price to be paid by Turkey. If it wishes to enjoy the benefits of belonging to the European Union and participating in the generation of wealth that such a union brings to its member States, it must abide by international rules. The European Union—the old

EEC—shunned Greece when that country was ruled by the colonels' dictatorship. Spain could never have joined the then EEC—now the European Union—if General Franco were still the President or Generalissimo of Spain. Nations that have now joined the European Union have been able to do so only on the basis that they have democratically elected governments and a market economy.

It is not too much to expect the European Union to stand up to the Turkish Government and say, 'You do not join us; we do not associate with you until such time as you recognise international laws and the rule of law which says that you are illegally occupying the northern part of Cyprus. Until such time as you withdraw recognition of your puppet regime and cease this ethnic engineering of the population of the northern part of Cyprus by mass migration from the Turkish mainland and allow for the reincorporation of the northern part of Cyprus into one nation, you do not enter this European Union. You do not get the economic benefits you seek from it without your complying with our wishes in this area.'

Britain has a very major role to play in it. It may be 22 years too late, in terms of taking some decisive action, but the requirement on Britain to show a bit of backbone to recognise its role as a former coloniser and as a co-guarantor of the independence of Cyprus demands no less an attitude. In particular, the United States must show that it, too, is prepared to partially redeem its errors of 22 years ago by insisting that there be no admittance of Turkey to a European union without Turkey's complying with UN resolutions concerning its illegal occupation of Cyprus.

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I support what has been said by all speakers today. I can see the logistics and sense in what we are trying to achieve. I am Australian of Greek parentage. I have lived in this country from the day I was born, and have been very closely associated with the Greek community, as my father, who migrated to Australia in 1928, was a former President of the Greek Orthodox Community of South Australia, which is situated in Franklin Street. I was in Greece during the invasion of Cyprus by the Turks, and I can imagine the turmoil that must have happened inside Cyprus during that invasion because, believe me, the turmoil that occurred in Athens, which was far away, reflected the panic and concern of the Greek people over the invasion itself.

For far too long politicians—and I will not pick out selected people—have talked about the invasion of Cyprus and what should happen, but no action has been taken at all. I do not want to single out Dunstan entirely but, during his Premiership from 1970 to 1979—which included the period in which the Turks invaded Cyprus—and considering the large Greek and Cypriot community in Australia at the time of the invasion, he should have done something. United Nations action should have been taken at that time to drive the Turks back into Turkey and to give Cyprus to Greece and the people of Cyprus. Nothing was done about it, and I think about it from time to time.

We have seen other invasions and how quickly the big powers of the world move in with ships and aircraft; bases are established and soldiers are moved in by the hundreds of thousands. We saw what happened in the Middle East, but why did it happen in the Middle East? Because there was oil, and oil means money. But poor old Cyprus had nothing very much: she relied on her tourism and her beauty. Today, 59 different airlines fly into Cyprus on a daily basis. In Cyprus tourism is probably one of the biggest money generators in the whole of Greece. I know that because, some three years ago, I had the pleasure of meeting Mr Laszaridis, who was then the Cypriot representative for the Commonwealth and Olympic Games Federation of Cyprus. He is also the Chairman of the Cyprus Popular Bank and Cyprus Airlines. He left an open invitation for me to visit Cyprus, and I intend to accept that invitation in the next couple of years because I want to see the difference between the Turkish and Cypriot occupied parts of Cyprus. They tell me it is like black and white, the differences being so stark, and there is also the misery and the conditions in which the people must live on the Turkish side of the island. He reflected on the growth and development in tourism and what it did for the people of Cyprus, and I was absolutely amazed.

We have not seen the United Kingdom enthusiastically wanting to drive the Turks out of Cyprus. We have not seen the United States of America, which has always been a front runner in the great democracy of the world, pour its resources into Cyprus and drive the Turks back to their own homeland to give back to the people the heritage that is rightly theirs. Why? Members need to look at the reasons. Quite simply, some of the United States' strongest air bases are situated in the centre of Turkey. Therefore, they say, 'We know that the Cypriots should have their entire island to themselves, but we cannot upset the Turks because we will be thrown out of our air bases in Turkey, and that will take our strategic power from that part of the world.' Who is suffering all along: the people of Cyprus. They have been neglected. They have not been given a fair go at the United Nations' hearing. They have been treated as a small island about which no-one cares.

As a Greek, I know that the Cypriot people will never rest until Cyprus is returned to Greece and the people of Cyprus. I believe that the world owes Cyprus the right to reclaim its total land. As politicians we should not be sitting here paying lip service but, if we want to take a bipartisan approach on this matter, we should send a letter to the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of England and the United Nations, sounding a warning that the part of Cyprus that is now occupied by Turkey must be returned.

We must also look at our historical background. I am very proud to be here today in the Parliament of South Australia, which runs on the democratic basis of people having the freedom and right to vote and to select their representative—and that was given to us by Ancient Greece. 'Themokratia' is the word, and that is what we are practicing in this House today. Greece has made that contribution to the whole world. But, she has made a greater contribution. Greece has also contributed to the world in the areas of art, language, culture, architecture and, more importantly, Christianity, which has survived thousands of years, through wars and turmoil. By giving us Christianity it has embraced the rest of the world, but has the rest of the world embraced Greek and Cyprus in its hour of need? Clearly, it has not.

In supporting what members have said today, let us just not leave it: let us do something positive. Let us take a bipartisan approach and let us see if we can agitate to get it into the United Nations forum. Let us get answers about why the powers of the world are not getting involved in it and see whether we can do something positive to return the land to the people who owned it.

Mr BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRIVILEGES COMMITTEE

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I move:

That this House appoint a Committee of Privileges to investigate the distribution and source of an anonymous letter about the member for Coles in the precincts of the Parliament; the delegation of the investigation by the Speaker to the member for Florey and the propriety of granting access to the member for Florey to computer records of members' comings and goings from the House with a view to finding the distributor of the anonymous letter and another letter signed by the member for Davenport; and the propriety of documents being finger printed in an attempt to identify the distributor of the anonymous letter concerning the member for Coles.

Members of the House are clearly divided about the conduct of the Speaker and the member for Florey in this matter. They are also divided over the anonymous letter about the member for Coles and the member for Davenport's letter about changing the Liberal Party's rules for electing its parliamentary Leader. My motion allows a committee of the House to investigate the facts in dispute pertaining to possible breaches of privilege. It permits the House to formulate rules upon which the House can agree, rules that are certain, rules that apply to Opposition and Government members alike. The Government should have nothing to fear, because it will have a majority on the committee. It is conventional wisdom that it is Oppositions who have most to lose from a privileges committee, not Governments. I should add that the House of Representatives has a Standing Privileges Committee. I shall narrate the story so far starting from the very beginning.

Since 1972 the Liberal Party has been divided between supporters of the old Liberal and Country League, sometimes called conservatives and now sometimes called dries, and supporters of the Liberal Movement, sometimes called small 'l' liberals or wets. Between 1972 and early 1976 the two were separate parties, the former led by the Hon. Bruce Eastick and the latter led by the member for Coles's husband. The Minister for Infrastructure is associated with the former and the Premier has been associated with the latter from his political infancy.

In November 1995, skirmishing resumed between the two factions. The *Sunday Mail* of 26 November 1995 carried a one-word headline: 'Backstabber'. The story alleged that an unnamed Liberal MP had politically backstabbed the Minister for Infrastructure; that she attempted to precipitate a leadership challenge by the Minister to the Premier in the hope that it would fail and the Minister would be dismissed; that she did this in order to speed her progress into the Ministry, even though the effect of her conduct would be to lose electoral support for the Liberal Government; that she encouraged an unnamed Liberal MP to ask the Premier a series of provocative questions at a Liberal Party meeting to try to precipitate a leadership challenge; that she conspired to give the impression of a leadership challenge when there was in fact no such challenge; and that she leaked information about this to the Leader of the parliamentary Labor Party either herself or through an intermediary. This summary of the story is not mine. It is the summary of the story by the member for Coles's solicitor who listed these points as defamatory imputations against the member.

The member for Coles sent the *Sunday Mail* a letter of demand about this story on the basis of which the Speaker ruled discussion of the matter in the House *sub judice*. I shall say no more about that ruling because it is on the record for future generations to compare with the canon of *sub judice* rulings. The member for Coles then issued defamation proceedings against the *Sunday Mail*. The member for Coles alleged the defamatory imputations I have listed above, argued that there was no defence to them, and asked for an apology and damages in respect of each imputation. Months passed. The trial date approached. As so often happens, both sides dreaded the costs of a trial and the Liberal Party dreaded the evidence that might come out at the trial.

The member for Coles in May this year settled the action in return for an apology and retraction in respect of only two of those imputations. They were that she leaked information to the Leader of the parliamentary Labor Party herself or through an intermediary. Later that month someone distributed anonymously a leaflet 'The Joan Hall Apology is an Admission of Guilt'. This leaflet, which I and other members received in the parliamentary mailboxes on the morning of Friday 24 May, made the rather obvious point that if the member for Coles settled for an apology and retraction about two imputations, what about the other six she had alleged in her statement of claim?

The member for Coles must realise that this is one of the penalties of commencing and then settling defamation proceedings. I read the leaflet, chuckled and tossed it into the bin. Members opposite treated it like the Zinoviev letter or the Zimmerman telegram. The letter may be defamatory in the common meaning in that it lessens the reputation of the member for Coles among her peers, but it is most certainly not defamatory in the legal sense in that it lessens the reputation of the member for Coles and there is no defence to it. On the contrary, the anonymous letter would be protected by truth in so far as it is an accurate summary of legal proceedings or qualified privilege or the new defence of political free speech established by the High Court in the Theophanous and Stephens cases.

The irony of the letter controversy is that there was no compelling legal reason for the letter to be anonymous. There were, of course, compelling Party reasons for it to be anonymous. Just after the Coles letter had been distributed, the member for Davenport distributed to the parliamentary mailboxes of Liberal MPs a letter suggesting the Liberal Party change its rules to allow Liberal members in another place to vote in the parliamentary Party ballot for Leader. The Coles letter was in the hands of some Liberal MPs at the Liberal Party seminar on Friday 24 May. The letter of the member for Davenport was distributed in the parliamentary letterboxes later that day and an account of it published in the *Sunday Mail* on 26 May.

In reply to a question by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on 5 June about when the member for Florey first approached the Speaker for access to the records, the Speaker replied:

In relation to the first part of the honourable member's question, it was the date on which the parliamentary Liberal Party held its seminar.

The story continues. The member for Florey obtained a copy of one of these letters and then approached the Speaker for permission to look at the electronic security records of Parliament to see which members had been in the building during the after-hours period. As a result of this permission the member for Florey then challenged the member for Custance about his presence in the building on the evening of 24 May. Why the evening of 24 May? The letter of the member for Coles had been distributed before the evening of 24 May. The member for Florey was fishing for something well beyond what the Speaker had explained he gave the permission for.

The member for Florey later announced to the parliamentary Liberal Party that he had arranged for copies of the anonymous letter to be removed from other members' parliamentary mailboxes to be tested for fingerprints. Given

that we can presume that the Liberal Party does not keep a register of its members' fingerprints, we can only assume that the member for Florey was going to arrange for the fingerprinting of the parliamentary Party—or at least suspects who are members of the House—with a view to comparing those fingerprints with the fingerprints on the anonymous letter.

If this declaration in the Party room was intended to cow some members of the Liberal Party, it is my observation that it was successful for a time. Although the member for Florey was bold enough to make these remarks in the Party room—that is uncontested—he did not apply to his remarks the old political test: how would they read on the front page of the *Advertiser*? In my opinion the undenied remarks and conduct of the member for Florey are a threat to all members because it is members who comprise the great majority of the people who have after-hours access to the House. The privacy of our after-hours comings and goings to the Parliament building should not be invaded by anyone, let alone a freshman member and no member should be threatened with fingerprinting.

The remarks of the member for Florey by themselves justify a committee of privileges. Accordingly, I am moving that the committee investigate the propriety of documents being fingerprinted in an attempt to identify the distributor of the anonymous letter concerning the member for Coles. The Speaker admits that the purpose of the investigation in the case of the anonymous letter was to nail the author, but I ask: nail them for what? The investigation might have been justified had a crime been committed, but not even the Speaker with his enviable knowledge of the law of defamation, has suggested that the anonymous letter was criminal defamation. At the very worst it might have been thought to be civil defamation for which there is a civil remedy. Are members now to assume that each time a letter that lessens the reputation of a member is put in the parliamentary mailboxes that an investigation is to be ordered by the Speaker?

In the parliamentary week beginning 4 June the Speaker asked Opposition members in the House to give him the name of the author or distributor of the anonymous sheet. Why? What would the Speaker do if I or another member gave the Speaker the name? On Wednesday 5 June the Speaker told the House, 'It would appear that members opposite did not appear to be particularly concerned about the distribution of this type of material.'

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: My first comment on that statement is that Opposition members are on the Speaker's left: we do not sit opposite the Speaker unless the Speaker is sitting on the Government benches either in body or spirit. The Speaker assures us that he is the very model of an independent Presiding Officer, so his statement giving himself a perspective from the Government benches must have been a slip of the tongue and the Opposition can readily forgive him for it.

My second comment on that statement is that the Speaker is right: I am not particularly concerned about the anonymous distribution of this material in Parliament. In some circumstances, it may be cowardly or bad form. However, we live in a society that values free speech; indeed, parliamentary democracy is impossible without reasonable freedom of speech. Although we as individuals frown on anonymous allegations, the Parliament has passed laws that encourage and protect it in some circumstances, and I refer the House to the Whistleblowers Protection Act. If the member for Coles thinks the anonymous letter is erroneous, she is free to refute it. She has not done so. The member for Florey and the Speaker did not debate its contents: they merely declared them defamatory and sought to find the author or distributor. This is not the spirit of free speech. It is not the spirit of the Bill of Rights. No, the breach of this House's privilege is not the distribution of the anonymous letter but the investigations that followed. Nevertheless, I am mindful of Mr Speaker's continual beseeching of the Opposition to name the anonymous author or distributor of the leaflet. I have made it one of the purposes of the privileges committee:

> To investigate the distribution and source of an anonymous letter about the member for Coles in the precincts of Parliament.

On 5 June, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked the Speaker this question without notice:

> Did you receive legal advice or consult with other Parliamentary Liberal Party colleagues as to whether you would grant access to the member for Florey to the security records of Parliament House; and, if so, who were they and on what basis and on whose authority in the future will these records be made available to other members of Parliament; and will they be released also to the Opposition Whip and to the member for Davenport?

The Speaker replied:

> The honourable member has asked a series of questions and I am very happy to respond to them all, but let me say to the first part of the question that I discuss issues with a wide range of members on a regular basis, and the role of a Presiding Officer is to keep those confidences involving those discussions with members on both sides of the House. In relation to the remainder of the honourable member's question, I will be pleased to give him a considered response as soon as possible.

That was on 5 June: it is now 4 July. I am disappointed to have to tell the House that one month after that undertaking was given we are still waiting for the answers. The Speaker has told the House that he is having rules about this matter drafted by an appropriate person. It turns out that this person is Mr Andrew Schulze. Much as I respect Mr Schulze, he is not the person to be doing the drafting. This is a job for us, the members of the House. That is why I propose this privileges committee.

The law of this State gives authority over the precincts of Parliament House outside the Assembly Chamber not to the Speaker but to the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee. I refer the House to section 28 of the Parliament (Joint Services) Act 1985. The Joint Parliamentary Service Committee was not and has not been consulted about the Speaker's granting access to the electronic security records to the member for Florey. Why the member for Florey? The member for Florey is a freshman member. He arrived in the House only in 1994. He holds no official position relevant to the task the Speaker gave him. Therefore, I have made another of the purposes of the privileges committee's investigation the delegation of the investigation by the Speaker to the member for Florey and the propriety of granting access to the member for Florey to computer records of members' comings and goings from the House, with a view to finding the distributor of the anonymous letter and another letter signed by the member for Davenport.

It is important that the House investigate whether the Speaker granted the member for Florey access to the security records not just for the investigation of the anonymous letter, as the Speaker claimed, but for the testing of the member for Davenport's veracity in telling the Party that he did not leak his letter to the *Sunday Mail*. If there is little justification for the first reason for the Speaker's giving permission, there is absolutely no justification for the second reason.

I ask members to cast aside pressure from the Government Whip and vote in their own interests and in the interests of the House as an institution. If we surrender our privilege of free speech and privacy to the Speaker and the member for Florey without a privileges committee consideration of the matter, then future generations of members will wonder what sort of parliamentarians we were. Are we mice or are we members?

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

PARKS HIGH SCHOOL

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr De Laine:

That this House—

(a) condemns the decision by the Minister for Education and Children's Services to close The Parks High School at the end of 1996 without any prior consultation with the school community on the findings of the 1995 review into the school;

(b) condemns the Minister for the way in which the school was advised of the decision and the inadequacy of the six sentence notice given to parents and caregivers, the timing of the notification on a Friday afternoon to minimise debate and the total lack of adequate counselling and support for students, staff and caregivers; and

(c) calls on the Minister to reverse his decision and consult with the school community on how the future of the school can be secured.

(Continued from 21 March. Page 1197.)

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): The Government has considered the motion by the member for Price, and I assure the honourable member that the Minister has carefully noted everything that the honourable member has said in this House and in other forums that are available to him. No-one on the Government benches can, should or would condemn any local member who seeks to fairly and honestly represent his electorate. The member for Price is known by most in this Chamber to be a person of integrity who does not deal lightly with his responsibilities and, in so far as he brings this motion into the House as an honest endeavour to rectify something that he sees as not going as he would wish in his electorate, I am sure that the Minister would wish me to commend him. That does not mean that he is right and it does not mean that the Government will support this motion.

Having spoken to the Minister and having looked at some of the matters surrounding the advent of this motion, I say to the honourable member that, while the decision to close The Parks High School may well be regretted, not only by the member for Price as the local member, members of the community, members of previous Governments and even members on this side, many of the seeds of its demise are basically beyond the control of the Government. I do not want to apportion any blame, but its history strikes me as fascinating. It started off as a Government-owned piece of property, a Government-owned high school. We built a landmark community school—The Parks Community Centre—with absolutely wonderful facilities and it was a leading structure of its type in this nation. It was a wonderful and brave adventure, but starting from that point—a Government-owned high school, a wonderful facility built with Government funds—the ownership of the land and the building passed from the Government to another group and the facility is now rented by DECS at a considerable cost.

I know that in closing this debate the member for Price will correct me if I am wrong, but The Parks is unique in this State. I know of no other Government high school that rents its premises. I do not know of any other Government-owned agency in this form, an educational institution, that rents its premises. The member for Price knows that the cost of that rental is considerable. I would say to the member for Price that perhaps it does not matter. It was a brave experiment; it was a very good attempt to look at the needs of an area which has been considered socioeconomically disadvantaged and to attempt, through the creation of a holistic educational approach in the area, where the community is brought into the school, to look at not only education but also other needs of the community, to restructure that community to enhance the educational opportunities.

Despite that happening, there is no evidence that the advent of people from The Parks going into preferred institutions, into preferred career paths, has in fact increased. Perhaps the member for Price can enlighten this House on the huge successes in terms of what it set out to achieve—which was to enhance opportunity for people in the area. If someone can convince me that it has done so, I would be grateful, but to my knowledge there is no evidence. I do not ask the member for Price to comment on this because he is in a difficult position. My late mother taught at Mansfield Park Primary School for the better part of two decades and she used to speak to me quite often about The Parks.

I know that the member for Price perhaps should not comment, but for many years I have observed the trend away from using the local community school, which is regrettable. It is not of any Government's making and I do not think it is of anyone's making, apart from circumstances. There was a time when the school did not have a good reputation, when things went wrong within the school, when there were many social problems associated with the school. Every member in this House knows that the quickest, easiest and best way to kill a school is for the local community to lose confidence in the school. Parents want the best possible education for their children. If they feel that a school offers less than the best and they have any choice at all, discerning parents will send their children elsewhere. Clearly, and regrettably, that is what happened in The Parks. The local people in The Parks area voted with their feet and chose to send their children elsewhere.

We had a considerable Government investment and a brave social experiment which was all designed not to help the member for Ridley send his children to the school, and not to help me, but to help the people living in Mansfield Park to get a better quality education. Yet those parents in that area chose for their own reasons to send their children elsewhere. It was a classic case of declining enrolment offset by a very large investment exacerbated by the need of the Government to meet a recurrent cost for the rental. That is the reason for closing The Parks High School. It is because it is no longer economically viable and because the people of that area have chosen alternatives for education. That does not mean that we do not support what The Parks was, or what The Parks sought to do. It was a brave experiment and a new direction and whoever is to be credited with its genesis must be given credit, but not everything we do in Government works. Some things work well, other things work at a mediocre level and other things fail. The art of being a good Government is picking the successes from the failures, building on the positives and moving forward.

Has the education system learned anything from The Parks? I hope it has learned a considerable amount. But does that mean that we should continue The Parks in perpetuity just because it started as a brave experiment or because it started as an icon to a particular view of the methods by

which education can be used to enhance opportunity for people in disadvantaged areas? I think not. It was a brave experiment but, according to economic measures and according to the perceived educational needs of the local community, it has failed.

In the little time available to me I will briefly deal with the serious issue canvassed by the member for Price in connection with the consultation with parents. I attribute no blame to him in putting up the motion, but the member for Price has been here a long time and he knows that we can always say that consultation was inadequate on any issue and on any occasion. It does not matter how many times you consult or who you consult, you will always be accused of not consulting the right people, or you have not given them enough time or you have not consulted them enough times. If every Government were to be berated and impeded in what it sought to do on the ground that consultation has not been adequate, we would get nowhere. Incidentally, and I do not mean this cruelly, the last Government often did get nowhere because it spent all its time consulting and none of its time doing anything. I believe that consultation was adequate.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

[Sitting suspended from 12.40 to 2 p.m.]

FISHING, NET

A petition signed by 132 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to ban net fishing in King George whiting nursery areas and from tourist beaches where requested by local government authorities was presented by Mrs Penfold.

Petition received.

GALLANTRY

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: On Tuesday 2 July 1996 the Leader of the Opposition asked several questions pertaining to the operational use of the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service fire boat M.V. *Gallantry*. The Opposition claims were designed to give the impression that the fire boat was being deliberately under-utilised—particularly in sea search and rescue operations—by this Government in order to justify any future sale. Of even more concern was the fact that the Leader of the Opposition claimed that I, in my capacity as Minister for Emergency Services, had issued specific instructions for the vessel not to be used in such operations.

Then yesterday the United Firefighters Union put out a media release stating that it was 'demanding an independent inquiry into whether the Government ordered police not to use the fire boat *Gallantry* in marine search and rescue missions in a bid to prove that the vessel is "useless".' The media release quoted the State Secretary of the United Firefighters Union as follows:

> It would be absolute lunacy for the Government to put people's lives at risk by ordering police not to use the fire boat just so the Minister can back up his own prejudice that the *Gallantry* is useless.

He goes further and states:

> However, it is quite clear from listening to the tape that the Opposition has dropped—no doubt by courtesy of the United Firefighters Union—
>
> that senior police believe they were under explicit orders from Wayne Matthew not to use the *Gallantry*—even if it could have helped save someone's life.

This emotive innuendo only highlights the desperate tactics of the Opposition and its union colleagues and is yet another example of their motto, 'Never let the facts get in the way of a good story.' If the Opposition or even the United Firefighters Union had referred their concerns to senior management of the South Australian Police Department, they would have been told that the Police Department does not regard the M.V. *Gallantry* as a first response vessel for any of the sea search and rescue operations that it coordinates.

Information supplied by the Police Commissioner's office shows that for the 1995-96 financial year its Water Response Section vessels were involved in 205 incidents including searches, rescues and tows. None of those involved the M.V. *Gallantry*. Further, the M.V. *Gallantry* has been called only once by the police Water Response Section, which was to tow the police launch *Vigilant* (formerly known as the *Des Corcoran*) to port on 26 November 1994 after halon gas was released in the engine room. However, the Police Commissioner's office advises that there have been approximately 10 other occasions when the M.V. *Gallantry* has voluntarily responded to incidents when not having been requested by police to do so.

Before calling out the fire boat, the Police Department, whose officers have responsibility for coordinating and planning all sea rescue operations, considers a number of factors, including: the police water rescue plan stipulates search and rescue vessels to be called as first response to situations at specific locations around the State; the MFS and the M.V. *Gallantry* are not trained in sea rescue searching techniques and do not exercise with the organisations using the water rescue plan; the vessel is not capable of entering some waters due to its design and draught; the vessel and other vessels in the stated categories should not be called upon unless all water rescue plan resources have been exhausted; and due consideration is given in life-threatening situations to the quickest means of matching urgent need to resources. This information supplied by the Police Department speaks for itself.

As to the Opposition's claims that I gave specific instructions to wind down the operations of the M.V. *Gallantry*, I again state for the record that its claims are untrue and easily disproved, for the direct opposite is the case. I gave specific instructions to SAMFS to maximise the use of the M.V. *Gallantry*. As a direct result of that specific instruction, the *Gallantry* has responded to incidents in which it would otherwise not have been involved. Of particular interest is the fact that the *Gallantry* has been called out to a number of incidents involving minor oil spills in Gulf St Vincent, including: 21 August 1995, diesel oil spill on the Port River at Osborne; 27 October 1995, spillage on the Port River at Port Adelaide; 23 May 1996, oil spillage; and 29 May 1996, oil spillage. This is the sort of roles in which the *Gallantry* was not previously involved.

The fact remains that to this day the fire boat has yet to pour water on to a fire—the exact purpose for which it was purchased and, indeed, built by the previous Labor Government at a cost of more than $1 million. During Question Time on 2 July the Leader of the Opposition was particularly critical of two search and rescue operations—one on 17-18 March and one on 2 April this year—and queried why the *Gallantry* was not called in to assist police in these two

operations. Again, had the Leader of the Opposition checked his facts or, indeed, had he consulted with police or even his own shadow emergency services spokesman, instead of making a cheap grab for publicity, he would have been told that the police conducting both searches determined that the fire boat was not necessary—not me, not the Government but the police coordinating the searches at the front line. All searches of that magnitude are coordinated by police officers who are able to call upon the services of the *Gallantry* if they believe it is warranted under the circumstances at hand. It is a decision made at the front line, and that is where the decision should be made—not by me and certainly not by the Leader of the Opposition.

As to the sea search on 17-18 March, police indicate that the *Gallantry* was not required as 'resources deployed were considered appropriate by the search controller'. For the Leader of the Opposition's benefit, those resources included two helicopters, one fixed-wing aircraft, two police launches, eight Sea Rescue Squadron vehicles, two volunteer coast guard vessels and one hovercraft. With that number of vessels and aircraft involved, it seems to me that police did have the situation under control.

As to the 2 April 1996 incident, the police advise that, again, the *Gallantry* was not required for similar reasons. The fact remains that, if this Government were to make a decision today about a fire boat for the future needs of the State, it would not buy such a vessel. The annual cost of running the boat is $823 000. I stress that the vessel is yet to pour water on a fire in almost two years of operation. There was no justification for buying the *Gallantry*, although there is justification for a contract to utilise a vessel with firefighting capabilities when the need arises. This has been achieved in other Australian cities, most notably in the Sydney Harbour waterfront area.

Final work is now being undertaken to determine the best option for a fire boat: whether it is more cost-effective for this Government to dispose of the boat and lease another in its place or, in view of the money already wasted by the previous Labor Government on its purchase, to keep the boat until its disposal. When this work is completed, I will make a further statement to the House on the future of the M.V. *Gallantry*. The decision will be predicated on a business case and not on the demands of the United Firefighters Union or the Leader of the Opposition.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I bring up the twenty-seventh report of the committee on the Port Augusta Hospital construction of a new 87 bed acute facility and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

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

That the report be printed.

Motion carried

QUESTION TIME

TENNECO GAS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Treasurer. What assurances has the Government received concerning the continued employment of South Australian Tenneco pipeline workers and the operations of the Peterborough depot given the purchase of Tenneco Energy by the US El Paso Energy Corporation and the intention announced by El Paso to sell up to 50 per cent of its Australian assets? The Pipelines Authority of South Australia was privatised and sold to Tenneco Energy one year ago for $304 million. Under the contract, Tenneco was committed to maintain existing jobs and the Peterborough depot for at least two years. El Paso Energy has now bought Tenneco Energy in a deal reportedly valued at $US4 billion. El Paso Energy President and Chief Executive Officer, Bill Wise, has announced:

In Australia. . . Tenneco owns 100 per cent equity in its pipeline projects. . . El Paso would like to reduce its stakes to between 20 per cent and 50 per cent in order to take debt off the new company's balance sheet.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The Leader is only a day late, because I understand that this question was asked in the Upper House yesterday. Contractual arrangements were made at the time of the sale to Tenneco. It was a good deal for the State and the Government and it remains that way, because the contractual arrangements that were put in place then remain with the business. In fact, whether El Paso or Tenneco owns the business, there is no change in that arrangement.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Indeed, that long-term commitment remains, and importantly—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: If the Leader of the Opposition would like to listen, one of the important parts of the original deal was to get another equity partner into the process. That was made quite clear. For example, there was some interest from Santos at the time regarding whether it wished to be in partnership with Tenneco in that pipeline and the transmission of gas. That did not eventuate. There might well have been some difficulties with trade practices or whatever, but we did not test that result. It was made quite clear at the time of the additional equity partner, and I presume that El Paso will follow the same track that Tenneco outlined originally.

In some ways, the El Paso deal means that we have a company that is focused on oil and gas. If the Leader of the Opposition had read the press, he would have understood that Tenneco is a very diversified company. One of its major strengths, which became its major weakness during the 1980s, was the manufacture of heavy agricultural equipment such as Case tractors. As I said, it was a very diversified company, and it decided to consolidate back into its core business. As the core business of El Paso is oil and gas, we believe this is an even stronger partnership than the previous one.

MIGRANTS

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): My question is directed to the Premier. In the light of the State Government's policy to attract an increased number of targeted migrants to South Australia, does the Premier support the decision announced yesterday by the Federal Government to increase the level of skilled migrants coming to Australia?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The State Government recently announced a strategy to increase the number of migrants coming to South Australia. The category that we are targeting particularly is skilled migrants. We are working with some of the larger information technology companies to put together a sponsored skilled migrant program so that we can bring to South Australia from overseas migrants who

have, in particular, software development skills for the computer industry, which is already experiencing a shortage in South Australia. We are looking at attracting electronic engineers, software development engineers and others. So, I welcome the announcement yesterday that the Federal Government plans to increase by 5 000 the number of skilled migrants coming to Australia.

The Federal Government also announced that it planned to reduce by 10 000 the total number of migrants entering Australia. I make it clear that I personally do not support a reduction in overall migration to South Australia, or to Australia. In fact, this State wants to attract more migrants. Australia's basic problem is that too many migrants simply settle in Sydney. We need to put in place programs to ensure that South Australia, Western Australia and Queensland attract a far higher percentage of the migrants coming to Australia. Although the Federal Government has reduced migration levels by 10 000 for the 1996-97 year, I hope it is not an indication that it intends to hold that level in the future.

I would urge the Federal Government to go back to accepting very close to 100 000 migrants a year, but I applaud the Federal Government's policy of increasing the number of skilled migrants. I have some concerns that the reduction in the level of migration into Australia will adversely affect families who are trying to attract other family members to Australia as migrants, and therefore bring about family reunions. The strategy of the State Government though is enhanced by this position laid down by the Federal Government. In terms of the 95 points for migrating to Australia, we would like to see specific points allocated to ensure that a migrant settles not in Sydney but elsewhere in Australia for at least two years. We support the Federal Government's proposal to increase the number of skilled migrants into Australia; that is exactly in line with what the State Government is putting down as its own policy.

ADELAIDE 21 PROJECT

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): What response has the Premier received from John Howard to the interim report on the Adelaide 21 project, and what financial commitment will both the State and Federal Governments make to achieving its objectives? The Premier will remember that, last year, he joined Paul Keating at Glenelg in announcing the Adelaide 21 project—an idea initiated by Labor Senator Nick Bolkus and Michael Lennon. The interim report, released in May this year, stressed that our city centre deserves priority and attention because it is critical to the State's successful transformation as we approach a new century. The Adelaide 21 report stresses the importance of the city centre (because if the centre dies the suburbs will lose), and creates a workable framework for strengthening and developing the city towards 2010.

The project's Director, Michael Lennon, said that the choice for Adelaide is either quiet regionalisation in the next century and relative decline, or the challenge of becoming a cosmopolitan, internationally oriented and competitive city. The report highlights the importance of our internationalising our universities; stresses that our parklands are under-used and poorly managed; and states that major city stakeholders, such as the universities, businesses and key Government agencies, have little direct say in the city's planning, management and development. The interim report stresses that Adelaide's civic leadership has become hopelessly deadlocked and that, instead of trying to mimic and compete with other capital cities, Adelaide should try to focus on what makes it different and unique. What is the State and Federal Governments' response to this important report?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Adelaide 21 project report will be released tomorrow. It is a joint project between the State Government, the Federal Government and the City of Adelaide. The project is under the chairmanship of Dr Don Williams, due to the State Government's lack of satisfaction with the progress being made on the future plans for the City of Adelaide by the Adelaide City Council. I do not intend to pre-empt the findings of the report, which will be released tomorrow, but I am willing to say that the State Government has embarked on a major program to put life back into the City of Adelaide itself.

We have embarked on a range of initiatives, including the upgrade of the eastern end of Rundle Street; the East Garden project; and the upgrade of North Terrace, with significant funds being invested in the upgrade of the Art Gallery, with the Library and Museum to follow. We have helped and encouraged the rejuvenation of the north-west corner of Adelaide. We have seen the development of the University of South Australia, which will attract 25 000 students. As a State Government we have just finished the next stage of a $20 million development of the Adelaide TAFE College; we have attracted EDS with its Asia-Pacific education centre into that TAFE centre, and the Government itself has made a commitment for another $15 million into a living arts centre adjacent to Light Square.

The State Government has also embarked on a number of other initiatives in the City of Adelaide itself. We want to see a vibrant, growing, developing city centre. People who come to this State will judge South Australia largely by the City of Adelaide itself. I have been very dissatisfied by the lack of vision and foresight shown by the council so far. We are delighted that the report has been undertaken, sponsored by the State Government, and I assure the people of South Australia that this Government now takes on as a major task the job of making sure that we have a significant upgrade of the City of Adelaide itself, together with a long-term vision and foresight for the city, and the State Government will be putting policies in place to achieve that.

FORWOOD PRODUCTS

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Gordon): Can the Treasurer advise the House what progress has been made by the Asset Management Task Force in selling the South-East timber processing plant, Forwood Products, on behalf of the State?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: It gives me a great deal of pleasure to announce today that Forwood Products is being sold to Carter Holt Harvey Limited, a New Zealand firm of considerable capacity and world-class practice. The sale price was some $130 million, and we believe that the combination we will now have in the South-East with Carter Holt Harvey's Australian wood products headquarters based there will augur well for the South-East. Importantly, the sale of Forwood Products brings the total asset sales close to the $1.8 billion that we announced prior to the last election. We reannounced it in the 1994 May statement as our target for asset sales which we would use for debt reduction. We are delighted that we have received a good price and, indeed, we have inherited a great corporate citizen in terms of the future of the South-East.

Carter Holt Harvey is one of the largest forest products companies in the Southern Hemisphere and is New Zealand's

second largest company by capitalisation. Carter Holt Harvey plans to develop the capacity of Forwood Products to produce in a world-class sawmilling environment products that not only are used on the domestic front but can be exported overseas using world's best practice. It has a number of aims for Forwood Products, including the introduction of world-class technology and management practices from Carter Holt Harvey's existing businesses; the enhanced capacity to obtain capital for future expansion (they are looking to put about $30 million into the south-eastern operation to bring it up to a very efficient operation); development of export opportunities through Carter Holt Harvey's global network, one of the largest networks in the world (a little different from the way Forwood Products has been able to concentrate in the main only on domestic markets); opportunities for employee advancement with a global forests products group; and benefits to Forwood Products' existing customers through an expanded distribution network.

Carter Holt Harvey Limited is a large and very strong company, as I mentioned, with a capitalisation of some NZ$5.7 billion, and it already employs more than 12 500 people. This is an important day for the South-East because it will secure the future of sawmilling in the South-East. It will bring a number of benefits to that area, and I believe that everyone should be pleased by the result we have obtained. Thanks to the Asset Management Task Force, to PISA and to the management and existing employees of Forwood Products, we have now transacted this sale and it only augurs well for the South-East and the State.

BUSINESS INCENTIVES

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier as Minister for Information Technology. Given the Minister for Infrastructure's acknowledgment yesterday of the financial difficulties which Australis Media is experiencing, will the Premier advise the House how much in the way of taxpayers' funds is at risk? The Minister for Infrastructure has said that, as well as providing Australis Media with a purpose-built building, the Government gave the company a whole package of incentives, including assistance with training in return for an employment target of 750 jobs. It was reported on radio this morning that an Industry Commission report, to be released shortly, says that South Australia is offering twice as much in taxpayer funded incentives than Queensland for companies to relocate here, and that the Industry Commission had difficulty collecting data from South Australia because of a Government ban on South Australian Government officials speaking to the commission on this issue.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Let us take up the last issue first. I am proud that this Government makes twice the commitment of the average State across Australia to attracting new industry to this State. I find it incredible that we have a Labor Opposition that apparently does not wish to see economic development in South Australia. It is very critical of the fact that we brought companies like Motorola, EDS, Australis and others—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes you are; you have just stood up and repeated—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader has asked his question and will not interject again.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: You have just used Bill Scales, from the Industry Commission, as an argument as to why we should be reducing the level of assistance given to economic development in South Australia. At the outset, I will say why the South Australian and Victorian Governments did not participate in the Industry Commission inquiry. They did not do so, because it was a political set-up by the Premier of New South Wales, who acknowledged that to the Premiers seated around an informal dinner table. He went off to his crony, the Federal Labor Minister, and asked, 'Will you issue instructions for a reference to the Industry Commission to look at levels of industry assistance of the various State Governments around Australia?'

So, we had this crony and a political inquiry set up by New South Wales, because they were shedding tears over their loss of Westpac out of New South Wales. That is the only reason why this Industry Commission inquiry has been held. It is a political inquiry organised by the Labor Party, and it reflects badly on the Opposition in South Australia that it should now be quoting Bill Scales and suggesting that we should be reducing the level of assistance for economic development in this State.

I assure the honourable member that this State Government has two clear objectives, the first of which is to create a competitive environment. We have started to achieve that after the debacle of the Bannon-Arnold Labor years. Arnold and Bannon imposed on industry in South Australia the highest increases in State taxation of any State Government in Australia. They would know that when they lost office South Australia was about the second least competitive State in the whole of Australia. Now we can hold our heads high and say that in just 2½ years this Liberal Government has now made South Australia the most competitive State for industrial development of any State in Australia. That is why I gave a commitment.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Sit down and take it!

The SPEAKER: Order! I take it that the Deputy Leader, even though he has not indicated his wish to do so, wishes to raise a point of order.

Mr CLARKE: I do, Sir. Standing Order 98 provides that Ministers are required to answer the substance of a question.

The SPEAKER: If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition were so concerned to see the Standing Orders implemented rigidly, he would not be in the Chamber today, as he has persistently breached Standing Orders. Therefore, I am not of the view that the Premier has breached Standing Orders in answering the question.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Who raised the issue of the Industry Commission report? None other than the honourable member who is now trying to shut me up on it. He threw up the ball and, just because I hit it back at him and aced him, he does not like it. South Australia now has a reputation for being more successful than the other States of Australia in attracting major new industrial developments such as the Westpac Centre, EDS, Australis, Motorola and others.

I stress that this Government will continue to make that additional commitment, like we do in education. It is not as if other areas of Government are suffering. We make a bigger commitment than any other State of Australia in the education of our children so that they will have a future in this State; and we now want to attract industries, particularly in the emerging areas such as information technology, tourism,

aquaculture and other areas, so our children have long-term job prospects in South Australia.

TAXI WATCH

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Minister for Police inform the House what crime prevention initiatives the South Australian Police Force has in conjunction with the taxi industry?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: A Taxi Watch system has been put in place; in fact, it relates back to 1993. I would like to give members an update on the extent to which the police are using the eyes and ears of those people who are out and about all the time to advance the issue of community safety. The system works as follows: when a major incident is reported, a fax is sent to taxi companies which notify their drivers, and we then have a wider capacity not only to detect dishonesty or offences but also to catch criminals.

It is pleasing to report that Access Cabs, Adelaide Independent Taxis, Amalgamated Taxi Services, Des's Cabs, Diamond Taxis, Suburban Taxi Service and Yellow Cabs are part of this system. On average, about 15 faxes are sent out per month on major incidents where we believe a wider network, such as taxi drivers, can assist police. Of the 15 faxes sent out per month, we receive about five responses from this source, and we have had major successes in terms of offenders being caught, problem road accidents being quickly fixed up, and the locating of distressed people.

It is important to understand that we are now utilising the resources of the community in a much wider sense, and that has been a great success, in addition to using our utilities—bus services, ETSA, the Gas Company and SA Water. These people are out and about all the time, and they notice more about what is going on, perhaps, than the residents themselves, and there has been a very positive response. The scheme has been very successful. Two other States—Victoria and Western Australia—are coming to look at it, and they also believe that the greater the involvement in the community as regards crime prevention and community safety the greater the chance of success in the whole process. Again, I congratulate the police for this initiative.

DOCTORS, MOUNT GAMBIER

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Following escalation of the South-East babies dispute after the threat to de-register doctors, does the Premier acknowledge the ongoing stress created to the South-East community by this dispute? Will the Premier direct the Health Minister to visit Mount Gambier and negotiate a long-term settlement? It was revealed today that the Medical Board threatened to de-register general practitioner-obstetricians in Mount Gambier only days before the deadline to resolve the babies dispute. As a result, doctors may now refuse to deliver babies after March next year. Today's *Border Watch* editorial states:

> The seeds of another dispute have already been sown.

The editorial also states:

> Without being alarmist, it is our duty to warn this community that the medical and health care scenario for the near future is grim.

Further, the *Border Watch* stated that it could only appeal again to the Minister to keep his promise to come to Mount Gambier as soon as possible for a public meeting; and that the member for Gordon should be pressing harder to ensure this vital meeting takes place for the future health and well-being of the people he represents.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Let us be clear about what the member for Gordon has already achieved for the people of Mount Gambier. This Government, after many years of procrastination by the former Labor Government, is committed to building a new hospital at Mount Gambier costing over $20 million. That has been brought about by the efforts of the member for Gordon and the responsiveness of this Government. Therefore, it is clear that this Government has a very high commitment to the health care of the people of Mount Gambier and surrounding districts. I also indicate something that the member for Elizabeth did not make clear: the doctors have agreed to participate in the indemnity insurance support scheme put in place by the Minister for Health, and they signed up last week.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: They have signed up and agreed to participate. Therefore, there is ongoing obstetric help in Mount Gambier and surrounding districts. Some of the other districts had signed up earlier and pledged their support to make sure that they maintained the service, as any doctor has a duty to do. Their duty is not to play politics over things like the birth of babies, but instead to make sure that they give ongoing support to people in the South-East with their medical services.

Ms Stevens: Why not send the Minister there?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The honourable member is quite out of touch. The Minister has already accepted an invitation by the member for Gordon to go to Mount Gambier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Minister was there in April this year.

Ms Stevens: That's not good enough.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Minister was there in April this year and he has already accepted a further invitation by the member for Gordon to go to Mount Gambier and talk to the people involved in the hospital.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Premier is having difficulty answering the question because members opposite keep interjecting.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader has already been spoken to. I suggest to the member for Elizabeth and others that the practice of continuing to interject in an endeavour to engage in a conversation while a question is being answered is unacceptable. If members do not wish to comply with that ruling, first, they will not get the call the next day and, secondly, they know the consequences.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We know that the member for Elizabeth is embarrassed. She asked whether I would instruct the Minister for Health to go to Mount Gambier, but he has already accepted an invitation to go there. I realise that she is embarrassed, but I assure her that the Minister, having already been there once this year, has plans to go again.

PLAYFORD, SIR THOMAS

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): My question is directed to the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development. This week marks the centenary of the birth of former South Australian Premier Sir Thomas Playford. Will the Minister outline what commemorative plans ETSA Corporation has to mark this occasion?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: As you advised the House yesterday, Mr Speaker, not only is tomorrow the centenary of Sir Thomas Playford's birth but the Premier has indicated a range of activities to celebrate his birth. Coincidentally, it is also the 50th anniversary of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. In 1946, under Tom Playford's leadership, the trust took over operations from the Adelaide Electric Supply Company. At that time South Australia had less than 50 miles of transmission lines and just one major power station at Osborne, and the vast majority of its customers lived and worked in Adelaide.

In those 50 years ETSA has expanded the electricity network throughout the State to encompass more than 72 000 kilometres of overhead power lines and 8 000 kilometres of underground power lines; it has constructed three major power stations (two at Port Augusta and one at Torrens Island); and its operation of the Leigh Creek coalfield sees 57 000 tonnes of coal extracted and processed every day. All of this was made possible by the remarkable efforts of a visionary—Sir Thomas Playford.

To ensure that his contribution to the State's electricity industry is acknowledged, ETSA Corporation has commissioned two bronze busts by local sculptor Jeff Mincham. One will be erected in the foyer of ETSA's headquarters at 1 Anzac Highway, Keswick, and will be unveiled tomorrow, being the anniversary of Sir Thomas's birthday, and the other will be placed at Leigh Creek in the town's recreation centre and unveiled in a ceremony later this month when the recreation centre will also be renamed in honour of Sir Thomas Playford.

ETSA will also mark the centenary with the opening, later this year, of the Thomas Playford Electricity Museum. Retired and current ETSA employees are collecting and bringing together photographs, equipment, books, appliances and other items to ensure that we preserve the history of electricity in South Australia—a major legacy of the Playford era. Work is well under way refurbishing ETSA's former depot at Kurralta Park for this purpose. The museum will be managed and maintained by the ETSA Corporation Retired Employees Association and will be open for tours by school and other community groups.

There is no doubt that Sir Thomas Playford was a great South Australian—a man whose vision gave guidance to generations of people in this State. He single-mindedly oversaw the modernisation of South Australia at a critical time in its history. He took our State from the largely rural base that it had since settlement, gave it a sense of the future and established a manufacturing base.

LIFTS MAINTENANCE

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Did the Minister for State Government Services order the lift maintenance section of Services SA to withdraw its lift maintenance tender, already accepted by the building owner of the SGIC building in Victoria Square; if so, on what grounds; and did he take legal advice as to whether the tender, once submitted, was irrevocable? The Opposition has received a letter regarding this situation. The letter states:

> Recently we were invited to supply a tender for the lift maintenance at the SGIC building in Victoria Square originally owned by the Government but later changed hands and is now owned by Legal & General. We received notification that we were the successful tender. However, we were told by our Minister to withdraw our tender and not to tender for any private work earmarked for privatisation.

The letter is signed by members of the lift section.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: As the honourable member is well aware, the Government has been progressively outsourcing work that was previously undertaken by Government employees. That is entirely consistent with the Government's policy of ensuring that work is undertaken by the private sector. Without my knowledge and that of any other member of the Government, Services SA placed a tender bid for maintenance work in a building that was not owned by the Government. That was inconsistent with the policy of this Government. On finding out about that tender, I instructed the agency to withdraw its application. It is news to me that it had won the tender. My information was that tenders had not at that time been decided. Accordingly, the tender was withdrawn, and it was an entirely appropriate decision.

This Government is not about competing with the work of the private sector. The building involved is not a Government building; it is owned by the private sector. It is not appropriate that any Government employee should be involved in the maintenance of a building that is not owned by the Government. Further, as has been stated in this place on many occasions, this Government is progressively outsourcing the work that is undertaken by Government employees. That work is going to the private sector.

RURAL FINANCE SUMMIT

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Primary Industries update the House on the rural finance summit presently being held in Canberra?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: The National Rural Finance Summit is presently being held in Canberra. South Australia is very well represented at the summit not only by staff in my department but by others from South Australia who have given up their time to attend the summit, including rural counsellors, the Agricultural Bureau, rural farm and business management consultants, the Farm Management Society, the Farmers Federation, individual farmers, the Citrus Growers Federation, the Sheep Meat Council, and the Riverland Horticultural Corporation, among others. The National Rural Finance Summit was convened by Minister Anderson to fulfil a commitment made prior to the election. The first day was used to set the scene but, already, there has been a positive flow of discussion. Members might have heard reports about the summit on radio this morning.

The outcomes that Minister Anderson sought include: the identification of challenges and opportunities facing rural South Australia; the identification of the challenges that need to be overcome by industry, Government and the community if we are to return to long-term sustainability and profitability in the farm sector, optimising its contribution to the economy; and the provision for the rural sector of the skills and services required to enable it to absorb adjustment pressures. The summit will also highlight and increase public awareness of the serious problems confronting the farm sector throughout Australia together with the tremendous opportunities and the contribution that the rural sector makes to the economy.

We recognise that the Government needs to work in partnership with industry and the community to develop policies which recognise the cyclical nature of primary production and which equip farmers with the financial tools necessary to manage the risks resulting from the cycles. We must facilitate skills development opportunities that will increase the long-term viability of farmers.

The Property Management Planning Scheme, which was conceived and first introduced into South Australia by PISA, has been widely applauded at the summit. Since its introduction in South Australia, 213 farm plan grants of $3 000 have been approved, representing a total cost of over $600 000. That is just one step along the path of proactively developing business skills amongst our farmers. It is anticipated that the summit will result in positive policy recommendations and direction for the Federal Government as to how government, industry and the community can work together to solve some of the problems in rural Australia.

ETSA SEPARATION PACKAGES

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Why did the Minister for Infrastructure tell the House yesterday that ETSA workers wanted the modified voluntary separation packages that gave them only 75 per cent of the value of a normal VSP? In the House yesterday the Minister said, 'It is an agreement that the work force wanted, as I understand it.' On Tuesday night a meeting of representatives of ETSA depots rejected the proposal. Yesterday, the ETSA single bargaining unit also rejected the proposal.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The honourable member has answered her own question.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

Mr BECKER (Peake): Will the Minister for State Government Services provide information on a driver training program soon to be introduced for drivers of Government vehicles and the reasons for such a scheme?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: It is fair to say that every member of this Chamber and, indeed, many people in the State would be well aware of the member for Peake's vigilance in ensuring the correct and proper use of Government motor vehicles. For that, the taxpayers of South Australia owe the honourable member a debt. In that vein, a training program is about to be introduced for drivers of State Government vehicles. Over the past 12 months there were 2 135 accidents or incidents of motor vehicle damage involving Government motor vehicles. In many cases with such accidents there were injuries and, regrettably, on three occasions over the past 12 months people have died travelling in Government motor vehicles. In total, these accidents have cost the Government and, therefore, taxpayers more than $2 million in vehicle repairs alone. The average damage bill is $909 per accident, but 14 of those accidents involved damage of more than $10 000.

I highlight these figures not to indicate that Government motor vehicles are involved in any greater number of accidents than those in the private sector, nor to claim that those in South Australia are worse than in any other areas, because the fact is that they are not: the primary aim in highlighting this concerns saving lives and reducing injury and the cost of motor vehicle accidents. The program we are about to introduce is not about laying the blame for accidents with any one particular person or group of people: it is about adopting a program that is used in the private sector to better make employees aware of their responsibilities in driving a motor vehicle.

As a result, driver training courses are being developed by my department in consultation with the private sector with a view to implementing a program within the next six months. It is expected that the courses will be designed for people who have experienced more than two accidents in a 12 month period, who are newer drivers not acquainted with Government vehicles or who undertake extensive country travel.

Statistics provided by FleetSA indicate that 175 Government employees were involved in more than one accident between 1 July 1995 and 30 June 1996. Of course, these people were not at fault in all those accidents. Unfortunately, statistics indicate that many of the accidents involving Government vehicles could have been avoided if drivers had been more attentive. The statistics provided by FleetSA indicate that the major causes of accidents and vehicle damage during the 1995-96 financial year were as follows: inattentive driving, 693 accidents; theft, vandalism and other damage, 613; reversing a vehicle, 519; failing to give way, 97; losing control of the vehicle, 63; accidents when changing lanes, 51; and those that fall into various other categories, 99.

The total repair costs were as follows: 1 589 accidents with damage less than $1 000; 483 accidents with damage of $1 000 to $5 000; 49 accidents between $5 000 and $10 000; and 14 accidents with damage greater than $10 000. The Government is of the view that driver training programs will assist users of vehicles to become more aware of major causes of vehicle accidents. As members would be well aware, similar courses are provided by the private sector. After registration of interests were sought and evaluated from private sector organisations, two conventional training firms and one four-wheel drive organisation were selected to conduct the courses.

The courses will cover areas of traffic law, and braking and parking manoeuvres, and will be incorporated with supervised on-road training. Obviously, if through these courses we can prevent just one road accident fatality or reduce the number of people injured, that in itself will prove that the courses are a very worthwhile investment for the South Australian taxpayer. An added benefit is that people who undertake the training courses will, hopefully, utilise their skills in driving their own private vehicles, therefore possibly further reducing the number of accidents on our roads.

FORWOOD PRODUCTS

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): In the light of the announced sale of Forwood Products to Carter Holt and the sale of Tenneco to El Paso Energy, will the Treasurer guarantee that Carter Holt will not in turn sell off any of Forwood's assets or long-term log supply rights to third party foreign companies?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: That is a very strange question. We are talking about one of the strongest and most successful timber companies in the world. This company seeks to make the South-East a prime provider of value-added timber in this country. The honourable member asks about tomorrow and whether the company will sell off. Quite frankly, I do not think that requires an answer.

YOUTH, BEHAVIOURAL PROBLEMS

Ms GREIG (Reynell): My question is directed to the Minister for Family and Community Services. What steps are being undertaken by the South Australian Government to address the issue of young people showing signs of severe destructive behaviour? There is growing concern within the community about the future of a certain group of young

people caught in patterns of major behavioural problems for which there does not appear to be any immediate response. Some of these young people are classified as homeless and have a background of abuse and drug use and are seemingly trapped in a lifestyle that threatens their long-term future, eventually leading to a custodial sentence.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am particularly pleased to be able to answer this question, and in doing so I would like to recognise the significant work that the member for Reynell does in her electorate to assist young people. I understand that on a number of nights the member for Reynell has gone out with officials to investigate some of the issues that face young people, and I commend her for that work.

The honourable member raises an important subject. It concerns the well-being and care of a group of young people who are among the most vulnerable in the community. I was particularly pleased at the Community Services Ministerial Meeting, which I attended in Tasmania on Tuesday and Wednesday, to secure the cooperative efforts of other States and the Commonwealth for a national approach on this issue. With national strategies being formulated for issues such as child abuse and paedophilia, I thought it would be remiss if we did not include young people with severe destructive behaviour patterns in this national effort.

I first raised this issue with other Ministers 12 months ago, particularly as it relates to ways of protecting this group of young people from themselves, for example, how to stop them from falling prey to drug rings, juvenile crime rings and teenage prostitution. In the past months, South Australia has taken a lead role in collating material from States and Territories on this issue. It is clear from the patterns that have emerged that these young people in question not only find their external environment hostile but experience homelessness, limited education, grief and rejection as far as abandonment is concerned, abuse and neglect, and multiple placements in the care system. They can also engage in a range of self-destructive behaviour including substance abuse, suicide attempts, high speed driving, crime, paedophilia and prostitution. Often these young people have no trust in adults and are extremely difficult to engage in traditional youth services and activities. There is also continuing pressure from the community to look at the possibility of locking up these young people for their own protection. Of course, this raises complex issues relating to civil liberty.

I am particularly pleased that South Australia has been able to take a lead in this issue and, in association with the Minister for Health and the Minister for Education, the Government has just announced the establishment of a $1 million behavioural intervention service for young people at risk of self-destructive behaviour. This represents forward thinking as far as this nation is concerned in providing a new cross-agency approach to both dealing with problems experienced by these young people through therapeutic services and, at the same time, getting them off the streets through new residential options. In addition, the Community Service Ministers who have just met have overwhelmingly endorsed the sharing between States of programs and information as well as the holding of a forum of senior officials to consider further the topic of these young people. I am pleased that South Australia will host that forum.

Finally, dealing with young people with severe destructive behavioural and mental health problems is an enormous challenge for us all, as the member for Reynell would appreciate, but it is a challenge that must be faced as part of the overall care system, a system that, hopefully, is supported by all members of this House. These kids deserve a future. It is important that we act to save them from suicide, drug overdose, exposure to AIDS or a lifetime in prison. I am delighted with the progress that South Australia has been able to make in this area.

RETAIL SHOP LEASES ACT

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): My question is directed to the Minister representing the Attorney-General. Has the Government received complaints from retailers and the Employers' Chamber about new section 81(2)(b) of the Retail Shop Leases Act and its effect of converting a periodic tenancy with which both the landlord and the tenant were happy into an unintended five-year lease unless the tenant pays for a lawyer's certificate? Section 81 of the Retail Shop Leases Act allows part 4 of the Landlord and Tenant Act to continue to apply to retail shop leases entered into before the commencement of the Act but, if the lease were a periodic tenancy, the new Act would be deemed to apply from only the first anniversary of the commencement as if there were a novation of the lease on that date.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I cannot say whether the Attorney has received representations, but I hope that those people who have been affected have made representations to the select committee. If the honourable member knows of such people, can he ensure that they give that information to the select committee, because that is what the select committee is all about?

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I am sure that the honourable member is well aware of the select committee. In fact, it is quite a dopey question, because he should urge all those people who have information to put it before the select committee. I understand that a number of people have provided information, and if—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I am just saying that I understand that the select committee will report shortly also. I will refer the question to the Attorney-General but, if the honourable member knows of people who believe that they are being disadvantaged by this section in the renewal provisions, I urge him to make sure that those examples are provided to the select committee. I will have the Attorney respond to the honourable member's more substantive question about whether he has received a number of representations on this issue.

PRISONS, INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): Will the Minister for Correctional Services advise the House whether the former Labor Government's system of providing prisoners with a remission of their sentence during times of industrial dispute shortened the actual time that prisoners spent behind bars, and will he also indicate the impact of Labor's early release scheme prior to the truth in sentencing legislation introduced by this Government? I note that in the House on 2 July 1996 the Minister stated that the former Labor Government on 59 occasions had used remissions for prisoners as a result of industrial action while the then Labor Government was in charge of the South Australian prisons system.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The member for Hanson has been a champion for his electorate in this Parliament on issues of law and order, so I can well imagine that he has

found the untruths peddled by the Labor Party in the past week as annoying as the rest of the Government members have. In particular, the member for Playford and the member for Spence have tried to put across to the media a story that this Government has reintroduced Labor's remission scheme. That is absolutely wrong, and the best way to demonstrate that to this Parliament is through real life examples. As I have indicated before, the Opposition used the remission scheme for industrial action on 59 occasions across multiple institutions between 1986 and 1993—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:—if the member for Spence would listen—in addition to—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:—Labor's remission scheme which has been ended by this Government. I cite two examples.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I know that the member for Spence does not like this, but it will be put on the record. The first example is of a prisoner who was admitted to prison in August 1990 having received a sentence of eight years imprisonment with a 5½ year non-parole period for committing armed robbery. That prisoner received 400 days remission prior to truth in sentencing—under Labor's early release, 400 days. That is what this Government has ended. In addition, as a result of industrial action in the prisons system during Labor's time in government, that prisoner received a further remission of 110 days. So, under Labor, that prisoner received a total of 510 days off the sentence. That armed robber was released 510 days earlier under the Labor Government.

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Sir. Is the question in order, given that Erskine May says that it is not in order to request information on matters of past history for the purposes of argument?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! As the member for Spence is aware, Erskine May is for the guidance of members. The Standing Orders provide the rules in relation to questions. Ministers have more latitude in answering questions. I point out the time to the Minister and suggest that, as he answered in some detail a relatively similar question yesterday, he now round off his answer.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: That prisoner, instead of receiving—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The honourable member should listen. I know that he does not want this on the record but it will go on the record. Instead of receiving a 5½-year non-parole period, that prisoner served three years and nine months.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence will come to order.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: One further example is a prisoner who was admitted to prison on 9 March 1992 and received 142 days off, thanks to Labor's early remission scheme. He then received another 134 days as a result of industrial disputes in the prison system.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: 'So what', says the member for Spence. It means that that prisoner was released 276 days earlier than was provided in the sentence handed down by the court. Those are just two examples of what happened under a Labor Government, and that system is finished.

GANDELL BULKY GOODS PROJECT

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is directed to the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. At what stage is the Gandell Bulky Goods project at Walkley Heights and, following recent council approval, will the Minister receive a delegation of concerned residents whose unanimous objections were not heeded by the City of Port Adelaide Enfield?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I did not hear the honourable member clearly. Was the honourable member asking whether I had received a delegation?

Mr Quirke: Will you receive a delegation?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I will be quite happy to receive a delegation in relation to that matter because, as we have explained all the way through, before any decision is taken we will be hearing all arguments from all sides to make sure that, when a decision is made, it is the correct decision.

LIFTS MAINTENANCE

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for State Government Services. What legal advice, if any, did the Minister receive with respect to his decision to withdraw the tender after it had been accepted by the owners of the SGIC building in Victoria Square for the lift maintenance section of his department to service that building's lifts?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I have already addressed that matter in answer to an earlier question.

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order. The Minister did not answer the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That is a frivolous point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition. The Chair was addressing the House. The Deputy Leader has been here long enough to know that that sort of behaviour is unacceptable and quite contrary to Standing Orders.

SHEEP LICE

Mr VENNING (Custance): Will the Minister for Primary Industries tell the House what the State Government is doing to combat the problem of lice in sheep?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thank the member for Custance for his second question in two days on sheep. As all members would know, we receive many requests to do something about the lice problem for the wool industry, which has been—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Members may laugh, but I am afraid that their ignorance is showing. Many people have suggested returning to previous regulations. It is widely recognised that the old system did not work. There is also a major initiative within the wool industry to cut the use of chemicals and the residual of chemicals in wool. The immediate answer is not obvious, but a clear message is

coming through to all rural members from wool growers that lice is a serious threat to the wool industry at the moment.

We are hopeful that significant breakthroughs will be made in research, which will probably be the ultimate answer to the problem. However, as a response to the current level of concern, we have announced the formation of a task force to work on strategies to minimise lice damage to the industry. That task force, which will include representatives from the Farmers Federation, the Agricultural Bureau, stud breeders, agents, PISA and SARDI, will be appointed in the very near future.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): The editorial from today's *Border Watch* entitled 'People have right to basic health care—and so do doctors who service it' states:

Doctors are not robots: they have the same feelings, strengths and weaknesses, suffer the same illnesses, stresses and pressures as any other member of the community.

Because of their high profiles, doctors are often more open to criticism. Yet they are the most relied upon people to perform their duties than any other person in this community, considering the very nature of their occupation.

In light of our story on page 1 today, it's about time the metropolitan-dominated, metropolitan-thinking Health Commission and the SA Medical Board recognised the importance of doctors to rural areas and to rural communities.

A 'fair go' for doctors in the country and the people they serve is long overdue.

As an example, Mount Gambier and the South-East has endured more than a year of tortuous negotiations over obstetrics' services, only to see doctors threatened with having their names struck off the register, instead of an amicable solution to the indemnity insurance issue being achieved.

The up-shot is that doctors are now likely to follow the SA Medical Board directives: the simplest being to tell pregnant women from this day on that they will be able to have their babies in Mount Gambier, but the current doctors won't deliver them. In other words, the seeds of another dispute have already been sown.

The onus will then rest heavily with the medical board and the Health Commission to ensure Mount Gambier has the minimum four registrars required to provide a 24-hours a day, seven days a week service.

Doctors are also feeling the stress of their current situation: not only has the babies' dispute been harrowing for all parties, there is also the ongoing problem of getting doctors to work in country regions.

Specialist doctors are non-existent and Mount Gambier will have to be content with the high quality visiting service provided from Adelaide. The very fact that this is a mobile utility underscores the fact that Mount Gambier—along with other country areas—is failing to attract specialist doctors.

There is mounting pressure to have enough anaesthetists; Mount Gambier has lost its paediatrician and dietitian. And this newspaper is reliably informed there are four other doctors either leaving, or contemplating leaving the city.

There is every indication among doctors reviewing their futures of a high level of dissatisfaction with the politics involved with the SA Medical Board and the Health Commission's failure to act upon doctor shortages across the board.

The way in which the babies' dispute was handled—especially the handing down of an ultimatum threatening doctors with being 'struck off'—only added fuel to the fire.

In today's story, South-East doctors' spokesperson, Dr Malcolm Gale, refers to doctors being under a great deal of stress and if any more doctors withdraw their services, a domino effect will come into play.

He is not referring simply to the ongoing obstetrics' dispute either.

Dr Gale's words should be heeded now by the politicians and bureaucrats in Adelaide who have been content to turn their back on the issue of country health services, believing they will somehow magically disappear.

Doctors have their own physical and mental well-being to consider. This newspaper believes, because of the duration of the babies' dispute, there has been an opportunity to open a window into what's actually happening within our medical fraternity.

We will lose more doctors in the coming months, leaving fewer people to cope with ongoing medical problems. Without being alarmist, it is our duty to warn this community that the medical and health care scenario for the near future is grim.

We can only appeal, again, to Health Minister, Dr Michael Armitage, to keep his promise and come to Mount Gambier for a public meeting as soon as possible.

Member for Gordon, Mr Harold Allison, should be pressing harder to ensure this vital meeting takes place—for the future health and well-being of the people he represents.

Forget non-existent political agendas, Mr Allison, they are a figment of your imagination as far as this newspaper is concerned. Let us get down to tintacks and address the health problems confronting our community—as the elected leader, the people are expecting some direction from you.

The urgency factor is to try to derail the potential loss of a number of doctors already considering their futures and to replace those who have, tragically, already been lost.

It's time this community had its hearing with the Minister at a public venue and without any more delays and excuses.

That is the reason for the question today, and I note that the Premier was not up to date in relation to that information.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. During the course of those remarks I heard the member for Elizabeth refer to the member for Gordon by his personal name. I believe that under Standing Orders that is highly disorderly. It was not correspondence that she was reading—it was a prepared statement. She did not attribute it to any other person.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair also heard the speech and is of the view that the member for Elizabeth was reading allegedly from an editorial in a newspaper and that is in order. If the honourable member was to refer directly to the member for Gordon other than by his district name, she would be out of order. The member for Reynell.

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Today, I wish to speak briefly about one of my local high schools. The reason for doing this is that only last week this school received more than its fair share of negative publicity. I guess it was the old cliche of never letting the facts get in the way of a good story. Christies Beach High School did not deserve the publicity it received from the *Advertiser* of 24 June, and I hope the journalist involved was deeply embarrassed by his article once he established a full picture of what happened at the school. Our schools do not get the opportunity to promote the many positive things that do happen on their campuses. The media is not really interested in promoting our many young achievers or our teaching staff who are leading the way in areas of curriculum; they forget about our principals who work closely with not only their students but the parent community, ensuring that we all have a role to play in guaranteeing the best educational outcome for all.

I have been a member of the Christies Beach High School Council for just over 2½ years and I must say that, as a council member, I have always felt like part of the team. Input is encouraged and valued by all members. The team is

progressive and our aims and ambitions are focused, again in the one direction, ensuring that we support our school in providing an education for all. The school itself is one of South Australia's largest high schools, catering for the needs of students from years 8 to 12. We have a special education unit and a very successful adult re-entry program. Like all our schools, Christies Beach High School is a very busy school. The school council, students and teaching fraternity have been involved in issues such as the restructure of the school campuses and the development of a sports policy.

Curriculum development and improvement was a particular focus for 1995. Staff were busy working on the years 8 to 10 curriculum, bringing it into line with the nationally developed curriculum statements and profiles. The staff were also very involved in developing an improved reporting process to parents. Reports demonstrate the outcomes that each student has achieved as measured against particular course objectives. Alternative learning programs have had outstanding success: for example, the Noarlunga Farm project provided an opportunity for some disinclined students in years 8 to 10, students who were unable to survive a normal classroom situation being kept in school whereas, in normal circumstances, they probably would have left school and faced a very bleak future.

The study skills program developed as a SACE stage 1 subject has had a significant and positive outcome for all year 11 students. Not only has it given students an extra SACE unit but it has provided them with a high level of support in meeting literacy requirements of SACE and a range of study skills that are able to be translated into other areas of learning. Christies Beach High School can proudly boast an outstanding shadowing program, and I will briefly explain this. The school staff worked closely with their colleagues in several neighbouring primary schools. Year 7 primary school students visit the high school over a three-day period and get a feeling for what high school life is about. A student task force is also a result of the development of this program.

The school has worked and continues to work diligently in strengthening relationships with other secondary schools in the region. Work has been done in a wide range of curriculum areas, and one of the most exciting achievements has been in the area of vocational curriculum. Working together as a cluster has allowed not only Christies Beach High School but all high schools in the region to provide a wide range of curriculum opportunities for students to study both within the workplace and at school. The list of achievements is endless and I am going to run out of time. However, I would like to acknowledge the school's work experience and volunteer community work program and the adult re-entry program, which I must say offers a wide range of educational opportunities. The outcomes of the program are often highly satisfying, with many adult students achieving high levels of success.

In sport, the arts and academic achievements the school has many success stories. The school, through Mrs Erica Russel, has put together a dynamic Youth Parliament team. The student government has been productive in pursuing issues of interest and concern on behalf of students, and it would be remiss of me not to mention the many hours of assistance and support given by the school support staff.

In conclusion, Christies Beach High School has proven itself to be a leader in all areas of education. The school provides each and every student with the opportunity to excel, and I only hope that those who choose to discredit our school will look closely at the many good things that happen and the many achievements our school has had and continues to have.

Mr De LAINE (Price): Following the attack made on me by the Premier yesterday during Question Time in relation to The Parks High School, I made a personal explanation in the House to correct some inaccurate assertions, and I would now like to use the forum of the grievance debate to fully explain the situation, if time permits. The Premier indicated in response to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition in this House on 27 March 1996 that, if a request was made for a delegation from The Parks High School to meet with him as Premier, he would consider the request only if it was made through the local member of Parliament. As I am the local member of Parliament, I forwarded a letter written by the Chairman of the school council to the Premier requesting an urgent meeting between representatives of the school council and the Premier to discuss possible options to keep the school open. With the letter, as the Premier requested, I sent a letter supporting the request of the school council to meet with the Premier. Part of my letter of 6 May 1996 states:

> Dear Premier,
>
> I write in support of a request by The Parks High School Council Chairman, Mr Gordon Phillis, to meet with representatives of the school council to discuss the announced closure of The Parks High School at the end of 1996. The school community have lost confidence in the Minister for Education, Hon. Rob Lucas, MLC, and seek an audience with you, as Premier, to embark on some meaningful discussions with respect to the future of this unique school.

Several weeks later, on 5 June, the Premier's office replied in writing to me that the Premier was unable to meet with the school committee but that he had arranged for the Minister for Education to meet with a delegation led by me in the Minister's office on 25 June 1996. Part of the letter from the Premier's office states:

> Dear Mr De Laine,
>
> The Premier has asked me to thank you for your letter of 6 May 1996 requesting an appointment to discuss the announced closure of The Parks High School. Mr Brown very much appreciates your request for an appointment but regrets that he is unable to coordinate a meeting at this stage and has requested that the Minister for Education and Children's Services, Hon. Rob Lucas, MLC, meet with yourself and the representatives from The Parks High School on his behalf.
>
> It would be appreciated if you could forward any additional background material or information relevant to the meeting to Mr Lucas' office on Level 9 of the Education Centre, 31 Flinders Street, Adelaide. The meeting will also take place in the Minister's office. . . Tuesday 25 June at 4 p.m. is a suitable date and time for the meeting.

After consultation with the school council, on 19 June I wrote to the Premier, with a copy going to the Minister for Education and Children's Services, refusing his offer to meet with the Minister on that date. I now read into *Hansard* the letter written by me on 19 June:

> Dear Premier,
>
> I refer to the letter of 5 June 1996 from the Office of the Premier and signed by Dawn Story, which is in response to my letter dated 6 May which was accompanied by a letter from the Chairperson of The Parks High School Council requesting an urgent meeting with you in relation to the announced closure of The Parks High School.
>
> After consultation with the school council, I advise that your response is unacceptable. Representatives of the school community and myself (as the local member) wish to meet with you, as Premier of South Australia, on site at the school. As our previous correspondence stated, the school community has no confidence in the Minister for Education, and therefore it would be pointless in meeting with him alone. We would certainly welcome the Minister to the school in order for him to see at first hand the excellent teaching facility that he proposes to close.

I therefore, on behalf of the council and school community, formally extend an invitation to you Premier, and the Minister for Education, to urgently meet with you both at The Parks High School, to give you both a first-hand insight into how the school operates, to discuss the proposed closure and to examine options which may see a resolution to the present impasse to the reasonable satisfaction of the Government, the students and the entire Parks community. As it is now mid-June, the situation is, as you know, becoming quite urgent [and] I would respectfully ask that you and the Minister accede to our request, as soon as possible.

In response to the accusations made by the Premier yesterday that the Labor Party and I are playing politics, I point out that that is completely wrong. In fact, it is quite the contrary—it is the Premier who is playing politics. In response to the Premier's criticism of me for not keeping an appointment with the Minister on 25 June, not cancelling the appointment or not apologising for the delegation's non-attendance, I point out to the Premier that it was not my place to attend or cancel the meeting, because I had not requested the meeting with the Minister. The Premier had arranged the meeting, and he had no right to do so, especially as both the school council and I had said that we had lost confidence in the Minister for Education. If anyone should have cancelled the meeting with the Premier, it should have been the Premier himself, as it was he who took it upon himself to arrange the meeting.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Yesterday, during Question Time, I asked the Minister for Infrastructure questions about modified voluntary separation packages. The Minister's response was most confusing—or could we call it enlightening. Let us just look at the facts of the matter. ETSA management put forward a proposal offering a 25 per cent reduced package to powerline workers, with a possibility of being able to undertake Government work with a contractor, contracted to Optus to do make-ready work for the cable television roll out. This is the first line of confusion. We must remember that, during his Estimates Committee in 1994, the Premier clearly stated that a Government employee could not take a package and then come back and undertake the same work privately within three years. Given that we cannot see the future needs of public utilities, it is not unrealistic to assume that a former Government employee could gain employment with a private company that wins a Government contract within a three year period. That former Government worker should be able to do that work if they have the necessary skills. Surely we would not see that as unreasonable—although we could not be blamed for thinking that the Government is short-sighted in its work force management.

However, in this situation, there could be something more sinister in the wind. Let us examine the first point of the 25 per cent package reduction. The work on offer at this time is private work—not Government work. So why the reduction offer? If we take the offer at face value, that is, accepting the reduced package enabling the worker to work back on ETSA assets, it sounds legitimate, though not morally acceptable. Why does the Government need to shed more staff? So we question the need for the offer, particularly when ETSA told its workers that it did not even bother to put in a tender for that job because it did not have enough staff left to do additional work.

It must be remembered that we are talking about private sector work and not Government work. However, if the Government has given an indication to private companies that ETSA work may be on offer in the not too distant future, that would clarify the Minister's responses, given the current climate which, I might add, he says the Premier supports. So here we may have an indication that ETSA work is to be given out to contract—in reality privatised—and this is the real reason for the reduction offer. We must remember again that Optus work is not Government work, so there is no validity in this reduced package.

In defence of the offer, the Minister says, 'It adds some flexibility into the scheme and, in the interests of the work force, it is an agreement that the work force wanted, as I understand it'. I have to ask, 'Does he understand it?' I do not think so. He is fiddling with the truth. On Tuesday evening, a meeting of representatives of ETSA depots rejected the offer as an insult to their intelligence. The offer was also rejected by the single bargaining unit on Wednesday—that was yesterday—at about the same time the Minister was telling us, in answer to my question, that it was an agreement the work force wanted. He went on to say:

We are meeting their requirements by putting 'may' in and giving some flexibility.

So to whose requirements is he referring: his, the Government's or ETSA management's? It certainly was not the workers' requirements. Is this merely to facilitate the process of privatisation of ETSA after the life of this Parliament which, just to make it clear for all, would be within the three year period? Is there some duplicity or complicity, or is this simply a con job? There was no consultation with the workers—the Minister confirmed that in answer to my question today—so his answers yesterday were clearly untrue. It was a managerial decision, directed by either Minister Olsen or the Premier without consultation and regard for ETSA workers. It is an endeavour to shed more of ETSA's highly skilled workers and to support this Liberal Government's agenda of screwing workers and fulfilling its privatisation policy or, as the Minister prefers to call it, outsourcing.

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I am disappointed that the member for Ross Smith is not here because, unlike him, I do not normally attack people behind their back. I am sure that he has a speaker in his room and he can hear what I am saying. I refer to the speech he made in the House yesterday in relation to the Federal member for Adelaide (Trish Worth). In the House yesterday, the member for Ross Smith accused the member for Adelaide of not taking sufficient steps to support the residents of Kilburn in relation to their opposition to the Collex waste treatment plant at Kilburn. Of course, we know that Kilburn happens to be in the electorate of the member for Ross Smith.

Members might ask why the residents were put in a position where they had to oppose the plant. The answer is pretty simple: because on 26 July 1993 the Bannon Government gave consent, through the Waste Disposal Committee, for the plant to be in Kilburn. The relevant Minister who gave the consent was the former member for Norwood (Greg Crafter). Of course, one can see in this the level of hypocrisy of the member for Ross Smith when he tried to attack us, because he knows full well that the former Labor Government gave consent for the plant to be at Kilburn. Obviously, if one were cynical, one would say that the member for Ross Smith is worried about the next State election, because he knows full well that the Labor Party created a problem in Kilburn which, as I said, is in his electorate.

He also accused the Federal member for Adelaide of abandoning the area of Kilburn after the election in December 1993. Of course, that is completely inaccurate and

totally false. She made her position clear in August 1993 when she wrote a letter to the residents of Kilburn. In relation to the issue, she said that, as a Federal politician, she could not interfere in State and local government processes. She made her position very clear before December 1993. Therefore, for the member for Ross Smith to say she abandoned the electorate after the State election is absolute rubbish, because her position was very clear prior to the election. In addition, after the State election in December 1993, she did not abandon the residents because she had meetings with Mayor Stock, Minister Oswald and Ross Thomas of the EPA in an effort to try to help the residents of Kilburn.

It is pretty clear that the member for Ross Smith is very adept at making misleading statements and telling untruths; it is part and parcel of his style. The member for Ross Smith also said that the member for Adelaide closed her file in December 1993. I do not know whether it was lack of memory or intentional, but the facts, as I have told the House—

Members interjecting:

Mr CUMMINS: I will give him the benefit of the doubt and say he was not deliberately misleading; perhaps he is just a bit slow. The file was open in December 1993, as is clear from the facts that I have put to the House. The honourable member called the member for Adelaide (Trish Worth) cowardly and disloyal. One would have thought it was patently obvious who the coward is—a member who comes into this House and attacks a Federal member of Parliament knowing full that she has no right of reply and cannot reply in this place. One can ascertain clearly from that who the coward is. In relation to the member for Ross Smith's accusing her of being disloyal, we can go further and say that not only was the member for Ross Smith disloyal—because the Labor Party approved this plant at Kilburn—but also he was dishonest in trying to paint that sort of picture, because we know who was responsible for it.

One would have thought that the member for Ross Smith was ugly enough and big enough to look after himself, without making attacks behind someone's back in this House. It disappoints me to see that he has stooped to the level of attacking someone who cannot defend herself in this place. As I said, the problem was created by Bannon and Crafter, and we have been presented with the problem. One might be cynical and ask, 'Why is the member for Ross Smith getting up and saying things about this problem now?'

I think it is pretty obvious. When I doorknocked in the electorate of Adelaide prior to the last Federal election, it was patently obvious to me that there would be a swing to the Liberal Party—and there was of about 3 to 4 per cent—so the member for Ross Smith now finds himself in a marginal seat. From my doorknocking and knowledge of the area—I was brought up in the northern regions—I do not think he is a very popular member. In fact, I think that he might have a margin of about only 3 to 4 per cent. It is obvious that the member for Ross Smith is protecting his own butt, and he is prepared to come into this House to tell a pack of untruths to substantiate his—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Becker): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Mawson.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Thus far I have not sought from my constituents their opinion as to what should happen with respect to local government reform and boundaries. It is not my intention, inside or outside this Chamber, to attempt to influence in any way the decision of the community and the councillors when it comes to the amalgamation of council boundaries. Clearly, my opinion and that, I believe, of members of this Chamber, is that it should be up to the community and members of councils to decide which way the amalgamations go.

One issue I want to raise in this House, which has been raised with me often, concerns the amalgamation of Noarlunga City Council with the Willunga Basin area. The question that is being asked is whether the amalgamation will lead to the demise of the Willunga Basin, because the Noarlunga City Council has a bad track record when it comes to protecting rural land, and it could mean that we will end up with concrete slabs on our best agricultural land. I am not sure why a few people have chosen to run that rumour around the electorate, but I think that that is grossly unfair to the Noarlunga City Council. Therefore, I want to spend a few minutes highlighting this council, which I see as very professional and one which is committed to the protection and enhancement of rural regions.

Prior to coming into this Parliament I worked with many councils across the State, and I have to say—and this has been confirmed since I have been in this Chamber—that the Noarlunga City Council is one of the most professional and committed councils one could ever find in South Australia. The council is led by the Mayor, Ray Gilbert. The staff of the council and the councillors—apart from one who has only recently moved to the south and has become a member—have been longstanding members of the community in the south. They realise the importance of viticulture and horticulture to the region for job creation, and they have shown a major commitment to looking after the rural areas in the electorate.

I have felt sorry for the Noarlunga City Council on some occasions and that is why, yesterday, I said that I support, in the circumstances of major developments, the Minister having more input—and we know the direction of that Bill that we will finish debating this afternoon. In certain circumstances I feel that major projects for South Australia must have the opportunity of being fast-tracked, putting the onus on the Government when it comes to a decision on a project. Far too often in the past Government agencies have almost ridden roughshod over Noarlunga City Council, and the council in those instances has not had enough control.

The council has had very good development plans to protect Blewitt Springs and the McLaren Flat area. The council is committed to those rural areas. I assure members and the community that, if Noarlunga City Council does amalgamate with the Willunga Basin area, it will look at the garden icon of the Willunga Basin, the tourism opportunities, the economic development opportunities and make sure that the area is committed to protection and enhancement.

To further confirm that, at the end of the day there is an absolute commitment from both the Premier and me—along with others, we are involved in writing the policy for the Willunga Basin—that concrete slabs will not go on that land. The Government is committed to that so, whatever happens with the amalgamation, the basin will be protected and enhanced.

Time and again I have heard Ray Gilbert, councillors and staff espouse the great benefits of the wine region. When you also look at the way they have put infrastructure into rural areas, I am sure the area will be enhanced irrespective of which way the amalgamation goes. I hope that differential rating will be a part of the new local government legislation

so that Noarlunga council will be able to give my rural community a true rural rate, as has been the case with the Willunga council. In summary, I reinforce the fact that some of the attitudes put in respect of the Noarlunga City Council have been somewhat unfair.

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

A quorum having been formed:

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES (OBJECTS OF FUNDS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Friendly Societies Act 1919. Read a first time.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: 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 amend the Friendly Societies Act in order to provide friendly societies the ability to offer a new product to counter the effects of extended deeming, which came into operation as a result of Commonwealth law on 1 July 1996.

There are seven friendly societies registered in South Australia. Four of these societies offer financial products to their members. These societies are a significant force in the non-bank financial institution sector.

The Federal Government passed legislation on 29 November 1995 for the introduction of extended deeming provisions. Deeming is the method used by the Department of Social Security to assess the income from investments held by a person to determine the amount of pension that will be paid to them. This method has been in use for some time, but did not apply to friendly society products that were established prior to January 1988. Extended deeming captures all friendly society investments held by pensioners, irrespective of the date when the investment was made. Although the Commonwealth legislation received Royal assent on 9 January 1996, the commencement of extended deeming was delayed until 1 July 1996 in order to allow pensioners sufficient time to review their investment arrangements.

Friendly society products have typically offered investors a tax paid return. Deeming does not treat investments which are tax paid or taxed in the hands of the investor differently. While the changes to the deeming arrangements do not affect the pension income of all pensioners, some pensioner members have sought alternative investment options in order to maximise their income allowed under the new arrangements.

It is the Government's view that the new product will provide friendly societies with the ability to offer existing members alternative investment opportunities within the sector. Additionally, the new product will be marketed to attract new investments to friendly societies.

The new product, which is known as a bonus bond, was designed by the Australian Friendly Societies Association and drafted in Victoria. Although the bonus bond was supposedly designed for adoption by friendly societies throughout Australia, no account of the differences in State legislation was made. Consequently, the Government is faced with having to amend the Act in order to enable South Australian based friendly societies to deliver this product to the market place. The Government is aware that a Victorian friendly society is already advertising the product here in South Australia.

In this particular case of the rules for the bonus bond product, the Government will support a proclamation based on a thorough examination of the rules, and because it considers that South Australian friendly societies should be given the same opportunities to provide this product compared to interstate friendly societies, which have already commenced marketing a similar product in South Australia.

Any future application to establish a new fund by this mechanism will need to be accompanied with sufficient details of the proposal, so that the Registrar of Friendly Societies can convince himself that the change is desirable when considered against the legal and financial criteria set out in the Act. With the impending commencement of the national scheme of supervision for friendly societies, it is anticipated that the Government will find it difficult to be convinced of the need for any further new objects to be established under the Act.

I commend the Bill to the House and I seek leave to have the explanations of the clauses inserted in Hansard without my reading them.

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 7—Objects for which funds may be maintained

Provision has been made for the Governor, by proclamation, to declare objects (other than those already listed in section 7(1) of the principal Act) to be objects for which a friendly society may raise and maintain a fund.

If such a fund is raised, it must be maintained in a separate fund (as is currently required in respect of certain other funds raised and maintained for other purposes by friendly societies—see section 7(7) of the principal Act).

A proclamation made for this purpose may be varied or revoked by subsequent proclamation and the day fixed by the Governor as the day on which the proclamation comes into operation may be a day prior to the day on which the proclamation is made or the day on which this proposed subsection comes into operation.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): The Opposition fully understands the reason for this legislation—the necessity to allow friendly societies to put on the South Australian market a range of products to enable them to compete with their interstate counterparts. We understand the necessity for retrospectivity for certain parts of the legislation, the fact that it will be going back five or six weeks, and we will support that as well.

The problem has stemmed from the way in which extended deeming has come into force; in particular, its impact on friendly societies in South Australia and throughout the whole country. Extended deeming is a complex subject. I had some dealings with it earlier this year. Some aspects of extended deeming affect the interest-free loans that certain persons give to others, usually children, prior to going into a nursing home. Those loans are now subject to a deemed 7 per cent interest above a certain figure.

Another impact of extended deeming was to call into question the tax-free savings of certain types of accounts held by friendly societies. I presume that the friendly societies in Victoria were the first cabs off the rank to organise products that could give the same benefits to those who purchased them. Indeed, it is necessary that that should happen, because the outflow of capital from friendly societies into other funds or consumption is something that all members would not wish to see. I will not take up any more time of the House. The Opposition supports and understands the necessity for this legislation and the speed with which it must be processed through this and the other place.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I thank the member for Playford for his contribution to the debate. The world is changing rapidly in the area of finance. The Federal rules regarding deeming have changed in that they do not recognise the taxation components of returns. To that extent, certain pensioner groups will face reductions because they are not getting a return on their investments. They are presumed to have been receiving a particular return on those investments, and new products are being put into the marketplace. It is important, therefore, that the friendly societies change

as a result of the change in the rules. We appreciate that particular groups of people have stuck with the friendly societies and made them a viable part of the financial institutions sector over a long period. They play an important role in the financial fabric of this and other States, so it is important for this Government and everybody concerned to allow friendly societies to remain as competitive as possible.

I have mentioned previously that we expect there will be some national financial governance over friendly societies. Legislation is being prepared in Victoria. We trust that our efforts to bring our friendly societies into line generally with the demands that are made on other financial institutions will be reciprocated around the country when the standard legislation has been developed. This is an important step forward. It allows friendly societies to be competitive and to offer products which are suitable and which are in keeping with the changes in taxation and deeming laws under the Social Security Act.

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

STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Emergency Services) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the State Emergency Service Act 1987. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill makes miscellaneous amendments to the *State Emergency Service Act 1987* to give legislative effect to the Government's decision in December 1995 to separate the State Emergency Service (SES) from the SA Police Department (SAPOL).

The employees of the SES, including the Director, SES, were appointed in SAPOL under the *Public Sector Management Act 1995* and were therefore responsible to the Commissioner of Police. In addition, the Commissioner of Police is responsible for the administration of the *State Emergency Service Act* subject to the control and direction of the Minister. This created an anomaly in that the Commissioner of Police is responsible to the Minister for Emergency Services for the administration of the *State Emergency Service Act* whilst being responsible to the Minister for Police for the administration and management of SAPOL, which included the employees of the SES.

The Government therefore decided that the employees of the SES should be constituted as a separate public service unit and *State Emergency Service SA* was created, effective from 1 July 1996, by proclamation made by Her Excellency the Governor in Executive Council pursuant to the *Public Sector Management Act* on 6 June 1996.

It is now necessary to make a number of minor amendments to the *State Emergency Service Act* in order to remove the responsibility for the administration of the Act from the Commissioner of Police, to clarify who is a member of the SES as constituted under the Act (as opposed to the administrative unit that has been created), and to improve the Act through several other technical amendments that do not alter the role and function of the SES.

The administrative unit that has been created is titled *State Emergency Service SA* to distinguish it from the wider SES body constituted under the Act, which includes not only members of this administrative unit but also the SES volunteers. This wider group is, under amendments proposed in the Bill, to be titled *State Emergency Service South Australia*. The lack of a distinction between the persons employed as a part of the SES within SAPOL and the SES as a whole was a minor deficiency of the Act. This deficiency assumes greater prominence once the independent administrative unit is created.

The other amendments proposed in the Bill simply tighten up the drafting of some provisions of the current Act. The Act currently makes reference to the Deputy Director of the SES but does not formally constitute that office or specify that the Deputy forms part of the SES. The Bill amends sections 4(2) and 5 of the Act to remedy this.

In addition, it was thought that the current description of who is included in the SES, contained in section 4(2)*(a)* of the Act, was imprecise in referring to 'persons employed in a position in the Service' and could cause confusion in so far as the SES is, and will continue to be, provided with administrative and support services by other agencies. The Bill therefore seeks to amend this provision to ensure that the persons included in the Service can be clearly identified.

The operational role and function of the SES is unchanged.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation

This clause amends section 3 to remove the definition relating to the Commissioner of Police and to make a number of consequential amendments reflecting the change to the State Emergency Service's name implemented by clause 3 of the Bill.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 4—Continuation of State Emergency Service South Australia

This clause amends section 4 of the Act to provide that the State Emergency Service continues under the name *State Emergency Service South Australia*. Subsection (2) is also amended to specifically include reference to the Deputy Director of the State Emergency Service and to clarify who else is included in the Service as constituted under the Act.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 5—The Director and Deputy Director of the Service

This clause amends section 5 of the Act to include reference to the Deputy Director of the State Emergency Service and to make it clear that the Director of the Service may or may not be the Chief Executive of the administrative unit that comprises or includes the public service members of the Service.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 7—Director to administer Act and submit annual report

This clause deletes subsection (1) of section 7 (which provided that the Commissioner of Police was responsible for the administration of the Act) and replaces references to 'the Commissioner' in subsection (2) with references to the Chief Executive of the administrative unit that comprises or includes the public service members of the Service. This means that the Chief Executive (rather than the Commissioner) will be responsible for preparing the Service's annual report.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 8—Functions of the Service

This clause makes an amendment that is consequential to the amendment removing the definition of 'the Commissioner' and corrects an incorrect reference in paragraph *(c)* of section 8.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

DEVELOPMENT (MAJOR DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 3 July. Page 1846.)

Clause 6—'Substitution of division 2 of part 4.'

The CHAIRMAN: I remind the Committee that we are debating the new sections under clause 6 separately. We are on new section 46.

Ms HURLEY: With regard to new section 46(1)(a), how does the Minister define 'major environmental, social or economic importance'? I understand that in some States that is defined in a particular way.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: We are bringing in regulations. If the development meets the criteria under the regulations, it would be considered a major development in terms of that wording.

Ms HURLEY: What matters might be in the State's interest that are not of 'major environmental, social or economic importance'?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: The State's interest refers to matters of State, not local, significance. The honourable member will be aware that I have referred on occasion to the call-in power where a matter is likely to impact on more than one local government area. For example, I referred to the tourist development that is proposed for the Barossa Valley. That will be of significance to areas other than the individual council area in which that development may finally be built. As it would impinge on tourism, and so on, in the State, obviously it would be of State significance.

As a result of the comments that have been made to me during the consultation process, I have agreed to delete even the term 'regional interest'. For example, it could be argued that the example to which I refer is of regional significance only. I argue that it would be more than that because, as the Barossa Valley is such a key area in the tourism industry, it will attract tourists from interstate and overseas. Obviously, tourists will spend time in areas other than the Barossa Valley, but that would be something of key significance to tourism in South Australia. I see something such as that as of State significance even more than of the regional interest.

As I said, we would consider the impact of the proposed development: will it be of significance to just the street, block or confined area, or will it be of significance to the people of the State or to some aspect of the industry within this State? Of course, we would then say it is of State significance because it will contribute to the State and not just to a small area or even a regional area. The honourable member would know that, as part of the consultative process, I removed the word 'regional'. Therefore, one would need to consider whether it would be of significance to South Australia. If it was, it would obviously be something I would seek to consider under that part of the legislation.

Ms HURLEY: In terms of definitions, the Bill refers to 'a project' and a footnote states:

> A project is an activity or a circumstance which does not require approval under this Act (because it is not within the ambit of the definition of 'development' under this Act). . .

What types of projects will be captured by this and what is the Minister's definition of 'project'?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: The best example I can provide is the South-East Drainage Project, which is under way. That would not be regarded as a development. Giving an example is the best way to explain what we are talking about in terms of a 'project'. If I could add to my answer to the previous question, I emphasise that size will not be the factor that determines whether it is of State significance. That is terribly important. Just because it is big does not necessarily mean it will be of State significance. We are not looking at size: we are looking at the significance to the State. As I said, an example of something that would not meet the requirements of the Act in terms of its being a development is the South-East Drainage Project.

Ms HURLEY: Regarding new section 46A, will the make-up of the advisory panel be significantly different from the current criteria for the Development Assessment Commission?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Yes, there is a difference. The first significant difference is the proposal that a representative of the EPA be on the panel, which is not the case at the moment. If the Bill is successful, the panel will also include a person who is an expert or who has expertise in the area being considered by the panel. They are two persons who will be on the panel and who have expertise that is not presently available under the existing legislation.

Ms HURLEY: Regarding new section 46D, I wonder about the DR process as described. Is the level of assessment significantly different from projects regularly assessed by councils?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I am not quite sure whether I understand the nub of the honourable member's question. Is the honourable member referring to the call-in or to major projects, because the DR applies only to major projects?

Ms HURLEY: This is the lowest tier of assessment of a major project. In what way is it significantly different from a lot of development proposals that might be assessed by a council? Why is it required?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: As the honourable member would know, which of those three processes we use will depend upon the impact that the development will have on the environment. If there will be a very small or minimum impact, or perhaps an impact in only one area, this is the process we will use. It would not require the full EIS that might have been required had this Bill not been introduced. Therefore, we seek to use that process where the panel was of the opinion that the development subject to the application would have minimal impact on the environment.

Ms HURLEY: I seek further clarification of that. I understand that the EIS-type process and the PER-type process are covered in Commonwealth legislation and perhaps in other States—I am not sure. The DR process is not in Commonwealth legislation. Why was it necessary to introduce this third tier, which the Minister has just described as being fairly local? If it is local, why would a council not assess it?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Again, as far as this process is concerned, it is set up for that specific purpose. It is designed to provide information that might not otherwise come forward. It is, if you like, a mini EIS. It has nothing to do with the size of the project being considered by the panel: it is a determination as to whether we need to go into the full EIS or whether it will be adequate to go through the DR process. I can put it no more simply than that. It is still a process which is designed to ensure an environmental consideration but not to the full extent that would be the case if the application for the development were to have a major impact on the environment.

Ms HURLEY: New section 48(12) provides that no appeal lies against a decision under this section. I understand that, under the current Act, that provision is also in place but that under the Act we are referring only to environmental impact statements. In this Bill we refer to a lower level of assessment. Does the Minister think it still appropriate that no appeal lies against any decision?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: It cannot be overlooked that the DR, as I said in answer to the previous question, is a mini EIS. Under this clause there would not be the right for an appeal to occur. The whole purpose of the existing Development Act is to ensure that certain proposals are subject to a greater degree of investigation than a normal application. All this Bill does is clarify that some proposals may require more investigations than others. I think the honourable member would agree with that. This Bill really refers only to a full EIS, a medium EIS or a small EIS: that is what those three terms mean, but they have been given different names. Currently, there is no provision for an appeal under the current Act, and that situation is not changed. The only major

difference in the procedures for all three levels is in the minimum exhibition period, to which I referred during the debate last evening. Again, I make the point that there is, therefore, no need for an appeal provision.

Given that the application will be subject to greater than normal investigation and high levels of public consultation—again, this is something which I emphasised during the debate last night—it is not considered appropriate to put the process through a second system under the ERD Court Act. So, I believe it is more important to ensure that all the planning and environmental issues are addressed during the investigation rather than after. That is the whole idea of what we are doing—and I made that point last night. I regard it as terribly important, as do developers and investors, that once a decision is made they can be certain that that is the final decision. There will be plenty of opportunities for a full investigation before a decision is made, but once that decision is made we see no need for an appeal provision.

Ms HURLEY: Regarding new section 48D, how often have decisions made by the Government regarding major developments been challenged in legal proceedings?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: There have been none, but appeals are being taken against the PARs. I am sure the honourable member is well aware of some of the actions that have been taken in relation to PARs. The Salisbury council has publicly stated that it intends to take court action in relation to the development at Walkley Heights, and so on. In other words, there is a greater move towards appeals being lodged against PARs. I see that as the first step in a process by which there will be an increase in the number of appeals in this area. I cannot emphasise enough to the honourable member that it is this sort of thing which is sending a negative message to investors and developers.

Ms HURLEY: I take it that the Minister has evidence that over the years there has been an increasing number of challenges against PARs?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: That is the case. What is upsetting is that the original intention of the appeal process is now being 'prostituted', because developers are using the process purely and simply to stop competition entering the field. That was never the intent of the original legislation, and that is something that needs to be removed, because I am sure that the honourable member would agree that using the system purely and simply to stop competition should never occur.

Ms HURLEY: The argument has been put again and again that competitors should not be allowed to challenge new developers coming in. Often some of these developments involve rezoning. People set up shops and developments with the knowledge that the zoning is such that they are in an area where they will not strike competition from other stores. These people deserve the full benefit of the system, including the ability to appeal to the courts. I am a little concerned that the Minister will immediately call in any projects or developments that he feels might run into trouble in the PAR process and thus remove any of this contention from the local area and allow open slather for development. Will the Minister comment?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: With regard to the first point that the honourable member raises, I could not agree with her more: there needs to be consistency, and I have no argument with that. However, competitors, instead of looking at the policy, are arguing against procedure. I do not think that is the way in which the present Act was ever intended to operate. It is important to be consistent, but let us also get rid of the problems arising because of the way in which the present legislation is being abused.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (7 to 14) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PULP AND PAPER MILL (HUNDREDS OF MAYURRA AND HINDMARSH) (COUNCIL RATES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 June. Page 1704.)

Ms HURLEY (Napier): This Bill has been introduced at short notice but, as I understand from the Minister that both parties agree to the proposed change in the rating system for the Kimberley-Clarke Pulp and Paper Mill, the Opposition is happy to facilitate that matter.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN (Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations): I thank members opposite for their cooperation and I can assure them that both the council and the company involved have reached agreement on this matter. However, as it is a hybrid Bill, as the honourable member would know, I will shortly be moving that it be referred to a select committee. I advise the House that some ratepayers might indicate disagreement with what the council has done. However, I can assure the honourable member that the council and the company have reached agreement, and this Bill reflects that agreement.

Bill read a second time and referred to a select committee consisting of the Hon. E.S. Ashenden, Mrs Geraghty, Ms Hurley, Mrs Kotz and Mr Scalzi; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on 25 July.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.10 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 9 July at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 2 July 1996

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

LO BIANCO REPORT

68. **Ms WHITE:** Does the Government intend to implement the recommendation of the Lo Bianco Report that some minority languages, such as Khmer, no longer be taught in State schools?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The Lo Bianco Report, *Consolidating Gains, Recovering Ground Languages in South Australia* is the result of an extensive consultation process with all relevant stakeholders in languages and multicultural education within the schooling sector and beyond. It makes a series of recommendations for the consideration of the Government concerning the next ten year planning cycle of languages other than English education in South Australian schools.

The Lo Bianco Report has been further distributed for general and broad consultations in order to determine the view of all stakeholders. I am advised that at this stage the recommendations of the Report appear to have broad acceptance by the relevant stakeholders in languages and multicultural education.

At this point in time no final decisions have been made concerning any of the recommendations of the Report. Currently, feedback from the consultations and the Report itself are being analysed within the Department for Education and Children's Services.

The importance of the Lo Bianco Report is that it advocates for the maintenance of a pluralistic approach to languages education, while at the same time providing greater flexibility for schools to accommodate the needs of students within smaller candidature languages. It further advocates the increased use of complementary providers such as Ethnic Schools, the Open Access College and the South Australian Secondary School of Languages to ensure that smaller candidature languages, such as Khmer, are accommodated.

EMU PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS

72. **Mr ATKINSON:** What is the legislative basis for the newly-introduced Emu pedestrian crossings? For what purpose was the latest version of section 76 introduced to the Road Traffic Act?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information.

1. Emu pedestrian crossings are a type of pedestrian facility designed to assist young people to safely travel to and from school.

They consist of a pedestrian crossing and the speed restriction sign, both of which are traffic control devices defined in section 5 of the Road Traffic Act 1961.

'School Zone' and 'End School Zone' signs are used to warn road users of the likely presence of children in the area. Signs denoting times are used to advise motorists of the times during which the speed limit will be enforced.

The pedestrian crossing has been installed in accordance with the authority vested in the Minister for Transport by section 17(1) of the Road Traffic Act 1961.

The speed limit is imposed under section 32(2) of the Road Traffic Act 1961, which enables the Minister to fix a speed limit for any road or portion of a road, or any carriageway or portion of a carriageway, at any time and without Gazettal notice. This provision differs from that under section 32(1) which applies to an area and requires Gazettal.

2. The section was last amended in the Road Traffic (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 1993.

Prior to this amendment, section 76(2) required a driver to comply with any instructions indicated by a traffic signal or traffic sign lawfully erected or placed on or near a road.

The amendment substituted a new subsection (2) and made it clear that it is only instructions that are applicable to the driver that have to be complied with.

Subsection (2a) was also inserted at this time to provide that pedestrians must also comply with any instructions applicable to the pedestrian that are indicated by a traffic signal or traffic sign lawfully erected or placed on or near a road.

ST JOHN AMBULANCE SERVICE

73. **Mr ATKINSON:** Why has the Government diminished and then abolished grants to St John Ambulance during its two years in office?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The South Australian Health Commission (SAHC) has in the past provided operational grants to St John. In August 1993 the former Labor Government advised the St John Foundation of its intention to eliminate funding in support of their activities as from 1 July 1995. This budget strategy was formulated to meet the savings targets required by the former Labor Government and took into account advice from St John which indicated it would be self funding by this time.

St John implemented budget containment strategies in an attempt to become less dependent on financial 'donations'. This is, to some extent, evidenced by the fact that St John managed to significantly reduce their 1995-96 operating deficit.

Notwithstanding St John's budget strategy, they approached me as Minister for Emergency Services, seeking financial support in recognition of their contribution to the South Australian community.

I am now pleased to advise that the Government has decided to provide St John Ambulance Australia South Australia Inc. with a grant of $100 000 from its Community Development Fund. These funds will be administered through my Ministerial 'Other Payments' budget line.

OLYMPIC GAMES

76. **Ms WHITE:** What action will the Minister take to assure that South Australia maximises its share of tourist income from international visitors attending the Sydney 2000 Olympics?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Up to 250 000 spectators, 30 000 media and 16 000 athletes, team and technical officials are expected to attend the Sydney Olympic Games. The Games are expected to have a positive impact on visitor numbers in every year of the forecast period and are estimated to add at least $3.5 billion to net export earnings between 1994 and 2004.

There are several promotional opportunities being pursued in relation to this matter. Initially, marketing activity will centre on the Atlanta Olympics with follow-up tourist trade marketing, particularly in North America. Details of the planned activities are:

ATLANTA SPORTS PLAZA PROMOTION:

The South Australian Tourism Commission is a joint partner, along with the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing and Department of Manufacturing, Industry, Small Business and Regional Development (MISBARD) (formerly EDA), in Austrade's Sport's promotion in Atlanta, situated on the 3rd level of the International Sports Plaza.

The promotion will run for thirteen months from February 1996 with ongoing staffing from Austrade to co-ordinate displays, distribute brochures and help participants with their individual promotions. Access to the Showcase area is for 'accredited' guests only and not the general public.

Representatives from each Agency met on a regular basis in late 1995 and early 1996 to determine how South Australia might best take advantage of this opportunity, and to prepare joint display material and co-ordinate supply of informational and motivational brochures to Austrade for use in the Showcase.

Display material, similar to that already displayed in the South Australian representative office in Sydney, has been prepared and supplied and is currently on display in Atlanta along with a number of relevant tourism, Recreation and Sport and MISBARD brochures. At this stage, SA is the only state represented in such a significant manner.

The Commission's Marketing Manager for North America has already visited Atlanta for the launch of the Showcase, and while there, organised to meet with and brief appropriate Austrade personnel to ensure that South Australia was high on their list of priorities when choosing displays.

'AUSSIE SPECIALIST TRADE SHOW'—NOVEMBER 1996

The key 'window of opportunity' for tourism is just prior to the major US Trade Show 'Aussie Specialist' which will be held in the first week of November 1996:

- key travel trade wholesalers and media will be in town
- some SA operators will be in Atlanta for the trade show
- focus will be on travel rather than sport.

A specific South Australian tourism week, entitled 'Discover Sensational Adelaide Australia', has been booked by Austrade commencing 28 October 1996:

- display area in this week will focus on South Australia

- showcase area has been booked on the evenings of 30 and/or 31 October 1996 for special functions
- VIP Travel Trade and Media in town will be invited
- SA operators will be in Atlanta to participate in the planned function(s).

These activities are expected to yield results in increased tourist arrivals to SA and expenditure after the Atlanta Games when the focus will divert to the Sydney Games and Australia.

The Minister and Australian Major Events' Chief Executive will be visiting Atlanta during the games and preparations are being made for a VIP luncheon to be held on Tuesday 23 July 1996 in the International Sports Plaza facility. The format will be an informal business networking function in which all of the SA delegation will be involved to promote SA as an ideal destination for pre Olympic and Para-Olympic training.

In addition, SA is distributing its brochures in the non-accredited media centre in Atlanta which will be established in July to service the 5 000 non-accredited media attending the Games.

The number of journalists visiting SA will be increasing as we near 2000, both through the efforts of our own media consultants targeting key journalists and through the Australian Tourist Commission's Visiting Journalists Program. Additional funds are being sought to handle the influx.

Through increased awareness, it is certain that a large number of visitors will use the opportunity of attending the Olympics to explore different parts of Australia both before and after the main event.

SA WATER

85. **Mr FOLEY:**

1. When and by whom was the Minister first informed of each of the following:
   (a) that SA Water granted a 4½ hour extension of time to United Water for lodgement of its bid for the water contract on 4 October 1995;
   (b) that the bids of the unsuccessful companies had been opened, copied and distributed on 4 October prior to lodgement of the ultimately successful bid;
   (c) that copies of the two unsuccessful bids were provided to six inappropriate persons on 4 October;
   (d) that the Probity Auditor was absent after 6 pm on 4 October;
   (e) that the surveillance tape in the secure room had run out without being replaced;
   (f) that the unsuccessful bidders were not told of the extension of time provided to United Water; and
   (g) that neither the SA Water CEO Mr Phipps nor the Contract Manager, Mr Killick, were present for completion of the lodgement of all bids.
2. When did the Minister first inform the Premier of each of the facts referred to in 1(a) to (g)?
3. Has the Minister disciplined any SA Water official or other individual for any of the matters referred to in question 1(a) to (g) and if so, who was disciplined, how were they disciplined and for what particular breach?
4. Was the Minister's office consulted during 4 October 1995 about the handling of the lodgement of the bids and if so, what was the nature of these discussions?
5. When will the Auditor-General complete his Report into the execution of the contract with United Water for the operation of Adelaide's water systems?
6. Did the Crown Solicitor interview those persons who were involved in operating and correcting faults in the United Water computing system on 4 October to confirm the reasons given for the delays in submitting their final bid?
7. Has the Minister investigated the reasons offered by United Water for the late lodgement of their final bid and if so, what did his inquiry reveal about the validity of the reasons?
8. What inquiries were made by the CEO of SA Water, Mr Phipps, and the Contract Project Manager, Mr Killick, as to why United Water could not meet the 5 p.m. deadline for the lodgement of their final bid and what action did they take to ensure the probity of the process before granting United Water a 2 hour extension of time that extended beyond 4 hours?
9. By whom was the Minister first made aware of the existence and nature of the subcontracting relationship between United Water International and United Water Services and when did the Minister inform the Premier?
10. How much will United Water International pay United Water Services for technical advice?
11. What is the precise nature of United Water Services' technical advice and how many employees are paid by the company?
12. Has the Auditor-General yet seen a copy of the contract between the Government and United Water?
13. Is the price being paid to United Water under the water contract only fixed for 5½ years and if so, will it then need to be renegotiated?
14. Under what conditions can United Water International negotiate a rise in the price paid to it under the contract and what other conditions of the contract become negotiable after this time?
15. Is United Water International obligated to continue to manage the operation and maintenance of Adelaide's water systems after 5½ years and under what circumstances can United Water International or its partners remove themselves from the contract at or after this time?
16. Why was the polling undertaken on behalf of SA Water to assess the public attitude to the water outsourcing deal after announcement of United Water as the preferred tenderer on 17 October 1995 and were results given to United Water?
17. What assets are being purchased by United Water from the Government, what is the price to be paid and what was the balance sheet value of those assets?
18. Are senior officials of SA Water conducting, or have they concluded, an internal audit of Spare Parts and Stores in an attempt to recover up to $2 million worth of minor plant and spares belonging to SA Water now believed to be in the hands of United Water staff?
19. When will the prospectus for the equity float of UWI be released?
20. How many of the former SA Water employees now surplus to United Water's requirements have taken up Targeted Separation Packages and how many are seeking redeployment?
21. What is the profile of those employees made surplus to requirement by employment classification?
22. What has been the cost to date of the Separation Packages associated with the water contract?
23. On what basis is United Water International paid, how often is payment made and how are these payments calculated?
24. How is the performance of United Water International monitored, by how many SA Water officials is it monitored, to whom do these officials report, by what criteria are the contractor's performance assessed and what penalties apply in the case of unsatisfactory performance?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:

1. SA Water followed proper process in regard to the selection of the preferred proponent. The Probity Auditor signed off that the process had been conducted in a fair and equitable manner. I was advised of that sign off. In that context it was not necessary that I be advised of process details.

2. For the same reasons as outlined in 1. above it was not necessary for me to discuss process details with the Premier.

3. This question does not dignify an answer; it is based on a false premise. The Solicitor-General on page 21 of his Report to the Auditor-General said 'the procedure adopted by SA Water was generally excellent'.

In his evidence to the Select Committee he said that 'this was perhaps the most intense and focussed contracting process that I had ever seen in the South Australian Government' and that 'the process was very well done and organised'.

I must say that all of the people involved merit the greatest praise for their dedication and commitment to achieving a contract which provides extraordinary benefits to all South Australians not only for the financial savings it guarantees but also for the increased employment opportunities that will result from the export growth commitments made by United Water.

4. Refer answer to question 1 above; it was not necessary for the Minister's office to be consulted.

5. This is a matter for the Auditor-General.

6. I am not aware of the specific process and manner in which the Solicitor-General conducted his independent review. This question should be directed to the Attorney-General in another place.

7. The matter was dealt with by the Solicitor-General in his report to the Auditor-General. It was not necessary for me to conduct further inquiry.

8. Reference should be made to the report of the Solicitor-General. SA Water officers followed proper process in consultation with the Probity Auditor in dealing with submissions from the proponents.

9. When this issue was raised in the public domain in the Select Committee it was still under negotiation; a contractual relationship did not exist at that time.

10. This is a matter of commercial relationship between UWI and UWS. SA Water's contractual relationship is with UWI.

11. This is a matter of commercial relationship between UWI and UWS. SA Water's contractual relationship is with UWI.

12. The Auditor-General has a copy of the contract.

13-15 These questions relate to commercial in confidence contract matters which it is not my intention to 15. detail.

16. Market research was undertaken by Kortlang in late October and early December in order to inform its communications advice to the Government. Results were not provided to United Water International.

17. United Water International is purchasing inventories, major plant and minor plant. The price for inventory is based on the cost to SA Water and the prices for major and minor plant are based on independent valuations. Sale proceeds have not varied significantly from Balance Sheet values.

18. The total inventory and minor plant in the metropolitan area as at 31 December 1995 was counted, agreed and signed off by both SA Water and United Water.

19. No decision on this matter has been taken.

20. At 26 April 1996, 200 employees had accepted TVSPs and 144 had sought redeployment.

21. The employment classifications of the 344 employees made surplus to requirements were:

Administrative Services Officers	33
Operations Services Officers	33
Technical Services Officers	21
Professional Services Officers	1
Construction and Maintenance Award	168
Metals Awards	73
Others, e.g. stores, plumbers, carpenters, etc	15

22. $7.19 million as at 26 April 1996.

23. UWI is paid monthly in arrears on a formula in accordance with the terms of the contract.

24. United Water International must report against contracted performance requirements on a monthly and ad hoc basis as required. It must maintain comprehensive records of all operations and maintenance activities. These records are the property of SA Water which has access to them at all times.

KEEPING FAMILIES TOGETHER PROGRAM

90. **Mr ATKINSON:** When will the Government make a decision about the Keeping Families Together program, and if the program is not to be continued, why not?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The 'Keeping Families Together' (KFT) program has been evaluated, and the findings of that evaluation were released in late April 1996. The evaluation has shown that the program has been generally positive.

Following the release of the evaluation outcomes, the Government acted with appropriate timing, and in early May 1996 advised of a continuation of funding at current levels to the end of 1996. Funding of $603 930 for this period was provided to the six non-government agencies.

VICTIMS OF CRIME SERVICE

92. **Mr ATKINSON:** Will the Government fund a homicide support officer attached to the Victims of Crime Service and, if not, why not?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The South Australian Government provides funding to the level of $345 000 (1995-96) to the Victims of Crime Service. The Victims of Crime Service is a community based organisation, which determines the kinds of services it provides to victims with the funding provided by the Government. They currently provide services to victims of violent crimes in particular, including homicide.

The funding level to VOCS was increased by $10 000 from their 1994-95 allocation, and in light of the cut backs to many areas of Government, this represents a considerable commitment to services to victims. There is no plan on the part of the Government to provide additional funding to the Victims of Crime Service to fund a specific homicide support officer. In addition to the fact that homicide victims are already provided with services through VOCS and other government agencies (including Police and Courts), it would clearly be impracticable for the Government to provide a specific support officer for victims of all types of crimes.

Furthermore, a review of the operations of the Victims of Crime Service has recently been undertaken, and the report of the consultant has been presented to VOCS and accepted by that organisation. I understand there has been no recommendation to restructure its services in order to support the establishment of specific support officers, including a homicide support officer, within its current structure.

I have met with parents and other relatives of homicide victims recently and discussed this issue. They understand the desirability of working through VOCS.

FIRE HYDRANTS

93. **Mr ATKINSON:** Are the form and colours of fire hydrants defined legislatively or administratively and has the definition changed in the past 10 years?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:

Street Hydrants/Plugs

The Waterworks Act 1932 requires that SA Water 'shall, within every water district, fix proper fire plugs in the main and other pipes belonging to the corporation, at such distances and at such places as the Corporation may consider proper and convenient for the supply of water for extinguishing any fire which may break out within any such district.' Therefore the responsibility for fire hydrants and fire plugs lies with SA Water.

The form and colouring of fire hydrants and fire plug indicator posts was, as far as can be ascertained, first detailed in correspondence from the Superintendent of the SA Fire Brigade to the Honourable Chief Secretary, Sir Henry Ayers, dated 1 August 1865.

Indicator posts were subsequently installed in 1872 to that specification.

No other legislative or administrative definition for their required form or colour could be identified, however, the use of RED for fire protection and prevention equipment is fairly traditional and consistent throughout the world.

Due to the fact that approximately 8 000 fire indicator posts have been recorded as missing throughout the metropolitan area, and in an endeavour to rapidly identify street hydrants, a trial is being conducted in several council areas with blue 'cats eyes' markers. These markers are painted onto the centre of the roadway and consist of a yellow isosceles triangle, pointing towards the hydrant, with a blue reflective marker (cats eye) located in the centre of that triangle.

It is believed that these markers will stand out from the traditional red and white road markers, enabling immediate location of fire-fighting water by emergency crews.

On Site Hydrants

The form and colour of on site hydrants, however, is administratively specified in the following Australian Standards.

AS2419	Fire Hydrant Installation
AS2700	Colour Standards for General Purposes
AS1345	Identification of the Contents of Piping, Conduits and Ducts

AS2419 is also called up in the Building Code of Australia, providing a legislated requirement for its use. In complying with the requirements of AS2419, reference is also made to AS2700 and AS1345.

Consequently, the form and colour of on-site hydrants is specified both administratively and legislatively. These requirements have not changed in the past 10 years.

RAFFLE PRIZES

94. **Mr ATKINSON:** Will the Government amend the liquor licensing laws to allow licensed clubs to raffle a small quantity of liquor and allow the winner of the raffle to carry the actual prize off the premises?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The honourable member has raised a very valid question because the issue of the provision of liquor as a prize in a raffle is causing confusion, not just for the club industry but also for many genuine money raisers.

The Liquor Licensing Commissioner is preparing a submission for the Minister's consideration which seeks to exempt the supply of liquor by way of a prize in a raffle or lottery and also the complimentary supply of celebratory liquor to persons attending receptions such as weddings from the Liquor Licensing Act. Any such exemption will need to be done in such a way that the protections in relation to supply to minors are maintained.

OFFICE OF THE AGEING

95. **Mr ATKINSON:**

1. What process was used by the Office of the Aged to award the consultancy to review day programs and the consultancy to review the implementation of standards in community care and does this process comply with the Government's guidelines on selecting consultants?

2. Has the Minister approved the appointment of these two consultancies by the Director of the Office of the Aged?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Office for the Ageing took the following action to implement two approved HACC projects:

The project to implement standards in community care was awarded to Aged Cottage Homes Inc.

The project to review day care programs was implemented by way of a consultancy, let as a result of an expression of interest process involving separate discussion with three separate consultants.

In view of the urgent need to implement this project, the process of discussion with three separate consultants was appropriate.

The approvals for the implementation of the project and the consultancy were made by the Director of the Office for the Ageing under his delegated authority.

ELECTORAL ENROLMENT

96. **Mr ATKINSON:** Will the State Electoral Commissioner be contacting voters whose names were removed by objection during the 1995 electoral roll review but who did not leave their Federal division and who were, upon presenting themselves to vote at the 1996 Federal election, re-enrolled as Commonwealth only electors by virtue of filling in their new address on the declaration vote slip with a view to State re-enrolment.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The short answer to the member's question is 'yes'.

For the benefit of members who may not know how the objection process is conducted, I will provide a brief outline.

During the biennial 'door knock' a review officer establishes that an elector may no longer reside at the address for which he/she is enrolled. A letter is sent to the elector at that address explaining that the name will be removed from the roll if no reply is received within 21 days. If there is no reply or the letter is returned unclaimed, the elector's name is deleted from the roll. A second notice is sent notifying the elector that his/her name has been removed from the roll and giving 21 days to respond if she/he wishes to be reinstated.

If an elector, whose name has been removed from the roll by objection, completes an 'unenrolled vote' at a Federal election, the Australian Electoral Commission will accept that vote and reinstate the elector on the roll. The State Electoral Act does not allow for reinstatement following the proper conduct of the objection process. To ensure that names have not been removed erroneously, the Registrar writes to all unenrolled electors who voted explaining that they have been reinstated for Commonwealth purposes but not for State. Enrolments forms are sent with the letters. If the Registrar does not receive a reply, the objection process starts again, but this time for Commonwealth enrolment only.

The Electoral Commissioner is not enamoured of the approach of the Australian Electoral Commission as very few people are wrongly removed from the roll. Furthermore, he does not believe it proper to admit to scrutiny, votes to which electors are probably not entitled. He believes that 'the benefit of the doubt' approach should not apply in circumstances where the doubt is high. If the election is closely contested, further investigation will reveal the veracity of those votes, but only where they have not been admitted to the scrutiny. Not surprisingly, he does not advocate any change to State legislation. Nevertheless, recognising that errors do occur occasionally, all electors who are reinstated following a Commonwealth election, are followed up.

FOREMAN, MR K.

97. **Mr ATKINSON:** Will the Government make *ex gratia* payment to Mr Kingsley Foreman to help him pay his legal expenses incurred in successfully defending the failed prosecution of him for murder?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The short answer is no. Mr Foreman was acquitted by a Supreme Court jury on one count of murder arising out of the death of a young man who was in the process of robbing a service station.

It is clear that Mr Foreman has no legal claim against the State of South Australia. If he were to be paid compensation it would be an *ex gratia* payment. In determining the question as to whether a payment should be made, a distinction needs to be made between those persons convicted of crimes and imprisoned and those who have been charged with an offence and acquitted. Clearly the court system has failed those who are wrongly convicted and imprisoned, in that all safety nets designed to prevent this from occurring have in some way failed.

In situations where a person has been acquitted, there may be any of a number of reasons for this, the most important of which is that the jury may not be satisfied beyond reasonable doubt either in fact, in law or in applying community values. A verdict of acquittal does not mean that the accused person should not have been charged or should not have faced trial. There is an expectation that the court system will not convict the innocent. This is the basis for the principles behind the granting of bail and the presumption of innocence in the courts whereby the prosecution must prove its case and the defendant is not required to prove anything. In the absence of *mala fides* or impropriety on the part of the police or the prosecuting authority, there is no basis for compensation.

PORT ADELAIDE YOUTH ACCOMMODATION PROGRAM

98. **Mr ATKINSON:** Does the Housing Trust intend to continue leasing No. 6/24 Boomerang Road, Croydon Park, to the Port Adelaide Youth Accommodation Program and, if so, why? Is the Minister aware of the effects occupants of this unit have had on the neighbourhood?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: No. given the disturbances which have been associated with short term youth tenancies at Unit 6/24 Boomerang Road, Croydon Park, the Port Adelaide Central Mission will relinquish its lease of that unit in exchange for a more appropriately located unit of accommodation.

I have recently been made aware of the alleged disturbances caused by occupants of that unit. The Housing Trust is currently seeking more appropriate accommodation for the Mission.

TAXIS, CHILD RESTRAINTS

100. **Mr ATKINSON:** What number and percentage of taxis have—

an anchor and straps; and

two anchors and straps,

for child restraints?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Under Australian Design Rules 34 and 34a all vehicles manufactured after 1 July 1976 must be fitted with anchorage points for child restraints. Therefore, all taxis manufactured after this date have been fitted with at least two, possibly three, anchorage points. There is no requirement for the vehicle manufacturer to supply straps for the anchorage points and as such there are no taxis specifically fitted with straps.

Australian Design Rules stipulate that anchorage points must be provided for all rear seating positions equipped with a rear seat belt assembly, resulting in three anchorage points being fitted. The only exception to this is where a vehicle is fitted with a back seat that is divided into two or more sections which can be folded independently of each other. In this case only the centre seating position is exempt from this requirement. Informal advice received from the Department of Transport indicates that although it is not a requirement to fit anchorage points to the centre seating positions in vehicles with hinged or folding rear seats, the majority of these vehicles are fitted with anchorage points at this seating position.

Straps for the anchorage point are an added accessory and are provided with the child restraining device and, therefore, they would only be fitted when a child restraint was required.

PROSTITUTION

104. **Mr ATKINSON:** Further to the letter in reply to question No. 245 of the past session, have any individuals been fined for prostitution related offences more than six times in any of the years referred to and, if so, how many individuals and how many times were each of them fined?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: In reference to the 350 breaches of section 21(1)(a) and 21(1)(b) of the Summary Offences Act finalised in the Magistrates Court of South Australia during 1994 (as detailed in response to the honourable member's previous Question on Notice No. 245):

- the 350 breaches involved 237 individuals
- 4 of these individuals were fined more than six times during 1994
- 3 of those 4 individuals were fined 7 times and one was fined 12 times.