HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 11 November 1999

The SPEAKER (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald) took the chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

CONSTITUTION (PARLIAMENTARY TERMS) AMENDMENT BILL

Mr HANNA (Mitchell) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Constitution Act. Read a first time.

Mr HANNA: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

It is based on the very simple concept that we should have exactly four year terms for this state parliament. Members would be aware that at present we have a very elastic situation whereby the term of parliament can be anywhere from about three to nearly 4½ years. I propose that the date for elections be fixed at the third Saturday in October every four years, commencing at the next election and running every election thereafter, provided that no exceptional circumstances arise.

Members would be aware that in the constitution at present there is provision for early elections to be called if the government loses a no-confidence motion in the House or if a bill of special importance is denied by the Legislative Council after being passed through this chamber. All that remains the same under my proposal.

The fact is that the public, when it elected every one of us here, expected us to serve out a four year term. Many people probably would not realise that in fact that may end up being a three year term or it could be closer to a 4½ year term, depending on the whim of the Premier and the executive of the day. This measure actually takes a little more power away from the Premier and the executive, power that is used only for political expediency.

I believe that the public should know where it stands and that members of parliament and their supporters should know where they stand in terms of the timing of elections. In any case, the supposed benefit of being able to call a snap election at any time after three years in South Australia is perhaps illusory. When one considers the most recent Victorian and South Australian elections it becomes apparent that there is perhaps no longer any real advantage in calling an early election or trying to pick the right timing politically for an election.

The public is for many reasons probably more cynical than ever about our behaviour. In particular, the public will punish the political expediency inherent in the calling of a snap election, an early election, by a Premier seeking political advantage. That is why I suggest that perhaps it is illusory in terms of the benefit of the power the Premier now has to call an election anywhere within that 18 month window of opportunity.

In Victoria, Premier Kennett tried to pick the right time to go to the polls and he was defeated. At the last state election, despite an overwhelming advantage in terms of numbers and resources, Premier Olsen went to the polls trying to seek exactly the right timing and was very nearly defeated. Take the converse situation in New South Wales where they have adopted this measure of fixed four year terms. In New South Wales, elections will be called on the first Saturday of March every four years. So, Premier Carr and his government did not have the supposed benefit of being able to call a snap election when the opposition was off guard or perhaps performing poorly in the polls for a short period of time. Yet the Carr government was returned with what we could a landslide majority. So, with those three recent examples I suggest that there is very little political advantage to be gained anymore in any case from the Premier having the power to go to the Governor any time within an 18 month window of opportunity and call a snap election.

I point out that it was in the mid 1980s that we as a parliament extended the parliamentary term from three years to four years. That is a notional three years to a notional four years. When that was introduced the average timing of elections was about 2¼ years, even though on the statute book it said that we had a three year term. I think that the average would have increased in the sense that we now have an average parliamentary term of closer to four years than three years, but still there is a great deal of uncertainty surrounding the timing of the election in that final year of a government's life.

There is a really sensible reason to endorse this measure, because in the final year when the Premier has the power to call an election at any time over an almost 18 month period the opposition is left wondering when the election will be called, the government backbenchers are wondering when an election will be called and one thing is guaranteed: that there are no drastic changes in policy and no bold initiatives either by government or opposition in that period, because an election can be called at any time. Parliament sits less than it normally does, because the government members and the opposition members want to spend more time in the electorate electioneering and campaigning. I am sure that if the public thought about it for a moment they would rather we were in here governing the place, making sensible laws and overseeing the Public Service, rather than being out there on the hustings.

So, the current system means that we virtually waste one year in every four in terms of good government. If we have a fixed election period we will have a phenomenon similar to what New South Wales has experienced recently where the activities of government are normal for at least 3½ years and it is only in the couple of months preceding the election period that we start to get more jingoistic slogans and media releases from government ministers and the opposition. The campaign then starts to build and about a month before the election it is as if the chequered flag drops and, suddenly, they are in a full-scale election campaign similar to what we experience after the Governor of South Australia issues the writs for an election here.

This bill is not just about more certainty: it is about better government. It is also about saving money, because over time we will actually have slightly fewer elections than we have now. That is marginal, but for those who focus on the cost of things this measure will save the public of South Australia money—not take more out of their pockets.

I will say one other thing about the bill in relation to the timing of the election. Obviously there are a number of choices. If one is to fix a particular Saturday in the year for an election, one would want to avoid when the weather is too hot and when the weather is too cold and wet; and one would also want to avoid the football season and school holidays as far as possible. In the end I have settled on the third Saturday in October, which is about three weeks after the AFL grand final. It would be humorous to take this too seriously except

for the fact that it does tend to play a role in Adelaide, particularly because the only state newspaper we have focuses so much on the football and the AFL grand final that room for serious debate is squeezed out. So it is important for an election campaign period not to clash with the AFL grand final season. Strange as that may seem, it is an important consideration for those of us who want to have a serious public debate at election time.

The timing also avoids student exams, avoids the heat of summer and the wet of mid winter. It is also important to consider that the state budget is brought down at the end of May. So, if we went to an election period in March, for example, we would find that considerable work has already been done in putting together the state budget for that year, whereas if we have a change of government in October there is ample time for the new government to settle in and take the new policy directions it has undertaken to put in place for the budget that it brings down six or seven months after the election.

At the end of the day there is room for different viewpoints in relation to the timing of elections, but I suggest that the third Saturday in October is at least as good as any. I urge members to support the bill. It is a simple straight-forward concept, a commonsense measure which will lead to better government and cost saving in South Australia. It will assist the general public understand the process because eventually a culture will develop of expecting elections to come around every fourth October, and certainty is a good thing.

I will now briefly explain the clauses of the bill. Clause 1 simply refers to the title of the bill as the Constitution (Parliamentary Terms) Amendment Act 1999. Clause 2 of the bill makes clear that the elections for the Legislative Council are to continue in the manner that they currently do, that is, there will be fixed eight year terms for legislative councillors. Clause 3 of the bill is the main clause and sets the election date as the third Saturday in October. The absence of any transitional provisions means that this will come into effect in October 2001, barring any exceptional circumstances. The bill also provides in clause 3 for the postponement of a state election should our Governor became aware of a commonwealth election being called just prior to the time at which the Governor should call the state election.

It provides for the Governor to postpone for four weeks the calling of the state election if a commonwealth election is called just before the state election. So, the bill takes into account the unlikely but possible event of commonwealth and state elections clashing and to a limited degree tries to separate out the commonwealth and state election campaigns in that unlikely but possible event. Clause 4, which is consequential, ensures that the exceptional circumstances to which I have earlier referred remain in place, providing for early elections.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (EXPIATION AND DETECTION OF VEHICLE OFFENCES) BILL

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Expiation of Offences Act 1996 and the Road Traffic Act 1961. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this bill is to give the community the ability to have more rights under this legislation. For a considerable time I have been of the view that, in a democracy, the citizens are entitled to question the ability of statutory officers to issue these dreadful on-the-spot fines which have now become virtually a way of life. They are not there to deter people from breaking the law, because many normally law-abiding citizens get caught up in this process for the most trifling and insignificant offences when they should never receive an on-the-spot fine. In many cases, the amounts involved are of such a nature that it becomes an unreasonable burden on those people.

I have therefore determined that this parliament should revisit this course of action because, as one of those who sat in the Parliament, like you Mr Speaker, when this legislation was originally brought to the Parliament, I do not think anyone believed that we would have a situation where the police would become an arm of the State Treasury, with these tickets being issued with gay abandon for all and various offences. This is in my view not only unnecessary but also quite unfair and is creating hardship and imposing a burden on the long suffering community.

I would like to know what instructions are given, who gives the instructions and what encouragement or incentives are given to the various groups who write out these tickets. It is rare, if ever in my experience, that you see officers talking to a motorist without their writing out a ticket. Therefore, it has become very evident to me that where people believe that the law has been enforced in a harsh or unreasonable manner they should have some redress. Where the offence is of a minor or trifling nature, it should be independently adjudicated. We should not have Caesar judging Caesar, and that is what this bill does. It also makes it an offence to hide speed cameras. It was part of this government's election policy when we came to office on the first occasion that we would take action. Mr Speaker, you would be aware, as would others, that we have had some interesting discussions in relation to that matter, but it was clear. I believe it may have been done unwittingly, but there was certainly an attempt to disregard the government's policy.

In a democracy, that should not take place. It is the role of the electorate at large to deal with the government if it does not like the policy, because people have a vote. I know—and I could provide a list for the House—of locations where speed cameras are hidden. For example, if one is going from Adelaide to Tarlee on the downhill slope where the bushes are on the left-hand side, there is one; there is another one between Iron Knob and Kimba. In moving that this bill be read a second time, I have said quite sufficient to ensure that this matter, which needs further consideration, is adequately brought to the attention of the House.

Clause 1 of the bill deals with the short title; clause 2 with commencement; and clause 3 with interpretation. Part 2, clause 4, inserts new section 12A, which allows for the withdrawal of an expiation notice on the grounds that the offence is trifling; clause 5 amends section 13 in relation to enforcement procedures; clause 6 amends section 16, which provides that an expiation notice may be withdrawn; and part 3, clause 7, amends section 79B, 'Provisions applying where certain offences are detected by photographic detection services'. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr De LAINE secured adjournment of the debate.

ROAD TRAFFIC (HIGHWAY SPEED LIMIT) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act 1961. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill allows, in certain circumstances, an increase in the speed limit on the open highway from 110 km/h to 130 km/h. This matter has generated considerable public interest and discussion since I first raised it. It has become evident that on some highways around South Australia, particularly in the northern parts of the state, there is a need to allow the public the ability to travel up to 130 km/h if they so desire. This provision is a maximum limit, not a minimum, and it would appear that certain people who have commented on this matter believe that everyone will have to drive at 130 km/h. Of course, that is a complete nonsense. You are not compelled to drive at 110 km/h, even though many people driving at 50 km/h, 60 km/h or 70 km/h on the open highway are themselves a danger to the motoring public. This provision, relating to those highways I have specified in the amendment to the act, in my view will be of great benefit to people who continually travel long distances.

I must say that, in discussing this matter with a wide range of people, I have received great public support, particularly from the people who know something about the isolated parts of the state. The only individual who has been somewhat critical of me was a character from the RAA who went on radio the other day. It is obvious that either he has driven in the northern parts of the state while wearing fogged glasses or he has never been there before, because his description of the roads did not describe the roads on which I drive. I was absolutely appalled at his attitude towards me. I have always had a high regard for that organisation but I have to say that I am now reconsidering my views, because he certainly was not representing the views of his members in the rural and isolated parts of South Australia.

It is most unfortunate that that sort of ill-informed comment is made because of the ridiculous situation that occurs when a person who is driving on the Stuart Highway goes across the Northern Territory border and proceeds to drive on a highway with an unlimited speed limit. On the national highways that go across the middle of the United States the speed limit has been increased from 110 km/h to 120 km/h. The autobahns in Germany have unlimited speed limits. Although the speed limits in Victoria are 100 km/h, I do not believe that they are any better off than we are in South Australia. I believe that there are just as many accidents and just as many deaths per head of population in Victoria as in South Australia.

Everyone knows that, when a survey was carried out between Port Augusta and Coober Pedy, the average speed limit was 130 km/h. That information has not been released but I know about it because I have been told about it. When I first got a driver's licence, like the member for Price, there were no speed limits. The motor cars were not as good and the roads were certainly nowhere near as good as they are today. We have consistently spent hundreds of millions of dollars on safety issues. We drive better motor cars which have been designed with the safety of the drivers and passengers in mind, and I believe that the proposition that I am putting forward is well worthy of consideration by this parliament.

It has been interesting to note the number of members who have said to me privately that they support me. It will be more interesting to see where they are when the bells ring and after they have been counselled by certain people. If they go out into the rural and isolated parts of this state, they will find that this measure has overwhelming support.

I now deal with the summary of the provisions. Clause 1 is the short title. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the act. Clause 3 amends section 5, which is the interpretation section. Clause 4 is an amendment to section 32 dealing with speed zones. Clause 5 amends section 48, which relates to general speed limits. Clause 6 amends section 175 relating to evidence. Clause 7 contains the transitional provision. I reiterate that this matter deals only with the following roads: Road No. 1000—Stuart Highway, between Port Augusta and the Northern Territory; Road No. 2000—Eyre Highway, between Port Augusta and the state of Western Australia; Road No. 3400—Barrier Highway, between Hallett and the state of New South Wales; and Road No. 1100—Hawker to Lyndhurst Road, between the towns of Hawker and Lyndhurst. This measure will be of great benefit to the people in the isolated parts of the state and I commend the bill to the House.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

EXPIATION OF OFFENCES (WITHDRAWAL OF NOTICES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Expiation of Offences Act 1996. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this bill is to put a new provision into this particular act which I described, I hope somewhat colourfully, in my earlier address to the House in relation to members of the public who are unfortunate enough to receive an on-the-spot fine. I outlined a few weeks ago a case in which a person received an on-the-spot fine which was defective in itself. The person did not know that the fine had been forwarded to him, because it was sent to the wrong address. However, the way the law stands, not only was that person responsible for the original ticket but because a late fee was involved, which they did not receive in time, they incurred a second penalty.

REMEMBRANCE DAY

The SPEAKER: Order! the honourable member will be seated. Today is Remembrance Day. The time is now 11 a.m. I invite all members and staff present to rise and join with me in a period of silence in recognition of those men and women who paid the supreme sacrifice in all wars in which Australia has taken part.

Members stood in their places in silence.

EXPIATION OF OFFENCES (WITHDRAWAL OF NOTICES) AMENDMENT BILL

Debate resumed.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I think we are all aware of the significance of the action that we have just taken. Most of us would have been appalled at what took place on North Terrace earlier this week when the crosses were desecrated by vandals.

I was explaining the reasons for bringing this measure before the House. A person came to me most annoyed about the circumstances in which they were placed through no fault of their own. They incurred an on-the-spot fine, which they did not argue about, but the notice had been sent to the wrong address. They then incurred a second penalty, of which they were not aware, of course. Eventually, the matter went to court so that it could be resolved in a sensible fashion.

I contacted the Attorney-General's office. The person in question was fortunate because they happen to know quite well a member of parliament. If this person had been a member of the community such as an elderly person who did not know someone who could act vigorously on their behalf, they would have been in a most difficult situation and experienced great personal distress and hardship which they should not be put through.

The interesting thing is that, if the individual in question had been given one of these tickets and themselves supplied the wrong address to a police officer or an inspector, whom we have endowed with these disgraceful powers, they would have committed a second offence. Whoever processed this notice with the wrong address gets off scot free. The person to whose case I am referring was put to great personal expense with two visits to court, and I had to speak at length with the Attorney-General's office to have the second penalty dealt with.

The average citizen would not be so fortunate. I do not believe that this person should have been put through such a trauma. There is a view within government that bureaucracy is never wrong, that bureaucracy is a wonderful thing, that it is self-fulfilling. Bureaucracy can make the most arbitrary decisions, it is completely insensitive, and it has no regard for personal hardship. We have created a situation today where, in many cases, those who are better off in the community are members of the bureaucracy.

Some bureaucrats have endowed themselves with massive salaries, and many benefits and conditions. However, they deal with the very people who work hard and battle to pay taxes to keep those bureaucrats in such a privileged station in life, then they are quite insensitive to them. The advice they tender to others often does not reflect any sensitivity to or regard for the welfare of those who have been afflicted by the sorts of recommendations and provisions this parliament has unfortunately enacted. If we believe in justice and a fair go, the House will support this measure. I intend to pursue vigorously this and other measures I will put before the House today, because I believe that the community at large has had enough of having these unnecessary impositions placed upon them, when many of them do not have the ability to pay for what in many cases are trifling and minimum offences where a caution should be given.

To those people who have the responsibility for administering these laws, do not think that you are immune to change. The more of these things you impose on the community, the closer the day that the community will say, 'Enough is enough!' History is full of people who thought they were protected because they had certain powers—and we know what has happened in other places. I will pursue these matters vigorously because in a democracy people are entitled to be treated in a more sensitive and reasonable manner. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

TAFE CHILD CARE

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I move:

That this House urges the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training to keep open the Regency Institute of TAFE's Elizabeth and Regency campus child-care centres in recognition of the negative impact that closing would have on current and future students' ability to participate in further education.

The reason I have moved this motion is that the closure of those centres will have a very negative impact not only on the students who are currently studying and relying on those centres for their ability to study but also on future students who are considering studying at those campuses of the Regency institute who, if there is no child-care facility on campus, may decide not to continue their studies. The issue of closure of child-care centres is very pertinent. This state government has admitted that much harm has been caused by the federal Liberal government's decision to rip money out of child care in this state. This state Liberal government has admitted that but is at this very point considering contributing to that harm.

Last year the Premier came up with a sleight of hand, with his claim of putting $1 million into child-care centres in this state, while his federal colleague immediately issued a press release refuting that that $1 million was a fillip for child care. The Hon. Warren Truss came out and said that the Premier was not being up front and was just redistributing money that was already in that budget.

The state Liberal government can criticise the federal Liberal government as much as it wants; the end result is that it is contributing to the loss of child-care facilities in this state. When the minister talks about TAFE child-care centres (and the Nuriootpa campus closed down last year) he often refers to the ability of students to use other child-care facilities. Another aspect to that argument that members need to be aware of is that students at TAFE in South Australia use TAFE campus child-care centres because they work out cheaper than other child-care centres, because students pay TAFE campus child-care centres only for the time that they attend TAFE. In other child-care centres they must reserve a place. They have to pay, even during course breaks. TAFE campus child-care centres do not do that. When the minister says there are other child-care centres about he does not accurately represent the situation for students, because it costs them more when they have to reserve a place at other child-care centres.

There is another problem for those TAFE students: most of them have to use public transport to travel to TAFE. The minister can say, 'A few kilometres down the road there is another child-care centre,' but if it means that they have to take another bus and they cannot get transport in between the two, that is a disincentive for them to attend TAFE in the first place. Members must understand that many of these students who use that service are very disadvantaged. Many of them are single parents and a lot of them have to rely on public transport. The cost is enormous for them. The fact that they even get to TAFE in the first place, and enrol, is a big thing. Often they are there to try to improve their skills so that they can obtain work and get off welfare benefits. Yet, this government is seemingly about placing this additional hurdle in their way.

Members may or may not be aware of a recent decision by the federal Liberal government to decrease the pensioner education supplement, which is a welfare payment that is given to students who are receiving pensions and who study

full-time or part-time. This decision has come at the same time as this government is looking at closing TAFE child-care centres, which do offer these students access to TAFE courses. The measure that has just passed through federal parliament is to halve the entitlement of part-time students (students doing 25 per cent or more of a course load), and this applies to both mainstream and Aboriginal students. That means reducing their supplement from $60 per fortnight to $30—and, with respect to Aboriginal students, from $120 to $60. That is a big attack on the ability of these students to attend.

The state minister is looking at compounding that situation by closing two TAFE campus child-care centres: the two remaining child-care centres of the Regency Institute of TAFE at the Elizabeth and Regency campuses. I asked the minister about this in June during estimates. He gave the following reasons why he was considering closing these centres. In the case of Elizabeth, he said that last year new child enrolments totalled five, whereas community new child enrolments totalled 56; and that, of the 35 licensed places, the average attendance was 13 full-time equivalents with no full-time enrolments at the centre. That is what the minister said. A lot of these students who are on pensions and have children cannot, because of their commitments, study full time; that is why they are full-time equivalents.

With respect to Regency, the minister said that, of the 56 licensed places, there was an average attendance of 20 full-time equivalents and decreasing enrolments. He confirmed that he was looking at the viability of those centres, and that closure was a real possibility. Recently in parliament I questioned him again about this matter and he said that he was waiting on a report, which I understand he now has. The end of the year is coming up very quickly. My information is that the Minister has already made the decision to close but he just will not come clean and say so. He is waiting for the term to finish, when the students are not on campus, so it is more difficult for them to organise a campaign against this measure. That is his usual modus operandi.

The figures that I have seen for this year with respect to the Elizabeth campus child-care centre indicate that 75 per cent of the children attending are current students and that community attendance is only 25 per cent. I have been told (and the minister can confirm whether this is true) that 92 students enrolled their children between January and August of this year, and that that child-care centre has the highest utility by students of any TAFE campus child-care centre. So, it is very critical that this child-care centre remain.

This is not the first time that this issue concerning the Elizabeth campus child-care centre has arisen. In fact, last year the minister tried it on in exactly the same way: after the students had broken up, in fact at their Christmas party, the news came down that it was to close. On 9 December the local press *News Review Messenger* carried a front page article entitled 'Fund cuts may wipe out TAFE child care' with the subtitle '"Secret" decision prompts parents to ambush director'. The first part of that article states:

> Regency TAFE Institute is reeling from funding cuts and may soon shut its child-care centres to save costs.
>
> The revelation came from Regency TAFE Director Maureen Morton during a Christmas party last week at TAFE's Elizabeth campus child-care centre.
>
> Rumours of an imminent closure have been circulating at the centre and parents were angry at secrecy surrounding such a decision.

Sounds familiar, does it not? The article continues:

> A group of parents planned to ambush Ms Morton with their concerns during the Christmas party and invited the *News Review Messenger* along to record the discussion.
>
> Just metres from where Father Christmas was playing with children, a small group of parents pressed Ms Morton for answers, at the party on Thursday 3 December.
>
> She conceded that Regency TAFE would lose $6 million in state government funding over the next two years and had to become more efficient by cutting costs.
>
> This could, Ms Morton said, lead to the closures of the Elizabeth and Salisbury campus child-care centres because [they] were losing money.
>
> 'We'll have a completely independent review of the centre,' Ms Morton assured the parents, 'Believe you me, we do not want to close it.'
>
> 'But, if in the final analysis, we won't have enough children it will make it very difficult to keep it open.'
>
> Ms Morton stressed all services at Regency TAFE were under review: 'TAFE has been under enormous pressure—it's not an easy time.'
>
> 'But we are doing it as carefully as possible.'
>
> The parents argued that some would have to give up study if the centre closed.

The article further states:

> Most parents were unaware of the possibility that the centre might close and the news at the party came as a shock.

One student said:

> If the centre shuts, I just won't study.

Another student asked:

> Where's the social justice in it all—this is a very disadvantaged area?

That really sums up the trouble. However, I want to point out the hypocrisy in this decision and refer members to a recent article in the *Xpress*, a publication of the Department for Education, Training and Employment, when the minister appeared with the federal minister Warren Truss at the City West Child Care campus. The article states:

> Malcolm Buckby said child-care centres such as City West made an important contribution to the role TAFE played in South Australia.

He is acknowledging the importance to TAFE students of campus child-care centres. The article continues:

> 'Child-care services provide a crucial role in TAFE in terms of supporting access for our students,' he said.

That is the minister acknowledging the importance and critical nature—'crucial role' in his words—of campus child-care centres to enable students to participate in TAFE in the first place. The minister goes on to say in that same article:

> Students who have child-care needs clearly can't attend unless their children are well looked after.
>
> Access to TAFE is an important factor, both in terms of people being able to get the education they require, but also in terms of their employment opportunities.

There we have the minister acknowledging the need for these centres to stay open, yet I have been questioning the minister in this parliament since June. My information is that the minister has received that report. He should, at the very least, let students know because they are trying to plan their courses for next year. The minister should, at the very least, come clean and tell them of the decision. If the decision is 'Yes', that is fantastic and students will have a good Christmas party this year. If the decision is 'No,' why is he hiding, in a very wimpish way, waiting until the students disappear so that they have fewer opportunities to organise against the decision?

This decision concerns people from some of the most disadvantaged areas in this state. They rely on these services to get to TAFE in the first place. The federal government is cutting back the pensioner education supplement, the state

government is cutting access to TAFE and we have hypocrisy from the minister when he says how important TAFE child care is. This is the minister's opportunity to act, to do something positive or, at the very least, not to put another hurdle in the way of these poorer and disadvantaged students.

Time expired.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I feel compelled to clarify the remarks made by the opposition spokesperson for eduction on a range of matters she has just put to the House. I start by reminding the member for Taylor of the Council of Australian Governments agreed position on the responsibility for child care within Australia and within the states: that child care is a federal and not a state responsibility. Indeed, this principle was put in place by a former ALP government, under the Keating administration, and it leaves no doubt that predominantly federal government funding is to be used to fund child care.

That is done through a process called child care assistance which is means-tested and which is for the benefit, predominantly, of the sort of people just described by the member for Taylor: students, low income earners, and people in part-time work. In fact, it is a very fair system: it cuts out at a certain income level so that the wealthy cannot access child care with taxpayers' support. It is a system that is focused in such a way that those most needy in the community stand to benefit the most. It is certainly a better arrangement than having child care fees as a tax deduction, which would clearly benefit those people who have high income.

It having been established through COAG that child care is a federal responsibility, the member for Taylor has failed to provide an answer to a very simple question: if child care is a federal responsibility why is the state taxpayer being asked to subsidise child care centres at TAFE when, clearly, federal money is being put aside for this purpose? It is fine for the member for Taylor to get up and say that students at TAFE are in enormous need and that TAFE needs child care support, and so on, and all that is very true. However, it is quite another thing to say that the state taxpayer should pay hundreds of thousands of dollars, if not millions of dollars, to subsidise child care centres which, at the end of the day, are not delivering a weekly fee to their customers, which is very much less, and in some cases more, than that provided by other child care centres that are not subsidised.

In fact, this federal government abolished the absolutely rorted subsidies to non-private child care centres, which amounted to millions of dollars, and in some cases up to $60 000 per year or more. This money was provided to these non-private child care centres which were then charging more for a weekly child care service than private child care centres across the road, which begs the question: if they are charging the same fee and they are getting $60 000 worth of extra funding, where is the money going? There were some very spectacular examples of where the money was going. One case reported in the Adelaide *Advertiser* indicated that money was being milked out of a community-based child care centre in South Australia and sent off to the former Yugoslavia to buy guns.

The whole story was actually printed in the *Advertiser*. There was a full inquiry, and legal action flowed from that incident. Some terrible things were going on. I have indicated in this House on several occasions that I have an interest in this matter: I have an ongoing involvement in the child-care industry; that is on the record. It is an industry that I know quite a bit about.

But I must pull up the member for Taylor on this issue of TAFE child-care centres. I agree with her that the needs of those students should be met, but it is another thing for the state taxpayer to be called upon to provide the resources for that to occur. Other kindergarten and early child-care services are available for parents. I also question the logic of the requirement for these centres to be provided at TAFE. If we look at the statistics on this, quite often parents prefer to access a child-care service close to home, not close to work or the place of study.

The real issue is how much is the fee, and the bottom line is that the system of child-care assistance, which is federally funded, is there to benefit the very people whom the member for Taylor has just risen to support. I believe that the minister is doing a commendable job of reviewing the place of TAFE child-care centres within the overall framework of taxpayer-funded state child-care services, and I question some of the statistics that the member for Taylor has put on the record in respect of the number of customers using TAFE services who are in fact TAFE students.

I would hazard a guess that by far the majority of customers using those services are not TAFE students, so why should the state taxpayer be subsidising services being accessed by the general public? I put to the House that there is an oversupply of early childhood services in this state, and I challenge the member for Taylor to open the Yellow Pages and ring 20 early childhood services of her choice. I can guarantee that she will find that if not all then certainly most have vacancies now; that they can take children this afternoon. Nearly all early childhood services in the state have vacancies, except in certain key geographic areas.

There is certainly no need for the state taxpayers to be tipping in bucketloads of money to subsidise a system that is the responsibility of the federal government. Indeed, the federal government is doing nothing more than duckshoving to the state government its financial responsibility to provide for child care. And certain members of the bureaucracy and governments over the years have willingly picked up the cudgels. The more state taxpayer money we can milk out of general education and put into early childhood the better, it would seem.

I put to the member for Taylor that the money being saved by any review of TAFE child-care centres might very well be used in building up primary schools, in providing better educational facilities for all the children of the state and in delivering a better dividend to families right across the board within South Australia, and that we should be putting more pressure on the federal government to do what it should be doing under COAG agreements and adequately funding child care. In that sense, I agree with the member for Taylor that there have been unnecessarily severe cuts at the federal level.

There is certainly a long overdue need to further reinforce child-care assistance, particularly for low and middle income earners and students. In that respect, the honourable member is completely right. I also draw the honourable member's attention to the Prime Minister's Small Business Deregulation Task Force, which made recommendations in respect of child care and the need for there to be competitive neutrality, and for early childhood services to be free to operate without the fear that the government sector of that industry will become both the regulator and the provider in the early childhood services sector. The reality is that there is a conflict when you have the government providing services and then regulating their competitors.

Ms White interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I have in fact. I challenge the opposition actually to do its homework, to refine its thinking on the issue of child care, to ask itself how taxpayers' money should be used for education and for early childhood and to ask whether that money is being well targeted. As the shadow spokesperson, the member for Taylor has just said that we should continue to put that money into TAFE child-care centres. I challenge the honourable member to have a good think about the early childhood service and to ask herself whether that money could not be better employed. We really need to help the families and the children and to remember that child care is for children. It is not for establishing bureaucracies or organisations, etc. It really has to be targeted at the families who really need it.

In conclusion, I must say that the minister is doing the right thing in reviewing TAFE child-care centres. The state taxpayer should not be subsidising child care and letting the federal government off the hook. The federal government should be rebolstering child-care assistance, targeting it at low and middle income earners and the very people who use TAFE services.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

HINDMARSH STADIUM

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): I move:

That this House requests the Treasurer, under section 32 of the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987, to request the Auditor-General to examine and report on dealings related to the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium Redevelopment project and in particular—

(a) whether there was due diligence by government representatives prior to the signing of agreements for construction stages 1 and 2 of the project;

(b) whether due diligence was applied subsequent to the commitment to stages 1 and 2, including whether the Crown Solicitor's advice as described on page 12 of the thirty-third report of the Public Works Committee dated August 1996 was adhered to;

(c) whether undue pressure was placed on individuals leading to legal commitments by them on behalf of sporting clubs or associations;

(d) the present status of all relevant deeds of guarantee or other legal documents, the financial status of the signatories and whether the legal agreements have created financial difficulty for any non-government persons or organisations;

(e) whether there were any conflicts of interest or other imprudent or improper behaviour by any person or persons, government or non-government, involved with the project and whether the appropriate processes were followed in relation to—

i. the planning of the stages of the project;
ii. the awarding and monitoring of consultancies;
iii. the tendering process;
iv. the letting of contracts;
v. the construction of the stadium; and
vi. the ongoing management of the stadium; and

(f) the Auditor-General be requested to include in his report recommendations for government and the parliament where appropriate.

I have moved this motion because there is a community expectation, indeed a demand, that taxpayers' funds must be expended responsibly and that due process must be followed in relation to the building of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. The process must accountable; it must be transparent. The books must be opened and they must show what the government claims they show. The Public Works Committee needed to be told the truth. The Auditor-General needed to be told the whole truth, and the parliament now needs to be told the truth.

Concerns about the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium redevelopment have come from a wide variety of sources, including government members, opposition members, Democrat members, Independent members and a parliamentary committee and people involved with the soccer community. The member for Hammond and Liberal MLC the Hon. Julian Stefani have been persistent in asking a whole range of questions about the Hindmarsh stadium. Mr Lewis, as chair of the Public Works Committee, has refused to endorse stage 2 of the redevelopment. Not to take due notice of these concerns from a broad cross-section would be a dereliction of duty by the opposition and by government. The concerns raised are not an attack on soccer; that is simply not the case. But taxpayers have a right to know and expect that their taxes are being used prudently and wisely, whether they are being used to build a hospital or a soccer stadium.

Labor supports the soccer community. We support and have confidence in Adelaide Force. We have confidence and support the premiership league. We have confidence and support the state league, but we have grave concerns about the South Australian Soccer Federation—and so does the soccer community. Let us do a quick history check of what has taken place here. In 1992 the state government provided about $1.8 million to upgrade Hindmarsh stadium to enable it to host four teams in the 1993 World Youth Soccer Championships. These works included an upgrade of flood lighting, an upgrading of players' and referees' facilities and a VIP area, installation of 3 000 permanent seats and an upgrade of catering facilities.

In February 1995 Premier Brown announced that Adelaide would host Olympic soccer in the Sydney 2000 Olympics. In August 1996 the parliamentary Public Works Committee approved an $8.1 million upgrade of Hindmarsh stadium after it was told by government representatives that completion of these works would ensure that Adelaide would have the necessary facilities to host a round of soccer matches for the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games.

The committee did, however, express concerns about the construction management and the process and requested separation between the tendering process and possible sponsorship opportunities for the South Australian Soccer Federation. It requested close monitoring to ensure that it was completed within budget (it was not) and at the cheapest possible price. It ended up costing the taxpayers $9.26 million or more than 15 per cent over the original budget. It was also concerned that the government did not own or have control over the facility as much of the land was and still is owned by the local council. It was revealed just yesterday of course that the Soccer Federation does not even have a lease over some of the areas of the redevelopment.

In April 1997 Mr Sam Ciccarello was hired by the government as a consultant for 90 days at $770 per day to win Olympic soccer for Adelaide. Mr Ciccarello continued to be hired by the government until 1999 at a cost of $378 000, but leaked documents show we had Olympic soccer as far back as 1995 and, of course, the Auditor-General has slammed that consultancy. In May 1997 the Public Works Committee discovered, via the Government's 1997-98 state budget papers, that a $16.2 million stage 2 redevelopment of the Hindmarsh soccer stadium was proposed. In November 1997 the Auditor-General first raised concerns about the project in his report of 1997.

In October 1999 the Auditor-General said that he had the 'amber lights flashing' in his 1997 report and that he remembers writing it and thinking to himself 'this is a very

serious issue'. In April 1998 the parliamentary Public Works Committee issued an interim report for stage 2, which said that it was unable to endorse stage 2 of the works or lodge its final report to Parliament as six items of information, requested by the committee to verify that stage 2 was now needed if Adelaide was to secure a round of the Olympic soccer tournament, had not been supplied. The committee said in its report that it must be given all material evidence needed for the proper evaluation of the project according to law.

This evidence included the following: the benefit cost study carried out by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies; the Ernst and Young report prepared in 1996 assessing the Soccer Federation's capability to service a loan; the memorandum of understanding between the Soccer Federation and the state government signed and sealed in May 1995; the memorandum of understanding between SOCOG, FIFA, Australian Soccer and the state government, signed in August 1997; acquittals from the Departments of Premier and Cabinet, Attorney-General's and Treasury and Finance; and evidence of correspondence between SOCOG and the South Australian government, which details the need for and specifications of additional work at the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium.

Other concerns expressed by the committee included a consideration that the expenditure of another $18.5 million would render the venue over-capitalised, that the average attendance at National Soccer League games was more than 1 000 fewer than even the then existing grandstand capacity at Hindmarsh, that they found it difficult to perceive how $18.5 million of work was overlooked in the stage 1 phase of the project, and that they were concerned that the question of ownership of the stadium was yet to be resolved.

The report stated that the South Australian Soccer Federation's government loan was for $4.065 million and in September 1997 it borrowed a further $2 million to finance the fit-out of facilities in the western grandstand—all paid for by levies on ticket sales. However, the committee said that there was ambiguity about which part of soccer obtains revenue from ticket sales and who accepts lawful responsibility for costs associated with each type of function.

In June 1998, the then Deputy Premier, Hon. Graham Ingerson, used government numbers in the parliament to have carried a motion sending back the interim report and forcing the Public Works Committee to present a final report by June 1998. On 16 June 1998, the committee submitted its final report, and again was unable to recommend that the redevelopment of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium proceed. The committee said:

> The government's decision to withhold vital information and direct the committee to report through the vote of the parliament meant that the committee had been denied the opportunity to resolve those matters it considered to be in the public interest.

This was jammed through by the government using government numbers, irrespective of the wishes of the Public Works Committee. Let us not forget that fact, sir.

In October 1998 the Auditor-General again raised the issue of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium in his 1998 annual report and revealed that the soccer stadium had been unable to fully fund the loan repayments, requiring the government (that is, taxpayers) to meet the shortfall. In December 1998, Hindmarsh stadium tenant National Rugby League club Adelaide Rams folded, placing further question marks over the need for stage 2.

In June and July 1999, Liberal MLC Hon. Julian Stefani asked a series of highly relevant but as yet unanswered questions about the Hindmarsh stadium redevelopment. The questions raised valid concerns about the deed of agreement and whether the Soccer Federation Incorporated had complied with the deed, and has cast deep doubt on whether all transactions have been recorded properly.

In about August 1999 the member for Coles, Hon. Joan Hall, previously known as the 'ambassador for soccer', resigned from her role as the ambassador for soccer. In September 1999 we had another blow to the stadium's viability with the loss of the Adelaide Sharks. South Australia now has only one national league club, the Adelaide Force, which has threatened to leave Hindmarsh for Norwood Oval unless they can reduce their costs. The government, with the Premier's direct involvement, negotiated a new deal and as yet undisclosed financial arrangements to keep Adelaide Force at Hindmarsh.

In October 1999 the Auditor-General reported again, expressing concerns about adequate standards of accountability in relation to the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. The Auditor-General was questioned by the parliament's powerful Economic and Finance Committee, where he expanded upon concerns he had expressed on three consecutive reporting occasions in his Auditor-General's reports. He says:

> We have committed ourselves as a state to paying around $30 million plus to a facility where we have no rights and where we have very limited proprietary rights. We have significant ongoing liability exposures in terms of the need to meet the default or the inability of others to meet their obligations. We say that, had adequate due diligence been undertaken in the initial stages, perhaps we would not be in this situation.

He further goes on to say:

> Sure, if the government wants to run dead on an audit report, there is nothing I can do about it.

Yesterday I raised a series of questions about the Hindmarsh stadium, none of which was answered or even partially answered by the government. It will be clear to any fair-minded person who reflects on the litany of misleading statements, half-truths, unheeded warnings and incompetence to which I have referred in this chronology that there must be a full inquiry into the circumstances surrounding the Hindmarsh stadium redevelopment.

As well, there is a welter of other concerns including the pressures that were placed upon community-based soccer clubs to sign up to the redevelopment. I have good reason to doubt that they were happy with the millstone of the stadium redevelopment around their necks and affecting their ongoing viability. It seems to be yet another decision by the top end of the sport with little regard for the grassroots.

We in the parliament are yet to see the proof of stage 2 in respect of the redevelopment. The government is withholding documents for what appear to be, at best, spurious reasons. The parliamentary Public Works Committee has been treated contemptuously; the Economic and Finance Committee has heard highly disturbing evidence from the Auditor-General; and the parliament has been given non-replies to searching questions about the redevelopment. I trust that an investigation by the Auditor-General will get to the bottom of this very murky pond.

Despite some concerns in 1996, let us not forget that Labor supported stage 1. However, Labor was deeply shocked when it was revealed in 1997 that a second stage of the redevelopment was planned and that $18.5 million of taxpayers' money was to be used for the Hindmarsh stadium.

Labor has no proof, nor does anyone else, that stage 2 was required for the Olympics. If there is proof, put it up, show us the documents: let us see the documents from SOCOG.

The then chair of the Public Works Committee (now our Speaker, the Hon. John Oswald) told the Public Works Committee that he was unaware of the second stage and the extra funding. He said:

> It has more than raised my eyebrows if that second stage is the case, particularly as we had an assurance that the original project would be accepted by SOCOG. We have always believed it was going to be a one stage project.

The list of concerns over this project is endless, and I will not have time to list them all but they include the letting and management of contracts for construction; the future management of the stadium; problems with car parking; the ownership of the stadium; the cost of consultancies; the failure to adhere to recommendations of the Crown Solicitor; and so the list goes on.

Time expired.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): If ever there was an example of one of the worst aspects of government mismanagement, incompetence and cover-up, this is it. What a saga it has been. I have been a member of the Public Works Committee for stage 1 and stage 2 of this project, and sometimes one forgets all the water that has gone under the bridge. It was good to hear the member for Lee outline the situation so eloquently and so logically in his presentation. I might say that I remember, when the Public Works Committee was dealing with stage 2, the press articles and the comments of the Premier and the member for Bragg. I remember the insults; I remember that the member for Reynell and I were called 'Labor stooges', that we were laughed at, that we were scoffed at, that we were arrogantly dismissed, and that we were called 'spoilers', just out to wreck a proposal that was going to be important for this state purely on political grounds.

They are not laughing now, and they will not laugh as this tawdry example of this government's mismanagement starts to completely unfold—and unfold it will. You actually cannot keep something as big as this under wraps. You can fool some people all the time and all the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time. Everyone in South Australia now knows that this stadium has been a debacle from start to finish and that the situation needs to be outlined in all its detail for everyone to see—and it is right and proper that this should be so.

This is the government which came to power saying that it would be doing everything better; that it had learnt from the things that Labor had done wrong; and that it would be exemplary in the way it managed. They were the experts in business and business deals and getting things going, yet look at what has happened.

The member for Lee outlined the issues that the Public Works Committee raised, and they are clearly there for everyone to see. They have been raised on many occasions in this House. There is no doubt that the $18.5 million stage 2 had many aspects that could not be justified in terms of its public value to the people of South Australia. The fact that the South Australian Soccer Federation is still unable to attract crowds of more than a few thousand to any of its matches is also a disgrace. I am the patron of the Elizabeth City Soccer Club, a struggling northern suburbs soccer club.

Mr Lewis: It could have done with a bit of this money.

Ms STEVENS: As the member for Hammond said, it could have done with a bit of this money, and I have said that before in this House. I am a strong supporter of soccer and we need to raise soccer's credibility and popularity in South Australia. Why is it that Perth Glory can get a full stadium of fans for its team's matches over there but that we in South Australia cannot get anywhere near that? What is going wrong? Why is it that clubs in the northern suburbs, where one would expect soccer to be strong, are struggling? Where is the support for those clubs? Why not put the support into developing soccer in the areas north and south of Adelaide? Why have we wasted $18.5 million on a stadium that cannot be filled?

I am the shadow minister for health. How can we say that spending $18.5 million on a white elephant was more important than providing hospital beds, health services and services for people with a disability? That is what this government has said, that it was more important to build a stadium that could not be justified, that will not be filled, than to spend the money elsewhere. This example will follow this government. This will be the flagship of what the government has achieved in this state over its time in office. This is what the people of South Australia will see.

Coming back to the motion, I point out that it is very important that this saga be told. Governments need to be transparent, they need to be efficient and they need to be accountable for their actions. In terms of this project, the Public Works Committee in its efforts to fulfil its terms of reference under the act was completely dogged. It was not able to get hold of the information it wanted. It was continually denied to the committee and then, finally, as the member for Lee explained to the House, the committee was forced to report. The full story was never able to be told, but it needs to be told now in the interests of the South Australian community and to make sure that it does not happen again. I urge all members to support the motion.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I support this motion and I urge all members who are serious about bringing to account government financial mismanagement to do likewise. I have been in this parliament since 1993 and I have watched this process with interest. I want to make a few observations about what I have seen over the years and where we are at today. We all recall at the beginning of this issue the government's decision to support stage 1 about which, as my colleague the member for Lee indicated, the opposition had some questions but which it ultimately supported.

The relationship that we have seen develop between the government and soccer in this state goes to the very heart of credibility and probity with respect to relationships between sporting bodies and government. The Soccer Federation took the quite extraordinary step of appointing as its honorary President the member for Coles, who was a backbencher at the time and is now Minister for Tourism.

Opposition members were stunned by that appointment. This is not a personal reflection on the honourable member, who I understand did the job extremely well and very diligently, but we felt that it was inappropriate to have in such a position a serving member of government when clearly a partisan decision involving a sporting body was involved. Many of us can recall the dark days of 1993-94 when there were only 10 Labor members. Many members of the community—I suspect particularly of the soccer community—felt that the Liberals would be in government

for decades to come, so this partisan appointment did not have much of a downside.

The opposition objected strongly to that appointment. I certainly recall that I objected to it quite strongly during meetings. The then Chairman of the Soccer Federation, Les Avery, was quite upset when I questioned this appointment. I will not use the expletives that he used during that discussion, but basically he said, 'What has Labor ever done for soccer and why should you dare question us?' The honourable member looks at me—she may well have her own views. Mr Avery was quite bitter in his attack on me because I dared to question the appropriateness of a serving member of government to be present.

I saw what I believed to be an unhealthy relationship developing between soccer and government. It represented one of the crudest examples of the old adage of political mateship. It appeared to me that a mateship was developing between soccer and government which I thought was unhealthy. I think it is one of the root causes of some of the issues that we now have with the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. The Auditor-General criticised, and my colleagues and government members of public works committees saw, these bizarre things that were occurring.

A committee was established to oversee the redevelopment of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. Who chaired that committee? It was the member for Coles. A sitting member of government was put into that position. I objected strongly to it at the time. It was nothing personal; it was my strongly held belief that this was not a proper appointment. We had a sitting member of parliament (a backbencher at the time) chairing a committee of public servants which was overseeing the upgrade of a stadium, a major public work. That person, the member for Coles, was also the figurehead for soccer in this state.

This was an obvious and direct conflict of interest and it simply should not have been allowed to happen. What then concerned me was when we looked at the strange, highly questionable and undesirable aspects of how the tendering process would take place. We saw situations, which I am sure my colleague has outlined already and of which the members of the Public Works Committee would be aware and many members were informed at the time. Under the situation with respect to tendering for aspects of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium upgrade those bidding for work would be allowed to have included in their bid sponsorship packages for soccer. Evaluations would occur.

The Hon. J. Hall interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The member for Coles shakes her head. She will get her chance to put her views on the record.

The Hon. J. Hall interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I ask her to bait me, because I am holding back some things that I am likely to say if I am sufficiently provoked. Sponsorship arrangements were involved in tendering. People could offer sponsorships for soccer to be assessed side by side with their commercial quotes.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: My colleague the member for Elizabeth was a member of that committee, and she indicates that that is correct. This is simply an unhealthy way to conduct public policy. Some very strange procedures were put in place.

Mr Lewis: Alice in Wonderland stuff.

Mr FOLEY: Very much Alice in Wonderland stuff. Things proceeded to get worse. Stage 2 came along. We have already heard from you, sir, a former chairman of the committee, that the committee was told that stage 2 was not needed. There were question marks over how that decision was taken. We are told that it was simply a decision of the member for Bragg and the member for Coles to commit the state, that a full cabinet process was not undertaken. We do not know whether that is correct. Only an inquiry can find that out. We need to know what process went on in government for that second stage when we were told it was not needed. They are the sorts of issues we have to understand.

Then we have unhealthy aspects such as Sam Ciccarello—another mate, another friend of this government. We saw the hundreds of thousands of dollars he was paid by then minister Ingerson, the member for Bragg, for another consultancy that we did not see anything of, to do with the merging of tourism and sport. He mysteriously got over $350 000 for a consultancy for Olympic soccer. We are yet to see what his work was, and we are yet to see what he actually produced for that money.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Yes. There is one thing we know for certain: Sam is a mate of this government. I must say he has done well from his relationship with this government. I would have thought that, come the mid to late 1990s, we would not be seeing these processes in parliament. We on this side of the House have copped significant criticism—and at times warranted criticism—for what occurred under former Labor governments with the banks, and other issues, and we have worn that. But we have learnt. To see this process unfold over the past five or six years quite frankly makes me sick, when I think about the breaches in public policy and probity.

It is interesting to note the current position of the Minister for Industry and Trade and Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, the member for Davenport, Iain Evans. I can well recall his views when he was initially on the Public Works Committee of this parliament. I can certainly recall his public comments to this parliament. He was extremely concerned about this stadium when he was but a backbencher in the then Brown government. It would be fair to say that he now clearly finds himself in a difficult position, as he has to defend what he knows in his heart of hearts is a diabolical process.

As my colleague said, I have a thousand interested children every weekend; in fact, my young son plays with the North West Soccer Federation. It is not even affiliated with the South Australian Soccer Federation, and it cannot get any assistance out of soccer. We have 1 000 children and a great opportunity to develop soccer. But what are we doing? Both soccer and the government put all their money into a white elephant. We have seen the Adelaide Sharks fold, and we see Adelaide Force threatening to play at Norwood. We have seven Olympic games here. What after that? They can only get 5 000 or 6 000 people. The role of the member for Coles was never more brought into the spotlight than when she resigned as soccer ambassador shortly after the demise of the Adelaide Sharks. If there was ever an indication that the member is very concerned about her vulnerability on this whole issue, that was pretty evident to me—although she may have a different view of that.

I want to conclude with this: members of the Soccer Federation have become very emotional and emotive. As I said to them, they chose to link hands with their Liberal friends. Don't blame the Labor Party if we happen to ensure that public policy and probity is upheld. I know that the Chairman of the South Australian Soccer Federation, Mr Les Avery, has written to my colleague the member for Lee in a very emotive and defamatory manner. Another

senior member of soccer in this state and nationally said to me only recently, in a way that only someone from the Soccer Federation can do, 'Mate, thank you very much for the Labor Party going quiet on the soccer stadium and not carrying on like those Liberals.' To that person, I say you are sadly wrong.

Time expired.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

FOUNDRY EMISSIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Key:

That this House notes the increasing evidence linking foundry emissions with health concerns including asthma, respiratory ailments, reproductive hazards and cancer and calls on the Government to take immediate steps to—

(a) conduct health surveys and make available medical tests for residents located next to foundries in the western and north western suburbs of Adelaide;
(b) carry out an independent scientific study on atmospheric pollutants created by foundries in these areas;
(c) establish an independent occupational health and safety audit into workers' exposure to toxic foundry chemicals; and
(d) assist and encourage foundries to relocate to the Foundry Park precinct.

(Continued from 28 October. Page 322.)

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I rise to speak briefly in support of this motion moved by the member for Hanson. As a lawyer I have seen a number of clients who have suffered respiratory diseases and various illnesses arising from chemicals used in foundries and factories of other kinds. One thing that has been clear to me is that our state of knowledge in relation to the diseases which can arise from foundries and institutions like them is still relatively primitive. I really do not believe that sufficient money has gone into researching the problems that workers experience as a result of working in some of these places. Some are better than others; there is no doubt about that but, generally speaking, when you are dealing with noxious fumes, highly toxic chemicals and the production processes involved in a foundry, it is easy enough to imagine the subtle causes of illness that are inherent.

It is particularly of concern when foundries are situated in residential areas. A prominent case at the moment is the foundry at Mount Barker in the Premier's own electorate, but there are many other foundries and similar industrial places virtually in residential areas throughout the western suburbs. As our state of awareness grows in relation to the illnesses that can arise where residents live close to these places, it is particularly important for the government to put some money aside to research just what the effects of these places are.

The motion has a poignant significance to me, because one of my relatives on my father's side died in his middle years after working most of his life in the smelters at Port Pirie. This is going back to the 1930s, and at the time the company doctor (as they had), made it very clear that his respiratory ailment could not possibly have derived from working in the smelters and the whole thing was pretty well hushed up. That was not a unique case: it was relatively common. We have come some way since then in at least recognising that some terrible diseases can arise from industrial workplaces, but we still have some way to go. That is why it is timely for this motion to be brought before the parliament.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

EAST TIMOR

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Bedford:

That this House—

(a) calls on the Federal Government to take those steps required to counter the destabilisation of the ungoverned province of East Timor in the lead up to independence;
(b) commends the United Nations for the establishment of an international inquiry into gross human rights violations and atrocities in East Timor;
(c) calls on the United Nations to—
  (i) organise an immediate United Nations supervised repatriation of East Timorese refugees from West Timor and other parts of Indonesia; and
  (ii) demand the immediate withdrawal of all Indonesian military and militia personnel from East Timor;
(d) calls on the United Nations and the Australian Government to—
  (i) urgently increase the emergency release of food and other humanitarian supplies to refugees in remote areas of East Timor to prevent starvation; and
  (ii) urge all governments, the World Bank and the IMF to ensure that economic assistance to Indonesia supports democratic and economic reform;
(e) commends the Australian Government for providing sanctuary to East Timorese refugees;
(f) calls on the Australian Government to—
  (i) expand that sanctuary to East Timorese refugees who are being targeted by the Indonesian military and militias;
  (ii) suspend military co-operation with Indonesia;
  (iii) immediately cease its de jure recognition of Indonesia's occupation of East Timor;
  (iv) thank the East Timorese people for their great sacrifice and support during World War II and welcome the decision of the Indonesian Government in recognising the Referendum outcome, which granted autonomy and Independence to East Timor; and
  (v) make a commitment to assisting reconstruction in East Timor.

(Continued from 28 October. Page 322.)

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I commend the member for Florey on moving this motion, which I think is both timely and appropriate. As the House is aware, it deals with the issue of our involvement in Timor. In particular, it calls on the federal government to take those steps required to counter the destabilisation of the ungoverned province of East Timor in the lead-up to independence. I am pleased to note and draw to the attention of the House the fact that, since then, the Australian led multinational force, Interfet, has significantly improved the security situation in East Timor.

The people of Australia and South Australia can be deeply proud of this achievement. Australia has contributed well over 1 700 troops—in fact, it now runs into the thousands—plus civilian police to both Interfet and the subsequent UN Transitional Authority in East Timor (UNTAET) to assist in maintaining security until East Timor's ultimate independence. UNTAET was mandated by the United Nations Security Council on 25 October to govern East Timor during this period of transition to independence.

The motion also calls on the United Nations to organise an immediate UN supervised repatriation of East Timorese from West Timor and other parts of Indonesia back to East Timor. Of course, as the House would be well aware, this process has been under way now since the member for Florey moved the motion. Some progress has been made. In fact, as of 3 November, almost 40 000 people have been assisted to return to UN High Commissioner for Refugees' camps. However, militia activity against East Timorese in West Timor continues, and the security situation prevents UNHCR from completing a repatriation program. But members would be aware that we are working on that problem.

The motion also calls on the United Nations and the Australian government to urgently increase emergency release of food and other humanitarian supplies to assist refugees. Of course, the House would be aware that the Australian government has been heavily involved in such action since the motion has been moved and that we have committed $13.7 million to emergency assistance to help the East Timorese people immediately, with a much greater level of assistance to follow.

The motion urges all governments, the World Bank and the IMF to ensure that economic assistance to Indonesia supports democratic and economic reform. President Wahid and Vice President Megawati, who have now come to office, have stressed the importance of reform. In their efforts they can be assured of Australia's support. The motion commends the Australian government for providing sanctuary to East Timorese refugees and, of course, the government agrees and notes that, by 3 November, 1 538 East Timorese remained in safe havens in Australia. Planning is under way for further voluntary repatriation to East Timor following the first return of 40 refugees from Australia on 28 October.

The motion also calls on the Australian government to expand that sanctuary to East Timorese refugees being targeted by Indonesian military and militia. Due to the improved security situation in East Timor following Interfet's arrival, the UNHCR has decided to repatriate directly to East Timor those East Timorese who are at risk in Indonesia. These repatriations have been occurring successfully for weeks, with our guidance and assistance.

One issue that the motion calls for is the suspension of military cooperation with Indonesia. In this respect, I would like to qualify the member for Florey's motion. Minister Moore (the Minister for Defence) announced in September that Australia's defence relationship with Indonesia was under review and that all military combat training had been suspended. However, I point out to the member for Florey that other forms of military cooperation have been ongoing for many years, and they should not be suspended. I speak specifically of non-combat related levels of military cooperation, such as visits by Australian senior officers to Indonesia and visits by Indonesian senior officers to Australia; the exchange of students at places such as the Royal Military College Duntroon, the Australian Commander-General's Staff College at Fort Queenscliff, and various training and administrative exchanges. Those sorts of linkages have helped us in the past to better understand the Indonesian military and have helped them to better understand us. They have also opened a window of understanding between the armed forces of both countries that has synergised well with diplomatic efforts by both countries.

They have not really imparted to the Indonesian army any combat capabilities: the linkages are really more open lines of communication and cordial exchanges based on furthering mutual understanding. It is my view that those types of military cooperation should not be suspended. In fact, at a time when your relationship with your neighbour is strained, those sorts of exchanges and relationships become even more important.

What has been drawn to the public's intention—and I think was probably the real intent of the member for Florey—was that we should not be imparting combat related capabilities to the Indonesian army that might then be used in Timor, or elsewhere, to the detriment of the people of Indonesia. Clearly, I would support the member for Florey's intent in that respect, but I would qualify her motion to provide that we simply review our military relationship with Indonesia so that it is positive, peaceful and constructive, rather than purely military and combat related. In that respect, I would seek to qualify the member for Florey's motion.

Other parts of the motion talk about thanking the East Timorese people for their great sacrifice and ceasing any de jure recognition of Indonesia's occupation of East Timor. Clearly, Australia has welcomed the decision, on 20 October, by the Indonesian People's Consultative Assembly to revoke Indonesia's incorporation of East Timor and the passage of Security Council resolution 1272 establishing the UN transitional authority in East Timor. Australia's gratitude to the East Timorese for their assistance in the Second World War was reiterated by Minister Anderson in federal parliament on 21 September. In parliament on 20 October Mr Howard also welcomed the Indonesian recognition of the outcome of the East Timor referendum.

Finally, the motion calls for us to make a commitment to assist in the reconstruction of East Timor. Clearly, the Prime Minister has said that the government will contribute generously towards East Timor's reconstruction, and of course we expect that other countries will contribute as well.

I congratulate the member for Florey for bringing this matter before the House. In discussions on the government side, we are in agreement that it is a worthwhile and most constructive motion. We live in uncertain times. I think that the events of recent months in Indonesia have reminded us of some very fundamental principles that have made this country great. One of them is that we must be prepared for the unexpected; that we must be prepared to take our place in our region; and that we must be prepared to maintain an adequate defence force and pay for it. And successive governments are not to blame in this regard: we the Australian public are to blame for not telling our respective governments that that is where the effort needs to be spent.

Our commitment to East Timor and the subsequent growth in the defence force that will follow means that we are now talking in terms of billions of dollars. I see it as an investment in the future that will benefit Australia and put us in a good position in our region. In conclusion, I feel—and I am sure the member for Florey would agree—that, by standing up for what we believe is right in East Timor, we have demonstrated to our neighbours that we are prepared to stand up for what we know is right and moral and what must be done: you earn more respect from your neighbours by doing that than by lying down in front of them and allowing yourself to be treated with disregard. I fully support the honourable member's motion.

Time expired.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I will speak briefly in support of the motion regarding East Timor brought before the House by the member for Florey. I was pleased to listen to the contribution by the member for Waite and to note the bipartisan support for the motion. Obviously, it is a significant international issue, but I believe that this state parliament should not concern itself merely with our schools, hospitals, local roads and rubbish and that we do need to keep abreast of international issues and concern ourselves with some of the major national issues of the day.

The particular angle I would like to speak about today is the interesting parallel I see between the East Timor situation and two other islands that are special to many people in South Australia. I refer to Cyprus and Ireland. In their different ways, East Timor, Cyprus and Northern Ireland have suffered

from the after effects of colonisation and the mixing of people with strongly differing cultural or religious beliefs. Of course, the English colonisation of Ireland several hundred years ago has left continuing divisions. I am glad to note that in the past year or so we have seen an easing of the violence that has characterised the Irish struggle for hundreds of years.

In Cyprus, of course, it has been 25 years since the Turkish government decided to invade and take unlawfully purported sovereignty over half the island in the name of the Turkish minority—and I mean culturally the Turkish minority on the island of Cyprus. In East Timor we also see a colonial power having left the island in something of a power and economic vacuum—a vacuum which was filled by the Indonesian invasion about 25 years ago and the subsequent struggles of the indigenous East Timorese people against what they felt was oppression.

The Australian history in relation to East Timor is not anything about which we can be proud but we can be proud of our current approach to East Timor—the military, economic and emotional support we are giving to the East Timorese people and to refugees from the war zone. I want to conclude on that optimistic note. I believe that there is a place for sentiment and neighbourliness in our international relations as well as in our own community. I am glad that the Australian people are giving and giving generously, both in military and financial terms, to atone for some of the horrors which the East Timorese people have experienced.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

[Sitting suspended from 12.27 to 2.00 p.m.]

PROSTITUTION

A petition signed by 543 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the Government to strengthen the law in relation to prostitution and ban prostitution related advertising was presented by Mr Scalzi.

Petition received.

REMEMBRANCE DAY

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Today is the day when all Australians remember and honour the sacrifices made by people during the time of war. On 10 November 1918 thousands of Australians, men of the 1st and 4th Divisions 1st Australian Imperial Force, were plodding wearily towards the front line in France. Two months previously these same Australians had fought their way across the Somme in some of the fiercest battles of the war. However, fortunately, they did not go into action again. Last Anzac Day I had the privilege of visiting the Adelaide cemetery at the Somme and I paid not only my respects but I am sure the respects of all South Australians.

At 11 a.m. on 11 November 1918 the guns fell silent as hostilities ceased on the western front, ending four years of the most terrible death and destruction. People celebrated across the world, but it was also a time to reflect on the extraordinary loss and suffering which had been inflicted. It is appropriate, as we mark the last Remembrance Day for the century, that we pay tribute to those 60 000 Australians who lost their lives. More than 416 000 brave Australians volunteered for service in World War I, and 324 000 of them served overseas.

But Remembrance Day is much more than a recognition of those brave people who suffered or lost their lives in action in World War I. We also reflect upon the other wars in which Australians have so proudly served during the 20th century: World War II, Vietnam, Korea and others. Thousands of Australians now lie in unknown resting places in every continent and every sea, and today we remember and honour them. We also remember today our brave Australian soldiers who are serving in East Timor and pray for their safety and early return.

Today is one to reflect on the breadth and extremes we see in the human race: its cruelty, its bravery and its kindness. But, unfortunately, almost every day somewhere in the world war continues to destroy the lives of innocent people. As we enter the new millennium sometimes we must question how much the human race has learned over the past 2000 years or more. The 20th century has seen the loss of more lives in war than the combined total of all centuries before it. We can only hope and pray that the future will herald a new era of world peace.

As part of the government's commitment to ensure that the memory of those who fought for the rights we in this country now enjoy remains, the Australian flag will fly day and night at the War Memorial on North Terrace. A permanent flagpole will be erected on the lawn area west of the memorial. This permanent mast will act as a constant reminder to South Australians of the bravery and courage of those who fought and died for our country under this flag.

Remembrance Day honours all those who have fallen in battle. It honours all those who suffered the social consequences of war. It honours those who came back to this country to forge a new and peaceful future, those who developed our farm lands, built our businesses, raised and nurtured families and showed by example the value of community citizenship. We can only hope that the privileges we enjoy in South Australia today are in some small way worthy of their sacrifice.

I am sure that the Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition and every member of this parliament joins me today to honour those who have died or suffered from the consequences of war, and reflect upon the great privilege and the wonderful opportunities we have living in South Australia and the enormous obligation we have to past and future generations to ensure that it remains that way.

QUESTION TIME

HUMAN SERVICES EXPENDITURE

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Minister for Human Services accept criticism by the Premier and the Premier's staff in briefings to the media of the his failure to spend $76 million allocated for new works on hospitals last year?

The Hon. J.W. Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): As I pointed out yesterday (and it is there for everyone to see), in fact the Department of Human Services overspent its recurrent budget last year by about $48 million.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: So, Mr Speaker, in overspending the budget by $48 million, as I highlighted yesterday, that overspend was compensated in a number of ways: first, some unspent reserves in the department; secondly, some additional allocations during the year through the budget process; and thirdly, about $10 million of debt that the hospitals have carried through from last year to this year. I think the Premier endorsed exactly those figures yesterday.

I understand that the Premier has raised concerns about protracted delays and slippages in the capital works program. In the whole of the health services area I think the slippage was about $12 million, which is about 5 per cent of the capital works program. In fact, that is a fairly small part, and it occurs invariably due to delays in planning and things like that. I highlight: put all that together and you will find that we overspent last year's budget quite considerably indeed. As a result of that, we have had to carry $10 million of debt from last year into this year and offset it against this year's budget. So the facts speak for themselves.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Will the Minister for Emergency Services inform the House of two significant events over the coming days involving emergency services?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I thank the member for Colton for this question because I know that he has a real commitment to volunteers and emergency services organisations in his own electorate. In fact, on a number of occasions, he has made representations to me on certain issues and aspects for his own electorate with respect to those services.

Two significant events in emergency services are occurring at the moment. One is SES Week, which will culminate tomorrow with a parade right through Adelaide. I hope that the many South Australians who will be in the city tomorrow will actually come into King William Street and have a look at the magnificent turnout of the 5 000 volunteers in the SES alone who, 24 hours a day, seven days a week, are at the ready to look after the lives and property of all South Australians. They put in almost 70 000 volunteer hours a year to provide this magnificent first-class protection of life and property for South Australians. In fact, 25 of them recently travelled to Sydney committed to special vertical rescue work with respect to the severe hailstorms that occurred there.

The other significant event occurring on Sunday is as a result of recognition requests for a long time from those representative organisations, namely, the Volunteer Fire Brigades Association and the State Emergency Services Association, in being able to get the wider public to understand what an enormous effort these volunteers put into their services for South Australians. This Sunday, from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. at Bonython Park, we will have the volunteers recognition day, known as Volunteers in Emergencies 1999.

On that day, I will be privileged to present some national awards and national medals to both SES and CFS volunteers. Some of these volunteers have been involved in SES and CFS for 20 to 25 years—and I hope the member for Peake will come along that day to acknowledge and recognise the volunteers in his electorate who are there 24 hours a day to protect both him and his community. As well as presenting these awards, we will commission the first of a series of new appliances for the SES. In the past, the SES has been the poorest cousin of the emergency services. It has had to run on the smell of an oily rag and has been clearly underfunded until recent times.

In fact, as a result of the new emergency services levy and the emergency services administration unit, and being able to look right across the state at how we manage the plant and equipment and support for volunteers, we are now in the position of being able to purchase seven additional vehicles, two of which will be commissioned on Sunday. Mount Barker will receive one of the vehicles. Mount Barker had the oldest SES appliance in the state yet Mount Barker SES has an enormous workload. Leigh Creek will also receive a new vehicle—and we all know what happens with road accident rescues in those remote rural areas.

As a result of those seven purchases, 14 units across South Australia will get benefit. As a result of providing brand new units in those busier areas, we will be able to relocate some other units into rural and regional South Australia, as well as bringing in new units. For example, at Marla in the far north of South Australia, the SES and CFS volunteers have been police officers, the proprietor and staff of the motel and general store complex, and staff from the Department of Correctional Services. But when it came to support for them, until recent times the only thing they had was a trailer and, indeed, they had to use a private vehicle when they were called out to an emergency scene. Clearly, that is not acceptable and I am delighted to see that a dual cab Mazda will be relocated to Marla.

We are now looking at adequate funding and support for all emergency services to enable them to do the most important job that they could possibly do, that is, the protection of life and property. By being able to manage holistically the finances for these organisations, we are seeing an enormous amount of support for those volunteers and that will continue into the future with sustainable budgets because of the quarantine and dedicated funding.

As well as the SES and CFS volunteers at the emergencies 1999 recognition day at Bonython Park on Sunday, we will also see other services. The police will be there to support it, as well as the ambulance service, surf lifesaving, sea rescue squadron, Red Cross and St John.

I am delighted that for the first time we have been able to support seriously the magnificent work that sea rescue and surf lifesaving do for South Australians. I encourage all members in this House to come along. It will be a great family day and an opportunity for people in the metropolitan area to look first-hand at simulated exercises in rescue, vertical rescue and road accident rescue. It is also a recognition of the families—in fact, 30 000 volunteers and their families—who put in an enormous effort every day in South Australia to look after us and I encourage all members and their communities to come along and support them on this very special.

HUMAN SERVICES EXPENDITURE

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Was the Minister for Human Services correct when he rejected your claim that his department had underspent its capital budget by $76 million in 1998-99, and then said at a media conference yesterday that 'I believe that whoever has made that claim does not understand budgets at all'?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): This is called, 'Mike, come lately.' This is a news story over 24 hours old, yet the Leader of the Opposition is trying to put an inference into the

equation. Try as he will, he will not be successful. On 19 October or thereabouts, the Treasurer reported to the parliament the outcomes for the financial returns to 30 June this year, that is, for last financial year. Those figures indicate an increase in the under spend in the capital works component of the budgets of a range of agencies. It is the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Hart as the shadow Treasurer who come in here after budget time, talk about the under spend and keep asking us what action we are taking.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The behaviour of the chamber yesterday was totally unacceptable and, if it continues today, something will be done about it. I caution everyone at this stage that they are already on one warning. The Premier.

An honourable member: Everyone?

The SPEAKER: Order! Yes, everyone. Do not test the chair. The Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Ross Smith for the second time.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Let me retrace my comments a little bit. As he is required to do, in October the Treasurer tabled the end of the financial year results, which indicated that in a range of government agencies and departments there was under spending in the capital works program. I have asked for Treasury and DPC staff to consult with each agency to ascertain why there is an under spend in their respective portfolio areas, and in doing so identify what corrective action can be taken to ensure that the funds we allocate for the provision of infrastructure for delivering essential services can be met, in the course of which there are significant economic spin-offs and employment growth. I make no apologies for that.

Treasury and DPC officers will report back in the course of the next few weeks because I am intent on ensuring that, in subsequent financial years, we do not have a growth in the under spend in a range of capital works programs. They are important programs and we want the funding spent. In one or two of those capital expenditure areas, there are quite plausible, reasonable explanations for delays or deferrals. They are legitimate reasons, based in some instances on matching commonwealth funding or the like, or some other explanation. We want to ascertain what those reasons are but what I want to ensure, as does all of the cabinet, is that the funds, the finite resource that is available to us to commit to capital works, will be spent in the year in which the allocation is made so that we get on with the infrastructure, which is the basis of the service delivery and which, importantly, gives some impetus to the economy in the process.

BRANCHED BROOMRAPE

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): Can the Minister for Primary Industries tell the House of the nature of the outbreak of branched broomrape in the Mallee in South Australia, the threat that it poses, and indicate the actions being taken to address the problem?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development): I thank the honourable member for his question and acknowledge his very close interest in this problem, bearing in mind that the outbreak has occurred in his electorate. The Animal and Plant Control Commission has commenced a containment program to control infestation of branched broomrape in the Lower Mallee in an area north-east of Murray Bridge. Branched broomrape is a serious weed. A small patch was found about seven years ago but until last year it had not been seen again, so this is a worrying outbreak.

The $400 000 program put in place is aimed at preventing any serious production losses, minimising the potential threats to our markets and containing the weed through quarantine and containment measures. The surveys of the affected area have found the weed in about 1 300 hectares, spread over about 40 farms. The full extent of the infestation is not known because the occurrence is masked by both grazing and herbicide use and, for most of the year, the plant grows only under the ground, which makes it unfortunately impractical to fumigate the area at this stage without knowing exactly where the weed is. Further surveys will certainly be conducted to determine the distribution of the weed. The containment strategy has been developed in consultation with landowners and industry, and there was a well attended public meeting at Burdett on Tuesday night.

Control measures such as fencing of infested land and restrictions on stocking and cropping on affected properties were implemented earlier this year. However, the increased known occurrence of the weed has made it necessary to quarantine additional properties found to have infestations. Grain from crops in the area which is certified as free of branched broomrape can be delivered to SACBH and other agents, and the government is putting in place a troop of people to do that and, certainly, we will pick up the cost of that certification program. Grain not certified to be free of that weed can be used within the quarantine area or delivered to designated spots for designated purposes.

Conditions are being developed for the movement of livestock, and so on, for slaughtering, and the transport issues are currently being addressed. A community support group has been formed and will met regularly to keep landowners informed. We appreciate the cooperation that we have received from landowners. They have not been difficult. It is bad luck that they have the weed, but we must address the problem. I certainly would not understate the importance of branched broomrape; it will cost the industry and we need to get rid of it.

I also would not understate the importance of phylloxera on the wine industry, fire blight, fruit fly, foot in mouth, or a range of diseases involving the livestock industries. Each requires a proactive strategy and full industry cooperation which, as I said, we are getting. The meeting of landholders at Burdett certainly was well attended on Tuesday night, and the management of this problem will require a focused team effort. If this occurs, as has been the case with fruit fly, fire blight and anthracnose in lupins in recent years, then the damage to our rural industries will be minimised and hopefully that will minimise the losses to the affected growers.

ELECTRICITY, PRIVATISATION

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier agree with the comments of a Liberal member of the Legislative Council, the Hon. Angus Redford, that the advice of the Auditor-General in recent reports has been ‘quite gratuitous’ and involves second guessing on legal matters and that the Auditor-General may have overstretched his expertise, and will the Premier assure the House that there will be no further Kennett style attempts by the government to undermine the role and credibility of the Auditor-General,

when he does not report the way you want him to? Following the Auditor-General's appearance before the Economic and Finance Committee yesterday, the Hon. Angus Redford called into question the legal expertise of the Auditor-General, who happens to be an eminent lawyer, and his department, shown in recent reports to parliament. Among other criticisms, he said:

> . . . the Auditor-General has been quite gratuitous and indeed second guessing of matters legal, one would hope that he is not overstretching his [legal] expertise.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I note that the leader pulls out one comment made in the upper house but ignores other comments made in the upper house. Until I have had an opportunity to read the comments, I do not intend to comment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

EMPLOYMENT

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Employment advise the House how the state government is working with regional industry to create employment opportunities in the tourism sector?

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Employment): I thank the member for Flinders for her question. I know of her passion for employment, especially in her area but throughout South Australia generally. The House will be aware that today's employment figures were disappointing, in that South Australia continues to bump along but not do as well as we would like. We are, and continue to be, disappointed about that. However, the government continues to show leadership in what, after all, is a partnership for the whole community. The government does not of itself create jobs. The government creates conditions and, hopefully—

Mr Foley: The government doesn't create jobs?

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The member for Hart interjects, 'The government does not create jobs?' If part of the policy of the opposition (and I have yet to hear what its policy is) is that it would, in government, create thousands of jobs from the public purse, let the member for Hart say so. The people of South Australia need to know what the policy of the opposition is, and not merely have gratuitous comments thrown across the chamber.

In South Australia we have done it tough, but I think that this is the 16th consecutive month in which the trend levels of employment have continued to show improvement. That is what makes today's results disappointing: there have been some very heartening signs. The Premier has talked about Morgan & Banks, about the ANZ, a record number—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The member for Ross Smith says, 'Who believes things like that?' The rest of Australia, including the reputable press, tend to believe those things. I am not surprised that the member for Ross Smith does not. The fact is that, in the last financial year, this government has helped to create 10 000 jobs through its various programs. The member for Flinders would know that many of those have been deliberately and specifically targeted towards regional and rural South Australia. I am not talking just since the Victorian election; I am talking since the course of this government. As the Minister for Education said yesterday, this government has for several years, at the direction of cabinet, had a priority to revitalise country and rural South Australia and we continue to be focused on that.

With respect to the specific question of employment in regional South Australia, especially in the tourist industry, we have recently granted the Regional Development Board on the Yorke Peninsula $50 000 to help a training needs analysis for 20 small businesses in specific industry training, as well as supporting a participating business program and networking process for the next 12 months. What we are seeking to do is not what Labor did when it was in office for so many years, which was sit in this place and tell this state how it should run.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: We are getting out there, getting out to regional and country South Australia and asking how we can help. I remind the member for Hart that, on becoming the Minister for Employment, I promised this House that, if unemployment figures ever reached the level they did under the previous Minister for Employment, the Hon. Mike Rann, I would resign. That promise still stands. And until my record and this government's record is as totally appalling as that of members opposite, they should just be quiet and desist and not get in the way by making a noise.

GOVERNMENT ACCOMMODATION, SINGAPORE

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier stand by his statement of 30 September that the South Australian government does not own or lease any residential property in Singapore besides that used by the government's commercial representative, Mr Tay Joo Soon and, if so, when did the government cease to pay rent on the apartment it was renting in Singapore? On 30 September, the Premier responded to an opposition question by stating that the only Singapore accommodation paid for by the government was that of Mr Soon. The opposition has received a leaked document recording correspondence from the Premier to Mr Cambridge dated 18 December 1997. The document is titled 'Minute from the Premier in response to JDC and rental of an apartment in Singapore'. Under the heading 'Description' the document states:

> Premier has written to JDC outlining concerns with renting an apartment in Singapore when only utilised for a few days per month.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): Nothing has come across my desk since I made my last response to the parliament. I will check the background to the claimed statements of the deputy leader.

WATER AUTHORISATIONS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Will the Minister for Environment and Heritage advise the House of the number of water authorisations that have been issued under the notice of restriction which exists in the Tintinara/Coonalpyn area, and indicate to the House when those landholders still awaiting a water authorisation will receive such advice? There are nine hundreds in the Upper South-East which are yet to be prescribed under the Water Resources Act 1997 and, on 13 January last year, the minister imposed a moratorium on the taking of water in that area. If landholders could meet certain criteria in that moratorium, they would be authorised to take water in the interim period.

I am advised by landholders that those landholders who are existing irrigators have been given an authorisation but some landholders are still expecting to receive an authorisation some time in the near future.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Environment and Heritage): I thank the honourable member for his question and acknowledge the very extensive representation he has offered to his constituents in that area with regard to all matters relating to water resources. I am very pleased the honourable member has asked this question because it enables me to document to the House a series of circumstances that led to the moratorium being proclaimed. The Department of Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs has completed a very intensive effort over the past 10 months to assess and process the applications for authorisation, which have been supported by technical work and advice from Primary Industries and the CSIRO within the Tintinara/Coonalpyn area.

This process has been accomplished as quickly as possible and has identified, unfortunately, some very critical issues for the long-term use and management of ground water resources in that area. The honourable member rightly comments that the Tintinara/Coonalpyn notice of restriction was imposed on 13 January 1999 for a period of 12 months. This notice was instituted to allow an assessment of the capability of the ground water resources to meet what was rapidly increasing demand for water for intensive irrigation from the unconfined aquifer and from the deeper confined or pressurised aquifer. The demand for water escalated during the latter half of 1998.

The notice was instituted on consideration of a recommendation to me by the South-East Water Catchment Management Board and consistently with advice from the Department for Environment. Following the notice of restriction, a public meeting was held at Tintinara on 1 February to explain the notice and the process for authorisations for existing users and others in terms of making financial commitments and demonstrated plans to use the ground water resources. This was followed by a second public meeting convened by the South Australian Farmers Federation on 15 April which further explained the notice of restriction, the authorisation process and the technical studies that were being initiated.

Two newsletters were also circulated in July and September to all landholders in the area to provide them with updated information as it became available. The Department of Environment conducted a land use survey in February to ascertain certain irrigation and other water use activity in that area. Meanwhile, the department called for submissions for authorisations to take water from the ground water resources during the notice of restriction from people who believed that they may have met the policy guidelines and the criteria for the authorisations to be approved by me. Applicants were requested to provide their submissions by the end of March to allow what would then be a timely process and assessment of the applications. We received some 114 submissions. These indicated the current and, certainly, the potential future demand for water. That was critical information for the technical studies to start taking place.

An assessment panel was then established to assess the submissions of land use in order to determine the applicants' actual eligibility for authorisation. We also had an independent internal probity auditor participating in the deliberations of the assessment panel. Applicants who did not initially meet the policy guidelines and the criteria for authorisation have been able to submit to us additional information, which has been assessed by an interdepartmental reference panel that consisted of representatives from DEHAA, primary industries, the Department of Industry and Trade and, of course, the external probity auditor. The reference panel has provided a review process for applicants applying for authorisations.

We had 39 new water applicants who were refused authorisation as they did not meet specific criteria, and they were notified of that decision some two months ago. Of those initial applicants, 28 were existing water users but sought additional new water. They were refused authorisation for the new water component under the same guidelines and criteria. Some 45 authorisations have been issued to existing users to take water from the unconfined aquifer during the notice of restriction and 21 authorisations to existing users of the confined aquifer. The majority of these authorisations were issued in June and July.

Some 14 authorisations were issued in August and September for new or expanded developments where applicants had actually met the policy guidelines and criteria to take water from the confined aquifer. This followed completion of ground water modelling by the Department of Primary Industries and Resources of the impact of these demands on the confined aquifer, based on the current technical knowledge of the resource. Further monitoring is now required during the irrigation season to confirm the predicted impacts from that particular modelling.

In conjunction with those authorisations, I also instigated a good neighbour policy to protect access to the confined aquifer of neighbouring stock and domestic users where ground water level declines during the irrigation season. For example, under this policy, where a land-holder causes the lowering of the water level within the confined aquifer, he or she must provide for the lowering of pumps on his or her neighbour's property to ensure the continued access to that resource. It should also be noted that water meters are now required as a condition of authorisation for new and additional water use.

Due to previous studies by the CSIRO regarding the potential for salinisation of ground water in the southern Murray basin, the CSIRO was engaged by DEHAA and PIRSA to study this potential in the notice of restriction area. This work identified unexpectedly high levels of salt, some as high as sea water, which had accumulated in the soil profile. The latest CSIRO studies show—and I quote from their document—that:

> . . . there is a significant potential for ground water salinisation. There is evidence of ground water salinisation already occurring, and the salinity of ground water pumped for the purpose of irrigation could become too saline in a matter of 10 years for further irrigation to continue.

This clearly shows that there is a serious threat to the quality of the unconfined aquifer and the long-term viability of irrigation in the area utilising water from this particular aquifer. The results of the CSIRO studies have important implications for the 32 remaining applicants for authorisations who did meet the policy guidelines and the criteria for an authorisation to take water from the unconfined aquifer for expanded or, indeed, new developments. These remaining applicants should be advised of their authorisations within the next two weeks.

Furthermore, to inform these applicants of the potential salinity threats to the ground water quality and their irrigation enterprises, they were invited to an information meeting held by DEHAA with the support of Primary Industries and the CSIRO on 1 November at Tintinara. This provided them with critical information regarding the resource before they take up their authorisations, for which they are eligible under the policy guidelines and criteria. The issue of these authorisations recognises the financial commitments these applicants were in the process of committing to their development whilst

taking into account the long-term management needs of the resource. A further four information meetings were held last week on 2 and 4 November to advise all other applicants for authorisations of the results of the technical studies to date.

The direction for future management of the ground water resources was also discussed at these meetings. The government will now consider the best long-term management arrangements for the area in conjunction with the Tintinara/Coonalpyn community and the South-East Water Catchment Board.

The SPEAKER: Order! I just highlight to ministers the opportunity for making ministerial statements.

CAMBRIDGE, Mr J.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): My question is directed to the Premier. For what purpose did Mr John Cambridge, through the Office of Asian Business, rent an apartment in Singapore? What was the cost of renting the apartment, and was it located at the Orchard Hotel, Orchard Road, Singapore?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): As I think I have previously advised the House, my understanding is there was no such rental accommodation. As I have indicated to the deputy leader, I will go and check the facts of the matter. My understanding was that, in an endeavour to reduce the cost of overseas accommodation, because some 50 per cent of his time was being spent there, rather than hotel accommodation it would be cheaper to undertake some other accommodation. My recollection is that that was refused. What we have is again the deputy leader, with half a snippet of information, making out she has a whole chapter and verse here to present to the parliament. When I check the facts, I think we will find that the deputy leader will be embarrassed yet again.

ENTERPRISE AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION TEAM

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): Can the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training outline new initiatives designed to link small business, industry and education?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training): I thank the member for Fisher for his question. I know of his deep interest in education. Today I am pleased to announce an Australian first which is an enterprise and vocational educational team. What we have had here in South Australia through the Salisbury High School and Peter Turner, when he was Principal of the Salisbury High School, is an excellent model of young South Australian students at school linking with industry and linking with further training and being able then to have excellent outcomes from the school. As members in this House would well know, the Salisbury High School has 98 per cent of students either going onto further training or going into jobs. That is just an excellent record of Peter Turner's leadership over that time.

What this team will do is transpose that model right across South Australia. We are looking to form links between schools and industry and between schools and training, so there is a clear pathway for students in South Australian schools that they recognise and can see if they study certain VET subjects, that will lead them onto subjects at TAFE and then lead them onto a university degree or whatever vocation they wish to follow. That to my mind is an excellent enterprise from the team. It will enable schools to be more responsive to the labour market. It will bring industry into our schools, which is what I want to do, so we get feedback from industry for them to say, 'These are the range of skills we want your young people to walk out the gate with when they finish year 12.'

Also, we want to see apprenticeships started while young students are at school so that, while they are still at school, they can get a start in their next period of training and in the vocation they wish to undertake in either traineeships or apprenticeships. Again, this team will be focusing on those sorts of linkages with industry to ensure that we close the gap and get information moving between the two sectors. Some 44 per cent of secondary school students in South Australia are expected to undertake vocational educational training in the year 2000.

I was with Minister Kemp this morning at Windsor Gardens Vocational College, and I would have to say—and I am sure he would agree—that we were very impressed with the vocational education training going on there. It includes six areas of learning, including hospitality (which is extremely popular), and the enthusiasm of the 100 young people undertaking the course this year is exceptional, and they are looking to move into careers through TAFE, university or apprenticeships. It is great to see that enthusiasm.

The Australian National Training Authority will look at a broad range of future training directions for the next millennium. We will be meeting tomorrow for the ANTAMINCO conference in Adelaide, and I am pleased to note that Adelaide will be the host. Tonight, the national training awards will be presented. We have a number of trainees and apprentices who will be coming up for Australian awards, as well as some small business companies for the Prime Minister's small business award—and I think we could have a very good chance of taking off that award again this year.

It brings together both public and private training providers from around the country to discuss further ways of bringing government and industry together to ensure, again, as this enterprise and vocational team will do, linkages between training, industry and our education system. The relevance, of course, to South Australia is the wine and food industries, information technology, aquaculture, back office call centres and mineral processing; and, of course, we all recognise that education in these areas—and all areas—is the cornerstone for future prosperity, opportunity and competitiveness of our industries in this state. So I am delighted that we are hosting the conference in Adelaide. I spoke at a breakfast this morning to industry leaders and also to the VET board, and we had some very good interaction between industry and good ideas coming out from industry.

Another excellent example, of course, in South Australian schools is Partnerships 21, and it is very interesting to see that the Victorian Labor government has agreed to come back to our system of local management of schools. The Victorian education minister, Mary Delahunty, clearly supports self-management, particularly SA style. So it is Victoria following South Australia, South Australian schools being the leading schools in Australia.

CAMBRIDGE, Mr J.

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Can the Minister for Education now tell the House the outcome of an Education Adelaide meeting held last Thursday at

which the potential conflict of interest of one of its directors, Mr John Cambridge, was discussed; and can he now tell us whether or not Mr Cambridge had declared his interest prior to writing a submission seeking assistance from Education Adelaide to redevelop the former taxation office in King William Street? It is understood from newspaper reports that the Chairman of Education Adelaide, Mr Rick Allert, has briefed the Minister on the outcome of the Education Adelaide meeting last Thursday.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training): I recall that there is an FOI on this information and I am sure that is following due process. The questions that the honourable member asked last week are similar to that which she has asked today. I have asked for an answer from Education Adelaide and I am still awaiting that answer.

DEREGULATED LABOUR MARKET

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Can the Minister for Government Enterprises advise the House about the level of interest being shown in the deregulation of labour markets?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): I thank the member for Waite for his question on a day which allows me to highlight the strength of labour markets where they have been deregulated. There has been a lot of interest—

Mr Foley: Unemployment is still high.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The member for Hart talks about the unemployment rate in South Australia, which is not deregulated, and that is why I said that this is an ideal opportunity to highlight a number of interesting facts. Indeed, a lot of interest has been shown by members on the other side and by their union colleagues, perhaps as an attempt to mask a number of the good outcomes that are being seen in areas around the world that have a deregulated labour market.

We do not have to look very far. Immediately to our east is New Zealand and, if the House reflects on the performance of the New Zealand economy (and I know that the Leader of the Opposition regularly reflects pleasantly on his days in New Zealand), they would know that New Zealand introduced individual workplace agreements in 1991. By the fifth year of individual workplace agreements, I am informed that about 49 per cent of the New Zealand work force was covered by those individual workplace agreements.

What has happened since the introduction of those individual workplace agreements? The effect is that New Zealand's unemployment rate dropped from 10.3 per cent to as low as 6.7 per cent. Perhaps more significant than that decrease is the fact that, in the five years before 1991, employment in New Zealand was falling on average by 1.1 per cent per annum and, in the five years after 1991, it was growing on average by 3.4 per cent per annum. I contend that that is an extraordinarily positive feature for the New Zealand labour market.

What would the Labor opposition rather have: a decrease of 1.1 per cent in employment annually or an increase of 3.4 per cent? Whilst it is a hypothetical question, I surmise that it would rather have employment growth. Opposition members might say that there are some cyclical effects within the New Zealand economy, but New Zealand suffered a recession in the first half of 1998, partly due to the Asian difficulties and dilemma and partly due to drought, yet despite that recession unemployment rates peaked at 7.7 per cent, which is much better than the recession in the early 1990s, when the unemployment rate peaked at 10.9 per cent. The unemployment peak, after individual workplace agreements have worked their way through the system, is much better.

Recent research, which was done by Tim Maloney of the Institute of Policy Studies, and a number of surveys of New Zealand employers provide very strong evidence that in New Zealand deregulation of the labour market has improved economic outcomes and improved labour market performance. I know that our philosophical opponents opposite do not like the facts and figures, but they are stark. When there is a deregulated labour market in New Zealand, immediately to our east, we have an increase in growth in employment. With the previous regime there was a fall in employment.

There are many other examples around the world where the deregulated labour market is doing well, and we are on the verge of a similar opportunity, and certainly the unemployed people would call on the Labor Party to allow us to bring in a system that would see employment growth rather than decline.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): Given today's rise in unemployment, giving South Australia the second highest unemployment rate in the nation, does the Premier stand by his target of reducing our unemployment rate to the national average by the year 2000? Today's bureau of statistics, labour force, released for the month of October, shows that South Australia's unemployment rate rose to 8.8 per cent. At the same time, the national rate fell to 7.1 per cent—1.7 percentage points below the South Australian rate. Sadly, South Australia lost 1 700 jobs last month, while the number of people unemployed exploded by 4 200 to 63 900 in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Employment): It's too important when it comes as question about number eight from the opposition. That shows the level of importance you'll really put on this, but you'll get an answer anyway.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Ross Smith for the last time.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: None of us—and I said this in answer to an earlier question from the government benches—on this side of the House is particularly pleased at the continuing employment figures in South Australia. This month does represent something of a glitch. However, we have said repeatedly in this place, in the good months as well as the bad months—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: —we have to do better, we have to get it right and we have to put this state back on track. That is what the Premier, minister and every member on this side of the House is seeking to do. Members opposite can take pleasure in more people being unemployed if they choose. We choose to see it as a disappointing result. The fact is that the matter of jobs in this state is a partnership. Our Premier, ministers, members and the members opposite, as well as the Prime Minister, can be no better than the nation we represent. The strength of this nation is in its people. It always has been, it always will be. We are with those people, working in a partnership.

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Elder for the last time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will resume his seat. I remind members that it has been my practice to warn people three times. However, I am not bound by that by any means. I can name people after one warning. I can do whatever I wish. We will have some sort of decorum in this Chamber. The behaviour yesterday was unacceptable for the South Australian parliament and it will not degenerate into that today.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The fact is that between 1990 and 1992 South Australia lost 38 300 jobs, and for the past 16 months the trend for employment in this state has been improving. I would remind members opposite—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Instead of reading the *Financial Review* every day, if the member for Hart actually looked at the employment figures he would see that we are not on the bottom. We are not the best performing state, but we are not the worst, either last month, this month or next month.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Yes, I know, because you don't like an intelligent discussion on unemployment. Members opposite are good at scaring the public of South Australia, convincing our young people they have no prospects of getting a job, and generally painting—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The member asks whether it is their fault. I would look at the member and say, 'Yes it is.' Unless members opposite adopt a more positive attitude towards the future of this state, they will be part of the problem, not part of the solution. I believe that emphatically.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I am very pleased to live in Kings Park. Every morning I awake to that quintessential Australian bird—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: No, the Australian bird, the laughing jackass, and I always think of the member for Hart.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will resume his seat. He is not contributing to the debate. I also warn the member for Hart for the last time.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The essence of the member's question was about achieving a target. During the course of discussions over the last few months with the Premier and the cabinet (and it was certainly in the media), this government has not been trying to set targets. If you set a target and if you achieve that target what, in fact—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The Premier and the government think about what they do on a daily basis. Where you were yesterday—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Good forward planning involves moving your thinking, and thinking about things. We on this side of the House—

Members interjecting:

MEMBER FOR ROSS SMITH, NAMING

The SPEAKER: Order! I name the member for Ross Smith. Will the minister resume his seat. Does the member wish to be heard in explanation or apology?

Mr CLARKE: Yes. I do apologise. I am sorry. You did give me fair warning, sir; I broke that, and I would ask you to accept my apology.

The SPEAKER: I think that the chair has given fair warning to everyone over the course of yesterday and today. I hear what the member says. I do not accept his apology and I ask the member to withdraw. Does any member wish to debate the matter with respect to whether the apology is accepted?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I rise on a point of order, sir. There seems to be some sort of breach of process here. You have named the member. I understood it was the normal process, before asking someone to leave the chamber, that you would in fact not only ask them to respond but then ask for a debate, so that the House decides, not the Speaker. I do not wish to challenge your ruling in any way, because you know of our affection and respect for you. However, it is an unusual practice—and I note that the honourable member has already done the decent thing and left the chamber. But, given some of the abuse coming from the other side of the parliament (and I understand that there are anxieties on the other side), I would have thought that a bit of good humour, considering the way in which we have handled all the bills with dispatch, and given the co-operation between the Premier and me on a range of important bills and legislation in the last few weeks—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You called me to address the chair, sir. Do you want me to finish, or not?

The SPEAKER: I am asking whether anyone wishes to move a motion—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER: You are debating the point of order. What is the point of order?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Let me go back to the start, if you like, sir. The fact is that there has been a breach in the process; a breach in the rules and regulations and standing orders of the parliament.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw members' attention to standing order 139 2, which provides:

> unless the explanation or apology is accepted by the House, the member then withdraws from the chamber;

No member has stood up. I ask members now if anyone wishes to move that the apology be accepted.

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I move:

> That the apology be accepted.

The SPEAKER: Does the deputy leader wish to speak to the motion?

Ms HURLEY: Yes, sir. As the leader has said, there was a bit of toing and froing across the chamber today—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: Yes, in a very good humoured fashion. There was a fair bit of noise on the government side. We responded to that on a series of occasions. The member acknowledged that he had been warned on those occasions and apologised for the fact that he had transgressed that warning and taken it too far. I believe that apology should be

accepted. No warning was given to members who were interjecting on the other side of the chamber or to ministers who were responding to interjections and whipping up sentiment on this side of the chamber.

The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: Indeed, a general warning was given, as the member for Adelaide says. The Minister for Government Enterprises was one of those members who was constantly interjecting during the whole of Question Time, yet he did not receive a warning either of a general nature or of any other nature. The member for Ross Smith did acknowledge the warning. There were transgressions by a number of members on this side of the House, as there were from members on the government's side. The honourable member acknowledged that and, I would have thought, he apologised for his behaviour in the most abject terms. I believe that the member for Ross Smith should not be further punished for that transgression.

As the leader has said, there has been a lot of cooperation with the government in these past couple of weeks of parliament. We have assisted the passage of a number of very important bills through the House. There has been great cooperation from this side of the House and we are quite happy—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now straying from the subject of the debate, which is an explanation of why the honourable member's apology should be accepted for ignoring a direction from the chair. The debate has nothing to do with cooperation in terms of legislation and other business before the House: it is simply that the chair gave a direction to an honourable member to desist from interjecting and disrupting the House, and the honourable member ignored the chair. That is what this debate is about.

Ms HURLEY: My point is that, although the honourable member acknowledged that he had temporarily disrupted the House, members on this side of the chamber had been doing their best to ensure the smooth running of this House in these final few weeks of the session before a very long break in terms of ensuring that important legislation is passed. I contend that the member for Ross Smith made a very minor transgression. He did disrupt the House, for which he apologised to you, Mr Speaker, I believe, in very fulsome terms, and he should not have to wear any further penalty for that.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier): I oppose accepting the honourable member's apology. There is a limit to the number of warnings that you, sir, should need to give. The situation is that there are public expectations of people in this place. The Speaker continually gave warnings to both sides of the House. He then gave the member for Ross Smith—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is a serious debate.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: —several warnings.

Ms Ciccarello: And you received none.

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the honourable member that she could end up being named. I will deal with that matter on a second occasion. The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: It has been noted that the member for Ross Smith acknowledged that he had transgressed. That is correct; he did acknowledge that fact. I suggest that, when they have been warned, members should acknowledge their transgression by being silent. The House has been very unruly in the past few days, and I think it is only proper that we support the Speaker's right to keep control of the House. It was very difficult today, and it has been difficult on several occasions lately. If members continue to transgress after they have been warned, they should wear the consequences.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I urge the House to accept the honourable member's apology, and I make these few points. Through this question time members on this side of the House have had to tolerate a number of ministers who have deliberately provoked the opposition. I ask members to cast their mind back to the very minister in question, the member for Unley. He has a habit of turning to this side of the House and deliberately engaging members opposite. I acknowledge the very important role that you, sir, play, but you sat quietly and accepted a minister of the Crown referring to me in this chamber as a jackass.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is reflecting on the chair. I do recall warning the minister at the time that, by making that remark, he was not contributing to the debate in the chamber.

Mr FOLEY: With all due respect, sir, I do not recall your doing that. You may have done that, but I do not recall it. However, prior to the member for Ross Smith being named in this House that minister quite deliberately and provocatively called me a jackass. Members opposite might think that is fun and humorous, but if we want to talk about the quality of debate and the conduct and behaviour of members you, sir, cannot, with all sincerity, accept that a minister of the Crown can call someone a jackass and not be thrown out of the parliament. Yet a member who acknowledged that perhaps he went too far quite rightly and quite correctly apologised. We listened to this minister give us a lecture when you, sir, said that she should give a ministerial statement. If we consider the front bench, ministers are clearly flouting your rules, sir. There are 47 members of this House. It is an absolute nonsense to suggest that only this side is disrupting the House, that only this side can be cautioned, that only this side can be warned. Quite frankly, a blanket warning of opposition members is an unprecedented call from the chair. You made the remark, sir, that yesterday was a day of high tension—and so it should have been. We had a report that deserves attention—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is straying from the subject of the debate. I remind members who have sat in this place as long as I have that I and other members have been subject to blanket warnings from various Speakers. It has happened frequently.

Mr FOLEY: Sir, I simply make the point that yesterday was a day of great tension and drama in this place as circumstance required. That is what happens when events such as yesterday occur; this parliament gets a bit electric. At least today we had a bit of levity. We actually had a little bit of frivolity that allowed the tensions to be dealt with today. The member for Unley was having a ball, encouraging it to occur. I copped the 'jackass'; we copped the abuse. I simply say to you, sir—and, clearly, the member for Coles is enjoying it, as she should—that today, for a change, there was a bit of fun in question time. Let us not have one set of rules that means on this side when it gets a little bit too much we suffer a penalty. I urge the House to apply some commonsense. Members such as the member for Unley cannot provoke, abuse and conduct themselves as they do when we pay the penalty.

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): The member for Ross Smith was unreserved in his apology. Sir, the member for Ross Smith was reticent in the cautions and the naming that you gave to him. General banter was occurring across both sides of the chamber. It occurred throughout question time today. Humbly, in my opinion, I do not think that the behaviour today was any worse than it was earlier in the week. In fact, I suggest that it was worse earlier in the week than it was today. I appeal to you, sir, not to toss out the member for Ross Smith today because of the parliamentary behaviour that occurred earlier in the week. I would like to say to you, sir, in total frankness and honesty, that you are a very fair and good Speaker. Let us not use the parliamentary numbers today to penalise the member for Ross Smith because of behaviour earlier in the week. Let some commonsense prevail. For the sake of parliamentary morale across the chamber, let some commonsense knock this on the head.

The member for Ross Smith was unreserved in his apology. He was very reticent in his apology. In my opinion, for what it is worth, the honourable member's behaviour was no worse than that of a number of other members, including me, members opposite and other members. It may well be that the honourable member was picked up for a couple of comments I made. Let us be honest: we all do this. There is no doubt that, from the minister's answer, he was not having a good day. The minister did use language that inflamed the situation—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now straying from the debate.

Mr WRIGHT: Fair enough. I conclude by saying that, for the sake of parliamentary morale and commonsense, do not abuse the parliamentary numbers. Deputy Premier, let us use a bit of commonsense. This can be quickly rectified. For the sake of the future of us all and for the sake of goodwill in this parliament, just knock this on its head.

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind members that this is a serious debate. We will hear it in silence.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Every member of this House should know that the authority of the chair should be accepted. There are certain people who on a regular basis continually flout the chair—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will resume his seat. In a moment it just might dawn on the member for Hart that this is being debated because of the continuous interjections across the chamber. The honourable member is very close to being named himself.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: It is clear that certain people take it upon themselves to deliberately and wilfully defy the rulings of the chair consistently, purely for the purpose either of shouting down a member who is on their feet or to prevent that member from giving information to the House. Those who were here during the time of Speaker Trainer—and one need only read the *Hansard*—would understand what it was like to have a draconian speaker. Therefore, Mr Speaker, I believe that you have been most tolerant towards those people who have taken it upon themselves to continually flout the rulings of the chair—

Mr Venning: On both sides.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Including the member for Schubert. I therefore believe that members have had ample opportunity, and when they fail to respond the chair has the ultimate responsibility of upholding the standing orders. That is the responsibility of the chair, and that is what the chair has done on this occasion. The chair has my total support. I support the move by the Deputy Premier and certainly ask the House not to accept the honourable member's apology.

Mr CONLON (Elder): The apology should be accepted by the House: it was an excellent apology. I speak as one with some experience, having on a number of occasions apologised to the House myself. From my experience, the honourable member's apology was very good. It was not quite as good as the one that I once had accepted by the House, but it was a lot better than the one I did not have accepted when I was asked to withdraw. I can honestly say that it was a very good apology as apologies go and should be accepted.

Mr Speaker, on a serious note, I do appreciate the difficult job that you have, but in urging the House to accept the apology I want to set a context for the behaviour of the member for Ross Smith. Plainly, it is obvious that we on this side of the House have not only better and more pleasant voices but that they carry better than members of the government. From the circumstances of the last two days, that is absolutely plain. I was warned by you, Mr Speaker, quite correctly, for interjecting twice in the first two minutes of question time yesterday. On both occasions I was responding to interjections and insults from the minister for the environment. The first insult was to call me a 'little boy' to which I responded. It has been some considerable period of time since I was a little boy—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will come back to the substance of this debate—not what happened yesterday.

Mr CONLON: I am merely trying to set the context for the behaviour of the member for Ross Smith to put a plea in mitigation for him, to put a plea to this House that his apology should be accepted. It should be accepted because not only was it an excellent apology, as I have said before, but there were certain mitigating circumstances to his behaviour. I am simply trying to point those out. As I say, on two occasions I was warned for responding to interjections. I suffer for having such an excellent voice. Mr Speaker, I also know today that I was given a final warning from you moments after I walked into the chamber, a warning that did seem somewhat to me to approximate the sentencing laws in the Northern Territory more than anything else. Mr Speaker, it was an excellent apology. I urge the House to accept it.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I rise to oppose the motion. There was a classic example before us today when the member for Ross Smith had been named and you, sir, had already asked him to absent himself but not one member opposite rose to defend him. I think that clearly indicated that members opposite knew that the member for Ross Smith—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is also straying from the substance of this debate.

Mr MEIER: I accept your ruling, but I think it was very clear that members opposite appreciated the fact that you had given this House a blanket warning in the first instance to every member—and, without question, so it should have been such a warning, after the behaviour of members earlier today and yesterday. Every member would have understood that very clearly. It was quite clear, when the member for Ross Smith, after having been given additional warnings, was named, that members opposite appreciated that your ruling was just and fair. Therefore, I found it very unusual that some

time after the member had absented himself a point of order was taken and a belated move was made to accept the explanation. I think every member here appreciates that your ruling was just and fair, and it is quite clear that the behaviour of this House has not been up to the standard that is expected of it. I would say that every member here should support the ruling you have given.

Motion negatived.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the member for Ross Smith be suspended from the service of the House.

Motion carried.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Ms BREUER (Giles): I want to talk about an appalling situation which has developed in the community of Mintabie in the Far North of the state. This community has been ripped apart through Partnerships 21. Given the minister's commitment to involving parents in local school management under Partnerships 21, I want to know if the minister authorised the involvement of the principal and the district superintendent of the Mintabie—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation. Members will either be seated or quietly leave the chamber. The member for Giles has the call.

Ms BREUER: I want to know if the minister authorised the involvement of the principal and the district superintendent of the Mintabie Area School in a meeting that attempted to remove the duly elected school council, and whether the minister is doing anything to ensure that his staff work towards a solution of the problems existing at that school.

In June, Partnerships 21 was discussed at the school and the principal invited Mark Woollacott from the South Australian Association of State School Organisations to come to Mintabie to talk to the school at that meeting, which was attended by parents and staff. At the meeting, a number of school council members and a few staff asked questions and raised issues of concern about Partnerships 21. After the meeting, staff members were called in individually and severely chastised for their lack of loyalty. The school council met and set the date for the AGM with the required notice of 14 days under the act. The AGM was called for 18 October. Three days before the AGM, motions were distributed by the principal which sought to change the composition of the school council to nine. This composition is in contravention of the Education Act.

Approximately 30 parents attended the AGM, and there are only 45 children at the school. The meeting did not support the change in composition of the council and voted to keep the council membership with proportional representatives of Marla parents. The meeting then duly elected the school council. Within the next few days, the school district superintendent visited the school and was observed with parents who were not successfully elected on the school council at the AGM. The district superintendent has never met with the elected school council. The school council had its first meeting on 25 October, elected a chairperson and discussed the process of deciding whether to opt into Partnerships 21. They decided to hold a community meeting on 8 November and also to distribute a survey to the community, and they would make the decision on the basis of those results. The principal was part of this decision.

On 26 October a petition calling for a special general meeting of the school under regulation 90 of the Education Act was distributed to parents seeking 20 parents' signatures. On 29 October a general meeting was advertised for 6 November, two days before the community meeting about Partnerships 21. In the week before 6 November, the principal organised a meeting between chairpersons of the school council, school council representatives and another community member. At that meeting the school council members were told that if they agreed to Partnerships 21 the meeting on 6 November would be called off. The school council did not accept the proposal. On 5 November the school newsletter was distributed announcing the meeting on 6 November and that Mark Woollacott from SAASSO would also attend the meeting.

Mark Woollacott, his wife, the principal, his wife and Graham Davis all arrived by plane on Saturday morning, 8 November. The school council chairperson and another member of the school council met the plane to point out to Mark Woollacott the concerns about the meeting and how it had been called. It was the first time that Mark Woollacott had any contact with the school council. The meeting, which was attended by approximately 60 people, consisted of community members from Mintabie, Marla and surrounding districts. There was no record kept of who attended the meeting, and a large number of people attending were not parents of the school. At no time were the 20 signatories sighted or confirmed that they were parents of the school.

A motion of no confidence in the school council was put before the meeting but gave no evidence for any of the claims. The vote was counted: 38 in favour, 20 against. Prior to this, Mark Woollacott called the school council outside and asked them if they would resign if the motion was passed. Mark Woollacott asked the school council members to stand up, and asked them individually whether they would resign: eight said they would not; three said they would. School council members who refused to resign pointed out that they had done nothing wrong. Mark Woollacott then said that the meeting could not remove the council from office but several reports would be going to the minister and it would be in the hands of the minister as to how he would proceed.

I will now list some points about the meeting. There was no verification of the signatures, no agreement between the school council chair and the principal about the timing of the meeting—

Time expired.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I would like first to raise the issue of the beautification of Victoria Square—and I have to say that I do so with some reluctance, because recently some notables around the city have been subjected to a barrage of criticism for suggesting flag poles and black stumps. My suggestion is simpler than that, and it relates to restoring to Victoria Square, over time, some significantly tall trees. The member for Colton, a former Lord Mayor of the city—and a good Lord Mayor at that—reminded me of years ago when there were huge Moreton Bay fig trees in Victoria Square. Sadly they were all removed to make way for

changes in the road layout. It is an area which would lend itself very well to species such as *Eucalyptus maculata*, the very tall spotted gum. It would go a long way in replacing the current sad specimens that are there, including mainly exotics, with a few jacarandas. Nearly all the trees there look rather tired and sad.

I have written to the Lord Mayor and all members of the council and suggested that they plant over time some tall trees, not in the whole area of Victoria Square of course, but in areas which would contribute to the setting, given that the square is virtually surrounded by tall buildings. I relay that point to the House and, indeed, reinforce it in terms of a suggestion to the council.

In regard to the matter of significant urban trees, which is a passion of mine—and I make no apology for it—I note the presence in the chamber of the Minister for Tourism, who did a lot of work in chairing a committee some years ago in helping to preserve significant trees in the urban setting. The issue has arisen again in Coromandel Valley, actually in the electorate of the member for Heysen, on the site of the former Uniting Church on which some very large red gums are located, some of which are probably in the order of 200 to 300 years old, and all of which are currently at risk of being removed. I am delighted that the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning (Hon. Diana Laidlaw) is moving expeditiously to develop proposals to safeguard significant trees in the urban area. I have great faith in the minister, because she is a doer, not a 'gunna'. I spoke to her yesterday and I believe that in the very near future she will provide appropriate measures to safeguard significant urban trees.

I also raise the matter of vandalism which, sadly, still occurs on our public transport system. At Coromandel Railway Station, on a brand new building put in recently nearly all the tall, two metre high glass partitions have been smashed, and nearly every window on every train has been scratched with coins. In particular, along the section from Keswick Railway Station to Adelaide Railway Station, there is graffiti on the trains owned by Great Southern Railway. I am not blaming them; it is not their fault, but it is an eyesore. Graffiti is on all the buildings along that section, and it provides a very poor introduction to tourists who are travelling on the suburban rail network into the city. I urge Great Southern and perhaps some of our agencies (using people on community service orders with appropriate safety provisions in place) to clean up the graffiti which is a blot on the landscape and an eyesore.

Last week I travelled to Melbourne—not for the Melbourne Cup; I did not attend the Cup, nor did I bet on it, even though I picked the winner, Rogan Josh.

Mr Foley: How can you prove it?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Well, I have no proof, but I have a witness above who can vouch for it. I looked at a skateboard park which is at the corner of Lonsdale and Swanston streets in Melbourne and which is supervised by the YMCA. It is currently an unused building site, and that skateboard park gets tremendous use from the young people of Melbourne. I spoke to one relieved mother of teenagers who said that it had literally been a lifesaver for her. The YMCA does a great job; it provides sunscreen, and I was told that they will call an ambulance when one is necessary. The sooner we can get something similar to that in the city of Adelaide, the better, because it will allow our young people to use up their energy in a constructive way. Finally, I highlight the seriousness of the branched broomrape outbreak in the Burdett area and commend the minister for taking prompt action.

Ms RANKINE (Wright): I bring to the attention of the House an issue which is of some concern to me and members of my electorate and which has come to my attention in the past week, and I also make a plea to the Minister for Environment to initiate an urgent and independent investigation into substantial damage which is occurring to mature gum trees surrounding the Vodafone telephone tower station in the Cobbler Creek Recreation Park.

Members will recall that this has been an issue of some concern to me since I entered this place—the fact that Vodafone went in there and erected the tower in our recreation park. That tower became operational in December last year. Only 10 months down the track mature gum trees, part of the rare native scrub protected by this park, and in close proximity to the tower, are dying. Significantly, this damage to the trees is occurring only in the section of the trees facing the tower. The other side of the trees remains lush and green.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: The trees are dying. These mature age trees facing the tower are dying. There was a huge community campaign in my electorate in relation to this matter. People were outraged when the tower was built, but that was a planning problem. People were campaigning against the planning procedures and about a lack of proper community consultation. Health issues were of some concern, but they were secondary in this instance because the tower was some distance from homes.

As I said, the damage that is occurring to these trees after only 10 months of operation of the tower is another issue. I do not know what has caused this problem but, clearly, something quite untoward is happening. There are those who should know what is happening and should be able to give us assurances—but that does not seem to be happening. A Vodafone spokesperson in this week's *Leader* Messenger was quoted as saying that they went out there last weekend to investigate. I would like to know the extent of that investigation. Did they just go there and have a look? I have done that. Did they inspect the trees? Did they take samples? Did they test their equipment? I want to know what they did.

The Vodafone spokesperson went on to say that she thought a bug, which had been detected in other areas throughout the state, could be responsible for the dying trees. I have walked that park extensively. I have seen no other trees affected to this degree in any part of the park. Quite frankly, they must be very selective bugs because they are killing the trees only on the section that faces the tower. Vodafone needs to explain why the bugs are only attacking those particular sections. The spokesperson went on to say:

> It doesn't really look like we have done anything at all from what was seen over the weekend. It's because of something else that's in the area, like a bug or something, although that has to be cross-checked.

Clearly, the investigation they undertook was not very clear. I am very concerned about this lack of assurance. Surely, Vodafone should have been able to come out very clearly and say, 'There is nothing emitting from our equipment. Nothing as a result of our construction has affected these trees.' They have not been able to do that. The article in the *Leader* Messenger continues:

> Smaller trees in the area, which had been planted by Vodafone [and which have also died], appeared to have been eaten by animals, possibly the sheep which inhabited the park.

This is in a sealed-off revegetation area. There are no sheep. What has happened to these trees as well? I call on the minister to enact an independent investigation to provide my

community with a clear, plausible and accurate explanation. The residents in my area want that—and so do I. This raises real concerns about towers next to homes.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I would like to talk about the extraordinary success of the recent 1999 World Solar Challenge and the considerable benefits which this event generated for our state. As many members would know, the World Solar Challenge was staged from 17 October to 26 October 1999 by the state government's Australian Major Events division and attracted 40 entries from 10 countries. This wide field of competition resulted in some truly spectacular racing, with the lead constantly changing between four different teams. The race was ultimately won by the Aurora 101 team from Victoria which defeated a strong international competition to claim the race for Australia. This was the first time the race had been won by an Australian team, and it represents a significant milestone in our development of solar energy as a viable source of power.

I think that it is also important to mention that almost 75 per cent of the teams involved finished the race—one of the best results ever. Most of the teams are also planning to compete again in 2001 when the race will coincide with the World Solar Congress to be held in Adelaide. The World Solar Challenge was ably supported by Transport SA, Fleet SA, the South Australian Ambulance Service and the South Australian Police Department. This event was very much a team effort with a number of government departments behind its success.

I am also pleased to report that the ETSA Power World Solar Cycle Challenge, which was run in conjunction with this race, was a similar success. The cycle challenge also attracted an international turn-out, with 21 teams from eight countries competing over a seven day competition. This race was again won by the Australian team, Reflex, with a particularly good performance by our own Woodville Special School. Events such as the World Solar Challenge and the ETSA Power World Solar Cycle Challenge provide our state, indeed our country, with numerous benefits.

First, these races facilitate the further development of solar energy as a sustainable and practical source of power, and I think it is worth mentioning that two of the South Australian teams (Annesley College and Mannum High School) had students involved in both building and racing the vehicles. In addition to the increased level of scientific expertise which they gained through this project, students also benefited with the development of teamwork and communication skills that will stand them in good stead for the future. I point out, too, that Quorn Area School was also involved in this event.

Secondly, events such as the World Solar Challenge are beneficial to the many small communities through which they pass. Although the race is a free event, the spending of spectators assembled to view the challenge generates expenditure right throughout our state. In addition, the spending of interstate and international teams also injects considerable funds into regional economies. In fact, I am told that, after just a brief taste of South Australia, many of these teams stayed on to experience our state with post race touring.

Events such as the World Solar Challenge are also valuable for the great exposure they generate for South Australia. The media coverage for this event was exceptional and included national television, radio and print coverage. Perhaps more importantly, this event also received extremely high level international coverage including CNN and *Sports Illustrated* in the United States, live radio reports to the UK, and live television crosses to Europe. While this coverage is impressive enough in its own right, it is important to remember that the World Solar Challenge is just one of our growing stable of high profile events.

These events ensure that awareness of our state continues to spread abroad and also provides South Australians with some great entertainment. The Clipsal 500 Adelaide, Jacob's Creek Tour Down Under, Tasting Australia, Classic Adelaide and the International Horse Trials all provide our state with considerable exposure in some of our key international markets. In addition, they each generate considerable immediate economic benefit for our state through ticket sales and increased interstate and overseas exposure.

I am aware that the Minister for Tourism has previously mentioned in the House that our tourism industry is now worth $2.7 billion in annual exposure and employs some 32 000 South Australians. It is currently the fastest growing industry in Australia and the last few years have seen South Australia benefit from this expansion. I share the minister's enthusiasm for world-class events such as the World Solar Challenge and I am also aware, and I hope the House is, of the great tourist industry and the great opportunities in the northern parts of South Australia.

Time expired.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): This week is Workplace Health and Safety Week. Admittedly, we are acknowledging it here in South Australia a week after the ACTU declared and acknowledged Health and Safety Week nationally, but it is a welcome focus for one of the nation's greatest scourges. When I say that it is a great scourge, I point out that workplace safety and accidents in the workplace are Australia's hidden killers. We are all very concerned about the road toll and the fact that the suicide rate is growing in this day and age, but it is estimated that over 2 900 people die from work-related accidents or illness each year. That is a total waste of human life and potential with a ripple effect on nearly every family in this state.

Few people realise that it is the greatest killer in Australia. Research has shown that Australians have a greater chance of being hurt or made sick at work than by the scourges of road accidents or suicide. Why do we need to acknowledge something as important as workplace health and safety? Without a focus on this issue, we overlook the obvious things that we can do in our daily lives to create a safer work environment. When one considers that the number of people who are injured or made sick at work in South Australia could fill Football Park, that is a very sobering thought.

Working on the theory that prevention is better than cure, I accept that it may also be beneficial to adopt a carrot approach as well as a stick approach. By that I mean that we need to implement safe work practices that benefit both employers and employees. No-one goes to work in Australia with the expectation that they will be injured or perhaps not even go home that evening. It is shocking to think that some people do not come home and that others suffer lifelong trauma and painful death as a result of work-related cancers and other illnesses, and in that regard I could talk about asbestos and the Leigh Creek coalfields, where a great deal of work is being done. Those sorts of hidden killers need to be isolated and focused upon.

I have been given some statistics today that show that, when South Australia is compared with New South Wales and the different size of the work force in those states is taken

into account, the likelihood of an improvement notice or a prohibition notice being issued in South Australia is eight times lower. I would love to accept that that meant that South Australian workplaces are that much safer and that we have taken all the measures possible to ensure that our workplaces are safe, but that is perhaps not the reason behind it. The likelihood of a conviction is nine times greater in New South Wales than in South Australia. Those figures show that not a great deal is happening in South Australia and we could do a lot better than the figure of 2 900 deaths.

I was troubled to hear that the minister has issued an arbitrary figure of the number of prosecutions that he wants to occur this year. That is not the way we should be tackling it. We should be looking at expunging the problem altogether or taking the necessary steps to make sure that these things are not the outcome, rather than an arbitrary figure that I am having trouble coming to terms with as a plan of action. We need to make sure that, when measures are not in place to prevent workplace accidents, something is done. Perhaps we need a greater number of people involved in inspecting work sites. I am not sure whether we can penny pinch and say that we do not need inspectors when the cost of death and illness is enormous.

There are some other interesting statistics on the gender differences in workplace-related accidents. A lot of people think it is more likely for men to be injured but in fact the figures are very close. Although men account for around 73 per cent of injuries in South Australia, which was 47 000 in the year 1997-98, because more men than women work full time it does not necessarily mean that they suffer a higher rate of injury. South Australia's employed population is made up of roughly 55 per cent men and 45 per cent women. Almost 50 per cent of the women are employed part time compared with 13 per cent of the men. Approximately 45 per cent of female injuries occur in community service industries, which include health, hospitals and education. I commend to the House that we acknowledge this disgusting figure and immediately take steps to implement some sort of changes.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): We are all aware that today is Remembrance Day, and I commend the Premier for his statement outlining the history of this day. Over 415 000 Australians volunteered in the Great War and 60 000 did not return. Approximately 30 000 South Australians volunteered, of whom one-fifth did not return. They paid the ultimate sacrifice and it is fitting that we acknowledge that.

Today I was fortunate to be granted a pair, for which I thank the opposition, which enabled me to attend a very moving ceremony organised by the Payneham RSL. It was a great occasion. The other day I asked a question about the teaching of civics and history and I can say that in my electorate it is very much alive. I commend Clarry Pollard, the President of the Payneham RSL, and his branch members because they have a history of involving the local schools. For example, East Marden Primary School was involved in another memorable ceremony on Anzac Day.

Today East Marden Primary School, St Joseph's School, Payneham, and Devitt Avenue Primary School were involved in the Remembrance Day ceremony. The Principal of East Marden Primary School, Maggie Kay, and her teachers, the Principal of St Joseph's Primary School, Maria Canala, and her teachers, and the Principal of Devitt Avenue Primary School, David Craig, and his teachers should be commended. It is not often that teachers are acknowledged for the work they do in schools but anyone attending the ceremony at Payneham today would have realised that the students were well prepared.

It was a fitting ceremony, organised for the last Remembrance Day of the century, by the Payneham RSL. It was evident that it had an impact not only on the members and those who attended, including Les Dennis from the Norwood, Payneham and St Peters council, but also on the students from the three schools who were obviously well prepared for the seriousness of the occasion. The students as well as the teachers present wore red poppies, illustrating that our students are well prepared to reflect on important events in our history. It is important that I highlight this today. I understand that the Payneham RSL has been involved in projects with the schools in the area, and its members have attended assemblies where they have made speeches. As I said, anyone there today would know that the students were obviously moved and were well prepared for the seriousness of the occasion.

It is important that our students have a good understanding of our history. As a former school teacher, in recent years I have noted that history has not taken the prominence in the classroom that it used to take in the past, and that concerns me. Without an historical perspective and without a sense chronology, there is the danger of students getting snippets of events—using technology and so on—from the past and putting them together in projects, for example, without really understanding what happened. When teaching history, it is important that things are put in chronological order, and the celebration of such important events in our history is essential for young people and for future generations so that they can gain a proper perspective of and give proper weight to our history. Again, I congratulate the three schools concerned and Father Alan Winter who officiated for the Catholic Church at Payneham.

Time expired.

NATIONAL DRIVING HOURS REGULATIONS

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): On behalf of the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning, I table a ministerial statement made by the minister in another place this afternoon.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I bring up the 108th report of the committee on the Modbury Hospital Redevelopment Status Report and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism): I move:

That the report be published.

Motion carried.

GUARDIANSHIP AND ADMINISTRATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): 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 *Guardianship and Administration Act* and the related *Mental Health Act 1993* came into operation on 6 March 1995. The two Acts were introduced following an extensive policy development process from 1989 to 1993.

The *Guardianship and Administration Act 1993* provides a legal framework for the support and protection of people who, through mental incapacity, are unable to look after their own health, safety or welfare or to manage their own affairs. Mental incapacity may have arisen from various causes. Intellectual disability, acquired brain injury, stroke, dementia and mental illness are conditions which may bring a person within the scope of the legislation.

The legislation provides a range of options for substitute decision-making on behalf of a person who lacks mental capacity. The two principal structures established under the Act are the Guardianship Board and the Public Advocate.

The Guardianship Board is a multi-disciplinary specialist legal tribunal whose functions include:

- Appointing a guardian to make personal lifestyle decisions for the protected person;
- Appointing an administrator to make financial decisions;
- Making decisions relating to major medical procedures, such as sterilisation and termination of pregnancy;
- Hearing appeals against detention orders under the *Mental Health Act*.

The Public Advocate has a major role in promoting and protecting the rights and interests of mentally incapacitated persons and their carers. The Board may appoint the Public Advocate to be the guardian or one of the guardians of a person, but only if the Board believes that no other order would be appropriate—in other words, the Public Advocate might be regarded as the guardian of last resort.

The principles which must be observed in making decisions under the powers of the Act require consideration to be given, where possible, to the present wishes of the person in respect of whom the decision is being made. As that is not always possible, the Act prescribes that paramount consideration must be given to what would be the wishes of the person, so far as there is reasonably ascertainable evidence. Consideration must also be given to the adequacy of existing informal arrangements for the care of the person or management of his or her financial affairs and the desirability of not disturbing those arrangements. Any decision or order made must be the least restrictive of the person's rights and personal autonomy as is consistent with his or her proper care and protection.

The 1993 legislation was a significant step forward in seeking to reduce the dominance of tribunal hearings and maintain family and local support for people with a mental incapacity but, at the same time, ensure that checks and balances existed. The creation of the Public Advocate was a major initiative aimed at promoting and protecting the rights and interests of people with mental incapacity and their carers.

During the passage of the legislation, Parliament inserted a 'sunset clause' to ensure that the legislation and the arrangements underpinning it were reviewed prior to the third anniversary of its commencement. The legislation was originally due to expire on 6 March 1998 but has been extended on two occasions to allow time for a Legislative Review and an Operational Review to be completed and considered. The current expiry date is 6 March 2000.

The Legislative Review was advertised widely and received 56 formal submissions. It is pleasing to note that generally there was support for the Act. In broad terms, the Legislative Review concluded that the legislation could benefit from some changes, mainly of a technical nature.

The Operational Review consulted with the authors of many of the submissions, with particular emphasis on clients, consumers and carers, sat in on Guardianship Board hearings and consulted with interstate counterparts, and met with service providers. The Operational Review concluded that there were a number of non-legislative measures which could be taken to enhance the operations of the Guardianship Board and the Office of the Public Advocate and assist the community in their dealings with the guardianship system—measures such as increasing the community's awareness and understanding of the guardianship system, developing customer service/consumer rights policies and protocols, including a formal complaints mechanism and establishing a quality assurance monitoring and advisory committee. These will be progressively worked through with the relevant parties.

The Operational Review was mindful of the increasing workloads of both the Guardianship Board and the Office of the Public Advocate. The Review sought to identify a mechanism to ensure that only those matters for which there was no other option but the Board's involvement went before the Guardianship Board and that in those cases, the necessary 'work up' and preparation of parties had occurred so that hearings were as expeditious and productive for all parties as possible.

The Bill therefore adopts the major recommendation of the Review—the introduction of a process of mediation. Proposed new Section 15A seeks to separate the executive and administrative functions of the current Registrar and place them with the Executive Officer and place new mediation functions with the position of Registrar. Transitional provisions are included for the current Registrar to become the Executive Officer. The Registrar may provide preliminary assistance in resolving proceedings before the Board. This may include ensuring that the parties to the proceedings are fully aware of their rights and obligations; identifying issues in dispute; canvassing options that may obviate the need to continue proceedings; and facilitating full and open communication between parties. The Board, the President or a Deputy President may refer proceedings or issues to the Registrar for mediation. The Board itself may endeavour to achieve a negotiated settlement of proceedings or resolution of issues arising and may embody the terms of the settlement in an order.

The Government believes that the introduction of mediation should assist the community in their dealings with the guardianship system and streamline the business of the Board.

Other amendments of a more technical nature seek to enhance the operations of the legislation. The definition of 'authorised witness' is expanded to include interstate justices of the peace and notaries public. The definition of 'medical treatment' is extended to incorporate treatment provided by other health professionals as well as medical practitioners. A definition of 'health professional' is inserted to include registered physiotherapists, chiropractors and chiropodists as persons who may seek the consent of the Guardianship Board to their proposed treatment of a mentally incapacitated person where there is no other person with the appropriate authority. The principles on which the Guardianship Board must act are amended to include 'good conscience', as is the norm for quasi-judicial boards and tribunals.

In relation to guardians, provision is included to make it clear that the powers of both enduring guardians and Board appointed guardians are subject to any limitations spelt out in the Act. It is also made clear that a person can appoint more than one enduring guardian. A new form is included for the appointment of sole or joint enduring guardians. Each relevant signature can be witnessed by different authorised witnesses if need be. Provision is also included for the concurrent hearing of an application for placement/detention with an application for guardianship. This provision overcomes an unintended consequence of the existing Act in that a guardian must be appointed before an application may be made to place or detain the protected person, which may result in multiple hearings when a single hearing would have been sufficient.

The Government believes that the principles embodied in the Act are as relevant now as they were when they were introduced. The amendments enhance the capacity of the legislation to strike a sound balance between an individual's right to autonomy and freedom and the need for care and protection from neglect, harm and abuse.

I commend the bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides for bringing the Act into operation by proclamation.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation

This clause deletes the reference to 'a clergyman' from the definition of 'authorised witness' and allows interstate justices of the peace and all notaries public to be authorised witnesses. The definition of 'health professional' is inserted to include registered physiotherapists, chiropractors and chiropodists as persons who may seek the consent of the Guardianship Board to their proposed treatment of a mentally incapacitated person (*see* sections 59 and 60). The definition of 'medical treatment' is similarly amended.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 12—Decisions of the Board

This clause amends the principles on which the Guardianship Board must act by including a reference to 'good conscience', as is the norm for quasi-judicial boards and tribunals.

Clause 5: Insertion of s. 15A

This clause inserts a new section in the Act providing for mediation of proceedings by the Registrar. The Registrar may also, on his or her own initiative, provide preliminary assistance in clarifying issues in proceedings that have been commenced before the Board.

Clause 6: Amendment of heading

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 17—The Registrar

Clause 8: Insertion of s. 17A

These clauses serve to hive off the administrative functions of the current position of Registrar and give them to the newly created position of Executive Officer of the Board. The Registrar's position will have semi-judicial functions only, including the new mediation functions. (*See* clause 18 for a transitional provision relating to the present Registrar).

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 21—General functions of Public Advocate

This clause empowers the Public Advocate to establish advisory committees.

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 23—Delegation by Public Advocate

This clause widens the Public Advocate's powers of delegation to include delegation to a person who is not a Public Service or Health Commission employee, but subject to the Minister's approval in each case.

Clause 11: Amendment of s. 25—Appointment of enduring guardian

Clause 12: Amendment of s. 31—Powers of guardian

These clauses make it clear that the powers of both enduring guardians and Board appointed guardians are subject to any limitations spelt out in the Act. It is also made clear that a person can appoint more than one enduring guardian.

Clause 13: Amendment of s. 32—Special powers to place and detain, etc., protected persons

This clause clarifies that an application for the appointment of a guardian can be accompanied by an application for an order relating to residence and detention, etc., of a mentally incapacitated person, and that both applications can be heard by the Board at the same time.

Clause 14: Amendment of s. 58—Application of this Part

This clause deletes the word 'reasonably' in relation to the availability of a medical agent, thus bringing this Act into line with the *Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Act* under which medical agents are appointed.

Clause 15: Amendment of s. 59—Consent of certain persons is effective

Clause 16: Amendment of s. 60—Person must not give consent unless authorised to do so under this Part

These clauses insert references to health professionals (*see* earlier definition) into two sections relating to giving consent to the medical treatment of mentally incapacitated persons.

Clause 17: Repeal of s. 86

This clause repeals the 'sunset clause' which provides for the expiry of the Act on 6 March 2000.

Clause 18: Substitution of Schedule

This clause provides a new form for the appointment of sole or joint enduring guardians. Each relevant signature to the document can be witnessed by different authorised witnesses if need be.

Clause 19: Further amendment of principal Act

This clause refers to some penalty amendments set out in the Schedule to the Bill.

Clause 20: Transitional provision

This transitional provision transfers the person who currently holds the office of Registrar under the Act to the new position of Executive Officer of the Board, without prejudicing his salary and other employment benefits and rights.

SCHEDULE

Amendment of Penalties

The Schedule converts all penalties in the Act from divisions to monetary amounts.

Ms WHITE secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

A quorum having been formed:

YUMBARRA CONSERVATION PARK

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.C. Kotz:

That this House requests His Excellency the Governor to make a proclamation under section 43(2) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 that declares that rights of entry, prospecting, exploration and mining under the Mining Act 1971 may be acquired and exercised in respect of that proportion of the Yumbarra Conservation Park being section 457, north out of Hundreds, county of Way (Fowler) and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting its concurrence thereto.

(Continued from 27 October. Page 312.)

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): I rise to offer conditional support to the government's request that His Excellency the Governor make a proclamation under section 43(2) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act. My conditional support is in three parts. The first part is non-negotiable in that I will require an amendment to the proclamation to see that an additional biological survey is conducted in the early phases of the process. I will also be appealing to the government to put a sunset clause into the proclamation. When Minister Kotz introduced the matter to the House, she talked about this being an opportunity for us to demonstrate how the community and the environment can benefit from best practice environmental management that sets and demands high standards of care and protection for the natural environment, and unlocks new possibilities for the creation of much needed jobs in this important area of our state. In other words, she is saying that it is a matter of our striking a balance. As the proclamation stands, it does not strike a balance that is acceptable to me.

When the member for Hammond spoke to the matter, he talked about the pursuit of knowledge and about the fact that, as we pursue this matter, we need to pursue a better understanding of the ecosystem which will be affected in some way. Why do we seek knowledge about the geology of the area? Because it involves the magnetic anomaly that is presumed to be caused by a significant geological structure, indicating the existence of a mineralisation. It is not known for certain, but it is assumed that that is the case. In the pursuit of knowledge and a better understanding of the anomaly, we believe that, on balance, we need to have a better understanding of the environment before we move to the next step, which is the possibility of exploring and mining that anomaly.

Mining of itself is not an evil pursuit. Extraction industries provide many of the raw materials that sustain life, culture and the pursuit of happiness. But what about a balance between sensitivity and sustainability? To strike that balance, I am suggesting that my support will only be given should the proclamation be varied to ensure that further biological data is collected. It can be done in tandem with the next stage in terms of the assessment of the anomaly, but it must be done before any decision is made to explore the anomaly in any significant way. What I am looking for is the opportunity to have a couple of data suites that will allow a control as we move into the next phase of mining, so that if we have an area on which there is an impact we have a control and we have a before and after situation in terms of modelling the impact on the environment. That request is non-negotiable.

I also would prefer the government to insert a sunset clause in the proclamation which would require a return to the status quo should, at the end of the exploration phase, the anomaly be found not to be of any commercial value. We have no idea what the anomaly is. It could be a significant

mineralisation and it could be valuable to the state and, to that end, I believe that we need to pursue further information about it. Should we discover, though, at the end of that phase that, really, it is of no economic significance, I believe there is merit in returning to the status quo.

It is also my preferred option that both the biological assessment work that is still required and the next phase of exploring the anomaly be carried out by the government and not by private enterprise. I would much prefer to see the next phase under the management of the government and, therefore, under the control of the people of South Australia. I would prefer that that work not be carried out in partnership at the early stage with a potential investor in the long term. I understand that there are economic consequences in that respect. I do not believe that the cost is high, and it is not something on which I will insist. However, it is certainly my preferred position, and I would ask the government seriously to consider managing now in tandem the next phase in terms of the biological assessment, and doing that at the same time as it gathers some more information about the exact nature of the anomaly.

That, to my mind, adds more value to the whole process when negotiating with private enterprise should something of a significant nature be found. I believe that, by doing that, we are not only reassuring all South Australians that phase one will be carried out in a particularly sensitive manner but we are also saying to them that here is an opportunity to add more value should something of economic significance be discovered. I do not believe we can leave things as they are. On behalf of all South Australians, we need to go and have a look at this anomaly.

In conclusion, I am saying that the proclamation to do that will gain my support on the basis that the proclamation is varied to accommodate more biological assessment. I do not accept the position taken by the member for Schubert, who claimed that baselining data existed at present. As I said when we had the opportunity to question the minister on the matter, I prefer the position taken by Dr Hugh Possingham, whom I find particularly balanced in this regard. It is his belief that there are gaps in the data suite and they need to be filled now so that, at least in a relatively primitive way, we can construct what is known as a BACIS (a before-after control and impact study), which I think will be essential as we move through the environmental impact process should we proceed to mining. So, that is non-negotiable.

I also appeal to the government to give serious consideration to inserting a sunset clause. I can see no downside in that, but I can see quite a bit of upside for the government. And it is certainly my preferred position that that early work be conducted by the government, not by private enterprise. I have more faith in the minister's department and her colleague's department than I have in private enterprise to conduct this work in such a sensitive environment.

I believe that the environmental movement also has much to gain by supporting the proclamation, albeit in the form that I am suggesting. At the end of the day, I do not believe that this is the highest priority for the environmental movement in South Australia. I believe that, at times, the environmental movement (as do all of us) needs carefully to weigh up all its priorities. Nothing is win-lose. There are many ways in which to view all those sensitive issues in our environment that need protection and I believe that, out of this, we could find an opportunity for the environmental movement, along with the government, to resource further work in more sensitive areas. However, the challenge here for the environment movement is to stand up and prioritise its requirements in terms of moving forward in this state. With these remarks I wish to conclude and say that my conditional support is offered at this time to the government.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I make no apology for my strong commitment to the environment but, as the member for Gordon has just pointed out, these issues always have to be looked at in a balanced way. I had hoped to go and look at Yumbarra Conservation Park a few weeks ago, but that opportunity did not avail itself so, like many others, I must rely on material gathered by researchers and comments from members in this place.

I think it is a pity that the proposal has gone beyond what the select committee of 1996 recommended. However, in fairness, because I was overseas when this matter was discussed in the party room I believe I am, therefore, constrained somewhat in what opportunity I have in this place to express my view on this matter.

I was heartened to hear the comments of the member for Gordon, and I believe that there is merit in the suggestions that he has put forward to be taken into account in the way in which we deal with Yumbarra. However, irrespective of what happens in terms of the proposal by the member for Gordon, I guarantee that I will be watching very closely any activity in that area to make sure that it is absolutely minimal and that there is no unnecessary desecration or destruction of that site.

South Australia, like the rest of Australia, has an appalling record with respect to the environment, and those who think otherwise are kidding themselves. We as a nation since white settlement have vandalised this country in a way that makes us amongst the worst in the world in terms of the way we have not cared about the environment, and those who think to the contrary are absolutely kidding themselves. We have a younger generation who are now more attuned to the environment. But sadly, too much of what is heard is mere lip-service. It involves a lack of understanding of basic ecology—ecological principles—which are very simple: interdependence and interrelatedness. As one who helped create the society and environment course that is now in schools (I was one of the pioneers of that program in what is now the University of South Australia, which had its offshoot in schools), I am heartened by the change of attitude amongst many people.

However, if one looks at what is happening in Queensland at the moment, for example, one will see that they are ripping the heart out of about 300 000 acres of bushland. That is absolutely criminal behaviour. In a few years the people doing it will be asking for assistance, because the land they are clearing will be affected by salt; and the farms will be marginal. It is not a question of pointing the finger at various groups. We have many farmers who are leaders in conservation—and I think of a former member of this party, Mr Brookman, who was one of the dedicated conservationists in the early days before it was fashionable to be labelled that way and who did a lot to conserve areas of bushland, particularly on the West Coast and some of the major parks there, such as Hincks.

This is a measure which, I must say, brings me no joy. However, I believe that if it is approached with care, and if we are mindful of imposing minimal impact on the area—and, I hope, with some of the suggestions put forward by the member for Gordon—I believe we should get through what is a difficult phase.

We need to look at this anomaly. It may turn out to be nothing but I believe we should see what is there. It is a pity, in a way, that we are not examining what is there before we make any further decisions. I trust that the suggestions of the member for Gordon will be taken on board; that we can look at the anomaly but not go beyond what is an absolute minimal approach to ascertaining the value or otherwise of that particular ore body.

Mr HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I wish to expand on an issue I raised over the past few days, namely, the swiftie this government has pulled in terms of funding to schools under the Partnerships 21 scheme and the swiftie that has been pulled during this last round of notification of global budgets and resource profiles to schools. I will recap what has happened between the August-September round (round two) when schools were notified of their resource profile, that is, what the government says it will cost to run a particular school and its global budget. The difference between figures of a couple of months ago and the new figures that have been released in the past few days is $28 million for resource profiles and $20 million for global budgets.

In other words, if one adds up what the government said it would cost to run all the schools in the state a couple of months ago compared to what it says now, there is a difference of $28 million. The government has downgraded global budgets. The total downgrade over the past couple of months totals $20 million. That difference of approximately $8 million has been explained away by the Chief Executive at several meetings but, in particular, at one meeting held some weeks ago with approximately 150 principals from schools in the northern suburbs and the Riverland. It was admitted at that meeting that a mistake had been made in the resource profiles of somewhere between $7 million and $9 million. Looking at the figures I have received, I believe that figure is approximately $8 million.

Okay, so the government made an administrative mistake in that second round by saying that it cost more to run the schools than it actually did. We will put that aside, but that does not explain away the fact that the government now suddenly says that it will cost $20 million less to run our schools. It looks like a cut: it is a cut. As I said yesterday and previously this week, most of that cut to global budgets has occurred in Labor electorates. Labor holds fewer than half the seats. Labor electorate schools are copping about two-thirds of that cut.

In addition, there has been a bit of a shift. The minister has been very careful to say that no school has been worse off. I want to look at the honesty of that claim because there has been a shift in the reference point. The minister talks about and uses figures that look at the difference between global budgets and resource profiles: that is what the government says it costs to run a school. The minister has said that if a school's global budget is below the resource profile figure, which is the cost of running that school, it will top up that funding. That is not guaranteed but initially the government will top up that funding. I also point out that the minister adds the rider that all these figures are due to budgetary consideration.

So, if a school's global budget is above its resource profile figure, that is the cost of running the school, the school gets to keep that difference. The school makes what we could call a profit. However, the government has downgraded all resource profiles by a total of $28 million and correspondingly downgraded the total of the global budgets by $20 million. The government is still looking at the profit with reference to that new downgraded resource profile figure. If $20 million is taken from the system the sorts of profits the minister has been touting in the past few days soon diminish.

I brought to the attention of the House yesterday the difference in some of the figures for schools in Labor electorates and I want to continue giving the House some examples this afternoon. In this last round the global budgets have been downgraded. I am quoting October figures. I acknowledge that the minister is correct in that these figures constantly change but one must remember that $20 million has been taken out. That is not accounted for by errors: that is a cut. Reynella East High School's global budget has been downgraded by roughly $197 000. In round two that school was to make a profit of approximately $76 000 but after round three it will need top-up funding of $11 727 just to keep parity.

Reynella East Primary School has a global budget downgrade of roughly $116 000. That school was to keep an extra $42 000 or thereabouts, but it will now need top-up funding of approximately $59 000. Reynella Primary School's global budget downgrade for this month is $107 000. That school went from a profit of approximately $34 000 to needing approximately $59 000 to keep parity. Salisbury Heights Junior Primary School has a global budget downgrade of approximately $74 000. That school went from a profit of approximately $6 000 to needing top-up funding of $51 000.

Salisbury Primary School has had approximately $148 000 skimmed off its global budget. It went from $40 000 in the positive to needing $59 000 in top-up funding. Smithfield Plains High School has had $167 000 taken from its global budget in this last round from a profit of $52 000, or thereabouts. It now needs approximately $94 000 in top-up funding. Taperoo High School has had $174 000 taken from its global budget. That school went from a profit of approximately $46 000 to needing approximately $13 800 in top-up funding.

Underdale High School, with a global budget decline of $125 000, went from a profit of $800 to needing top-up funding of around $91 000. Wandana Primary School, with a global budget downgrade of roughly $76 000, went from a profit of about $18 000 in round two to needing approximately $34 000 top-up funding in round three. West Lakes Shore Junior, with a $175 000 downgrade to its global budget, went from a profit of $115 000 to needing $50 000 just to keep parity. Woodville Special School, with a downgrade of $89 000 in its global budget, went from a profit of about $37 000 in the last round to needing $45 000 top-up funding in this round.

I could give many other examples. Not only is this a cut overall to the budgets of schools in this third round but it is a change in the reference point. In relation to the profits that schools think they might be getting, they should really take account of the $20 million that has come out of those global budgets and resource profiles. If they compare what they are being offered now with the second round resource profile,

they will get a much more accurate picture of whether their school will be better or worse off. The truth is that a number of schools in Labor electorates will be worse off—not better off.

Time expired.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Most members would be aware that national driving hours regulations are now in force. Today, the minister, thank goodness, has issued a press release, because I and other members have expressed grave concern about the implications of certain provisions in these new regulations which, if not changed, to put it mildly, would be bureaucratic, cumbersome, time consuming and unnecessary. It would give rise to a number of Sir Humphrey Applebys inflicting their views on society and making the lives of a number of hard working people endeavouring to make a living more difficult. Members would be aware of the discussions in which we have been involved to facilitate some changes.

I want to put on the public record the current situation in relation to national road regulations, because I will not sit idly by in this parliament if certain circumstances occur. If my constituents or any other rural constituents become the victims of the overzealous implementation of these regulations, I will have no hesitation in rising in this place and moving the appropriate motion, because these people are trying to make a living under very difficult circumstances. Many sections of the rural industry face downturns in income caused by seasonal conditions, commodity prices and, in many sections of my constituency, plagues such as grasshoppers and locusts. These people are suffering and are far from impressed by governments spending money on huge monuments of little consequence or value, because they do not have the resources to attend or visit them anyway.

They also see increased salaries being paid to already highly paid and resourced public officials. In some cases, the people to whom I refer would be living on less than the latest round of salary increases for the senior bureaucracy. A set of circumstances is currently in vogue which does not make them feel particularly happy or impressed with general administration. So, I make those few comments to give the background to these particularly new, enlightened rules.

At the outset let me say that I am yet to be convinced because, whilst people may be foolish in New South Wales, Queensland or Victoria, I do not think that we need to follow suit. I note that Western Australia and the Northern Territory would not have anything to do with these regulations. So, that in itself is rather interesting. I do give the minister some credit for acting rather swiftly. I know that I could perhaps be described as somewhat difficult in this matter, but I have no alternative, because I am elected to this place to represent the interests, views and needs of my constituents, and I intend to do so vigorously, if necessary. In her statement the minister said:

> Notwithstanding all this effort, since the regulations came into operation, certain practical difficulties have become apparent with the application of the new laws.

I think that is an understatement. It continues:

> Therefore, today I advise that the government intends to act by Thursday next week to amend the Road Traffic (Driving Hours) Regulations to provide a power for the minister to exclude certain types of vehicle operations from all or part of the regulations—but only where the essential features of the national law are retained and public safety is not compromised. I note that New South Wales and Queensland driving hours regulations already contain such a power.

Most interesting. It continues:

> One particular area of concern relates to the application of the law to farmers engaged in harvesting grain and transporting it to silos. Until 1 November these farmers were required to keep a log book, although it appears few farmers appreciate this was so, even within the 100 kilometre zone from their base. Since 1 November, if operating within the 100 kilometre zone of their base, farmers are no longer required to use a log book—only a local area management record. While this form of record keeping represents a less onerous undertaking, farmers are now obliged to comply with the requirement that they do not drive and work for more than 14 hours within any 24 hour period, and that they take a six hour continuous rest away from the vehicle during any 24 hour period.

There was a character who came on the radio and gave an explanation of how these regulations would apply. This is how foolish was the information conveyed. He indicated that if you were sitting in the truck it was counted as time but that if you got out and sat under a tree it was not counted. We then had a debate, and I was told that if the driver sat in the passenger seat with the engine running and the air conditioner on it was not counted. I cannot for the life of me understand the logic of that sort of Sir Humphrey Appleby decision making. However, I am aware that bureaucracy is a wonderful thing, is unique and takes upon itself and exudes great wisdom; but I do not know who is meant to benefit from it. However, the statement continues:

> These requirements do represent a significant change to previous practices, without any clear evidence that these changes are required for safety reasons.

The minister is absolutely correct, and I commend her for that observation. Further:

> Another area of ambiguity is the possible application of the new law to mobile homes.

That will be good. No-one thought of that, and I understand that they are now a most popular form of recreation. This is about as good as what Mr Beazley said at the last federal election when he and some of his whiz kids took a dislike to four-wheel drives. He guaranteed the member for Grey and all other rural members in rural Australia a huge increase in their majorities. One of the most interesting exercises I have carried out was to stand outside the shopping centre at Port Augusta and say to every person with a four-wheel drive,'You know what he's going to do to you.' They said, 'We know what we're going to do to him.' I said, 'He's going to add $7 000 to the cost of your four-wheel drive.' They said, 'He's not going to get the chance.'

I say to the ministers around Australia that these people will not forget this. As a driver asked me the other day: is he meant to stop between Giles and Blackstone because he is running out of time? Sir Humphrey had not thought of that, because if we increase the speed limit to 100 km/h that would mean that a driver driving within the law could get from Port Augusta to Alice Springs. But, if we do not, there is grave doubt that he could. You would think that the bureaucracy in Canberra would have some wit or wisdom and would know something about Australia. Not long ago, a certain enlightened fellow told residents in my constituency that he thought Lake Torrens should be full of water. That is how much he knew. People wonder why on occasions some of us take umbrage at this foolishness, and why we are not keen to give any more power to Canberra. It is not hard to understand why people across rural Australia on Saturday voted No in droves, because they already feel cut off from decision making. The statement continues:

> However, the regulations do not allow for the granting of such exemptions. The foreshadowed regulations will not provide a blanket

exemption for certain classes of vehicle as this may pose unacceptable public safety risks. Rather, the regulations will allow the minister to prescribe appropriate conditions, such as adherence to a code of practice and approval of occupational health and safety as a part of granting exemptions from the law for certain types of vehicle or certain types of operation. This reflects the practice in Western Australia and Northern Territory.

Three hearty cheers! It continues:

Since the practical difficulties to which I have referred above were brought to the government's attention in recent days, I have acted promptly to address this matter. I recognise that the grain harvest is currently under way and the current regulations, while well intended, have the potential to cause significant problems for this important sector of the economy.

I am very pleased that the minister has acted promptly. It is important that the message gets through to the bureaucracy and that they do not set out on an escapade of handing out these dreadful on-the-spot fines about which I spoke at length today. If they do, and if anyone comes to me, the House will be kept well abreast of what is taking place. I will read them out, name the people who signed them and move the appropriate motion. I will not see anyone unnecessarily victimised because of red tape.

Time expired.

Motion carried.

At 4.32 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 16 November at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 9 November 1999

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

METROPOLITAN BEACHES

3. **Mr HILL:** What action has been taken to implement each of the recommendations of the report into the management of Adelaide's beaches released by the minister on 14 November 1998 and have the recommended studies into the effects of seagrass dieback on coastal processes been carried out and if so, what are the details and when will the results of the studies be released?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Environment and Heritage): The 'Report of the Review of the Management of Adelaide Metropolitan Beaches' endorsed the current beach replenishment strategy but made a number of recommendations concerned with refining the strategy. These recommendations and their implementation status are detailed below.

Rationale for beach improvement: recognition of recreational value.

Recommendation:

- Recreational benefits should be given due regard in State Government budgeting and in providing grants to local councils.

Status:

The Coast Protection Board (the board) is funding projects such as the sand replenishment at Seacliff partly for recreational benefit.

Seagrass loss

Recommendation:

- Further study into seagrass loss is urgently needed.

Status:

Seagrass studies, to be carried out by the Environment Protection Agency (EPA) will be a major element of the proposed Adelaide Coastal Waters Study. Tenders for a project manager are currently being assessed. The project will start next year with an budget of $2.1 million and will be completed by June 2003.

Since the release of the review report in 1998 the EPA has continued to monitor seabed changes. The University of Adelaide, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, in consultation with EPA, has undertaken a laboratory and numerical investigation of the effects of seagrass loss on nearshore processes along the Adelaide coastline. EPA has yet to receive the results of the numerical modelling to determine what effect this might have on beach sand erosion for the Adelaide coast as a whole.

Sand sources for beach replenishment.

Recommendations:

- More offshore sand needs to be found for beach replenishment and proved up as a matter of urgency

Status:

The Board has carried out a study of the seabed south of Pt Stanvac to Moana. The study did not reveal a suitable sand supply. Alternative beach management options are being explored.

- Methods for using the Outer Harbor sand source to be investigated

  Status:

  Expected to be included in a proposed study in the year 2000.
- The deposit of coarser sand close to the southern Outer Harbor breakwater should be resurveyed to establish how much of the better quality sand is left.

  Status:

  Project currently under way.
  - Further investigation into the coarser sands thought to be underlying much of the Le Fevre Peninsula and into whether it may be practical to use this sand for beach replenishment.

  Status:

  Project currently under way.
  - Use of fine sand should continue to be investigated in light of any new knowledge or experience elsewhere

  Status:

  Project currently under way.
  - DENR should obtain the services of an appropriate marine geologist to lead an offshore sand search

  Status:

  A consultant was engaged for exploration of the southern area, but further work is envisaged in the northern Adelaide coastal area.

Beach Management between Kingston Park and Glenelg

Recommendations:

- The coast between Brighton and Somerton should continue to be replenished on a biennial basis with sand dredged from Pt Stanvac, until this source is exhausted.

Status:

The sand source has now been exhausted and further exploratory work is being carried out elsewhere.

- Sand should continue to be trucked as required southward from these replenished beaches to maintain sand levels at Kingston Park and at the Brighton and Seacliff Yacht Club.

  Status:

  Carried out annually through the Board's works program.
  - The southern replenishment should not be extended north of the Minda dunes at this stage. This should be reviewed in two to three year's time.

  Status:

  To be reviewed in a proposed study in the year 2000.
  - Short inexpensive groynes should be considered after a trial groyne at Semaphore Park.

  Status:

  Consultants for a study are being assessed.

Beach management at North Glenelg and West Beach

Recommendation:

There may be cost advantages in combining contracts for dredging for sand management at Glenelg with entrance dredging at North Haven.

Status:

EPA and Transport SA are providing sand management associated with the harbours, under approval from the Board for overall beach management. Expected to be included in a proposed study in the year 2000.Beach management from West Beach to Tennyson

Recommendations:

- Erosion at Tennyson should continue to be held by restoring the beach and dune buffer as required and that sand for this should be trucked the short distances along the beach from north of the Grange jetty and from the beach in the vicinity of Estcourt House

Status:

Carried out as required.

- The Henley-Grange sand bar should be investigated as a possible source of sand for redistribution to nearby beaches.

Status:

Expected to be included in a proposed study in the year 2000.

Beach management from north of Tennyson to Outer Harbor

Recommendations:

- Erosion at Semaphore Park should be managed by maintaining a sand buffer and that the sand should be obtained from Semaphore Beach.

Status:

Carried out as required.

- Before using any sand from Semaphore beach for replenishment DENR should ensure that all interested parties are consulted and that the procedures for future management and consultation as recommended in this report are explained.

Status:

Successful public consultation was carried out for this year's operation.

- A trial geofabric groyne is recommended at Pt Malcolm as a precursor to a possible groyne field as a last resort option if required in the future.

  Status:

  Expected to be included as an option in a study for which consultants are being assessed.
- Reference group recommends investigations into:
  - sediment processes between West Beach and Outer Harbor
  - seagrass and sediment dynamics
  - links between these, especially for the northern part of the metropolitan coast.

  And:
  - That the Coast Protection Board work with the EPA to consider how present or proposed studies by the EPA could be extended to provide information on coastal processes.

  Status:

Expected to be included in a proposed study in the year 2000. The Board has approved a contribution toward the EPA study of Gulf St. Vincent, offshore metropolitan Adelaide.

Recommendation:

Attention is drawn to an urgent need to review pollution controls which the EPA is applying to dredging for sand management.

Status:

To be reviewed.

Christies Beach

Recommendation:

- The option of using a combined strategy of groynes and beach replenishment and the availability of replenishment sand should be fully explored by the Noarlunga Council and State Government before proceeding further.

Status:

The Board has offered assistance to Onkaparinga Council to initiate a study.

Hallett Cove

Recommendation:

- Dredged sediment pumped northwards into the nearshore zone should be a requirement for all future dredging at Pt Stanvac and the O'Sullivan Beach boat ramp.

Status:

A requirement of any Board approval.

Biological impacts of dredging in the Northern Beaches area

Recommendation:

- The Review supports further investigation of the biological communities in the region and the susceptibility of seagrasses to reduced water quality prior to authorisation of any dredging operations in the northern beaches are should these be required.

Status:

When required, if dredging is recommended in the findings of the proposed study in the year 2000.

Enhancing community participation

Recommendation:

- The reference group recommends more attention to community consultation and public education by the various agencies active in management of the coast

Status:

The Board has budgeted funds for this purpose.

Northern Beaches Study—Biological Conservation

Recommendation:

- That the Taperoo foreshore area between the North Haven development and Largs Bay should be afforded local 'protected area' status as a Crown Land reserve dedicated for conservation and managed by the Council.

Status:

A study has been initiated on plant communities in the area.

Northern Beaches Study—Dune management

Recommendation:

- That the value of the dunes as a feature of natural or cultural significance needs to be balanced against the fact of their recent formation along an accreting coastline and the need to export limited amounts of sand from the intertidal zone as part of the regional beach management strategy endorsed by the review.

Status:

The Board has provided funding for dune planting.

Northern Beaches Study—Community Involvement

Recommendation:

- That the Port Adelaide Enfield Council and its local community should be actively encouraged and supported in developing a local coastal management plan, as a statutory document under the Development Act.

Status:

Planning is currently under way.

Northern Beaches Study—Management of Beached Seagrass

Recommendation:

That beached seagrass only be removed from:

- Areas of excessive build up next to breakwaters
- Adjacent to access paths to improve access to the shore
- Areas where sand is removed for sand management purposes

Status:

In accordance with current operations.

Management and Funding—Recommendations on Management

Recommendation:

- That a Management Committee, reporting to the Coast Protection Board, should be established and consist of the chief executive of each of the three metropolitan coastal Councils, a nominee of each of these Councils to represent the community, and the Chairman of the Coast Protection Board.

Status:

The chairman of the Metropolitan Seaside Councils Committee has been appointed to the Board under the "advisory committee" provisions of the Coast Protection Act, to provide for better communication between the Councils and Board on beach management issues.

NATIVE VEGETATION

19. **Mr HILL:** Why wasn't the City of Onkaparinga consulted regarding the removal of a significant stand of native vegetation on a property at Chalk Hill Road in McLaren Vale?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Environment and Heritage): In April 1999, the Native Vegetation Council approved clearance of 4.9 ha of native vegetation on a property on Chalk Hill Road, McLaren Vale, on condition that a further 10.3 ha of native vegetation be retained and protected in perpetuity.

It is standard practice, although not a legal requirement, for the Native Vegetation Council to consult the relevant local Government council about each application for native vegetation clearance. With this application, the City of Onkaparinga was not consulted due to an administrative oversight.

Subsequently, revised consultative arrangements have been instituted by the Native Vegetation Council and its support staff to ensure that this problem does not recur.

SCHOOL CARD

28. **Ms KEY:** What number and proportion of students received school cards during 1998 and 1999 at each of the following schools—Black Forest Primary, Cowandilla Primary, Goodwood Primary, Heathfield High, Linden Park Primary, Marryatville High, Mitcham Primary, Nuriootpa High, Plympton Primary, Richmond Primary, Rose Park Primary, Stirling East Primary, Warriappendi, William Light R–12, and Yankalilla Area?

The Hon M.R.BUCKBY (Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training): The following are the number and proportion of students that received school card during the 1998 school year for the schools requested.

School Name	1998 School Card approvals	Proportion of enrolment (%)
Black Forest Primary School	153	29
Cowandilla Primary School	142	95
Goodwood Primary School	73	35
Heathfield High School	122	17
Linden Park Primary School	110	20
Marryatville High School	174	17
Mitcham Primary School	84	19
Nuriootpa High school	227	24
Plympton Primary School	147	51
Richmond Primary School	86	57
Rose Park Primary School	66	15
Stirling East Primary School	59	15
Warriappendi School	35	100
William Light R-12 School	257	38
Yankalilla Area School	214	54

As the final date for submissions for school card is the 5 November 1999 it is not possible to give the number or proportion of students approved for school card at this time. The final school card figures for the 1999 school year will be available in December.