LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 15 November 1995

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Peter Dunn) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The PRESIDENT: I direct that written answers to the following questions on notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 2, 3, 7, 8, 11 to 13, 20, 21, 24, 26, 28, 33 to 35 and 37.

SCHOOL AMALGAMATIONS

2. **The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES:**

1. What are the names of all schools now being reviewed under the program to determine school closures and amalgamations?

2. When is each review expected to be completed for decision by the Minister?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:

Southern Fleurieu Cluster

This involves Victor Harbor High School, Mount Compass and Yankalilla Area Schools, Rapid Bay, Myponga, Goolwa, Victor Harbor Junior Primary and Primary Schools and Willunga High School. A report has been completed and is being considered.

Recommendations on the middle school and joint DECS/TAFE proposal are expected to be prepared by the end of 1995.

Marion Road Corridor Project

This project involves Sturt, South Road, Marion and Clovelly Park Primary Schools and Marion, Daws Road and Hamilton High Schools. The relocation of the former Minda School is also part of this project. A report from the Project Team has been received and is being considered.

A Departmental report is almost complete.

Clare and District Future Education (CADFE) Project

This review has been completed and the review team is now seeking additional information concerning implementation of some of the recommendations of its report. A possible Stage 1 of the project involves the establishment of a middle. school on the High School site in 1997.

Whyalla

A review of educational delivery across the primary schools in Whyalla is in progress and the report will be completed by the end of Term 4, 1995.

Jamestown

This review involves Jamestown Primary and High School and has strong community support. This report will be prepared by the end of Term 4, 1995.

Secondary Language Centre

The Secondary Language Centre currently operates across two campuses (Cowandilla and Blair Athol). A feasibility study into its relocation to Underdale High School is in preparation and should be completed within a month.

Central West District

An investigation of educational delivery across the Central West district is in progress. This involves schools in the districts from Croydon to West Beach to Plympton. This report will be prepared by the end of Term 4, 1995.

Inner City Schools

This review involves Gilles Street, Sturt Street and Parkside Primary Schools. This report is currently with officers from the Department for Education and Children's Services for final compilation.

Girls' Only Primary School

An investigation into the provision of a girls' only primary school is in progress. This investigation will also consider the feasibility of establishing a middle school at Mitcham Girls' High School with years 6 and 7 students. This report will be completed by the end of Term 4, 1995.

Brentwood Rural School and Port Victoria Primary School

The District Superintendent of Education is currently reviewing both these schools and a report is expected by mid Term 4, 1995.

Surrey Downs Junior Primary and Primary School

The District Superintendent of Education is meeting with the Surrey Downs School Council to discuss amalgamation. The junior primary school enrolment is approximately 90 students and the junior primary principal has sought alternative placement to facilitate the amalgamation. It is expected that the amalgamation will commence from the start of 1996.

The Parks High School

A review into The Parks High School has recently been completed and this report is currently with the Department for Education and Children's Services.

Mt Remarkable Schools

Booleroo Centre Primary and High Schools and Melrose and Wilmington Primary Schools are likely to indicate agreement to establish a review team to investigate methods for closer collaboration and co-operation.

METROPOLITAN AREA

3. **The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES:** Have the boundaries of the 'metropolitan area' been amended and, if so, what are the new boundaries?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The boundaries of the metropolitan area have been extended for staffing purposes only. This was agreed as part of negotiations between the South Australian Institute of Teachers and DECS. The change will be effective from 24 January 1996.

Teachers currently employed in the schools will retain their existing industrial rights and newly appointed teachers will still be able to access Office of Government Employee Housing and furniture removal expenses. However, newly appointed teachers will not be eligible for any guaranteed transfer.

Schools now included in the extended metropolitan area but previously considered country schools are:

Angaston Primary School	Arbury Park Outdoor School
Birdwood High School	Birdwood Primary School
Callington Primary School	Echunga Primary School
Freeling Primary School	Goolwa Primary School
Greenock Primary School	Gumeracha Primary School
Hahndorf Child Parent Centre	Hahndorf Primary School
Houghton Primary School	Kapunda Primary School
Kapunda High School	Kersbrook Primary School
Langhorne Creek Primary School	Lenswood Primary School
Light Pass Primary School	Littlehampton Primary SchoolLobethal Primary School
Lyndoch Primary School	Macclesfield Primary School
Meadows Primary School	Milang Primary School
Millbrook Primary School	Moculta Primary School
Mount Barker High School	Mount Barker Primary School
Mount Barker South Primary School	Mount Compass Area School
Mount Pleasant Primary School	Mount Torrens Primary School
Myponga Primary School	Nairne Primary School
Nuriootpa High School	Nuriootpa Primary School
Oakbank Area School	Paracombe Primary School
Port Elliot Primary School	Rapid Bay Primary School
Rosedale Primary School	Roseworthy Primary School
Sandy Creek Primary School	Springton Primary School
Strathalbyn High School	Strathalbyn Primary School
Tanunda Primary School	Two Wells Primary School
Victor Harbor High School	Victor Harbor Junior Primary School
Victor Harbor Primary School	Williamstown Primary School
Woodside Primary School	Yankalilla Area School

PUBLIC SECTOR OFFICES

7. **The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS:**

1. How many branch offices of departments or Statutory Authorities which are the responsibility of the Premier and Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs are located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division?

2. What is the location of each office?

3. What is the role of the office?

4. How many full-time equivalent positions are employed in each office?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:

1. There is only one branch office outside the Adelaide Statistical Division which is the Agent-General's Office.

2. The Agent-General's Office is located at 115 The Strand, London.

3. The Agent-General's Office represents the Government in the United Kingdom and Europe. Its objectives are to:

- secure individual and corporate investment for the State;
- broaden awareness of South Australia's importance as a technologically sophisticated Asian-Pacific location in key sectors, including electronics, defence and aerospace equipment/sales and software development;
- assist in the development of export markets in Europe for selected goods and services, particularly the promotion of wine;
- promote immigration to South Australia;
- promote tourism from Europe to South Australia.

4. The Agent-General's office currently employs 8 FTE's plus the Agent-General.

8. **The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS:**

1. How many branch offices of Departments or Statutory Authorities which are the responsibility of the Deputy Premier and Treasurer and which are located outside the Adelaide Statistical Division?

2. What is the location of each office?

3. What is the role of the office?

4. How many full time equivalent positions are employed in each office?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The following figures are provided in response to the Honourable Member's question.

AGENCY	1 (no. of branch offices)	2 Location of each office		3 Role of the office	4 Full time positions employed in each office
Department for State Services*	11	State Print—	Port Lincoln Whyalla Port Augusta Port Pirie Murray Bridge	Instantgraphics Bureaux situated at the Institutes of TAFE.	All instantgraphics Bureaus have 1 FTE
		State Fleet—	Murray Bridge Berri Mt Gambier	Satellite car pools	1 FTE at Murray Bridge
		State Supply—	Mt Gambier Whyalla	Office/Warehouse	Both Mt Gambier and Whyalla have 2 FTEs and use casuals as required.
		Central Linen—	Port Pirie	Laundry	Port Pirie has 3.6 FTEs
South Australian Asset Management Corporation (SAAMC)	5	Melbourne Sydney New York London Auckland		To continue to perform the banking role of SBSA (State Bank of South Australia) performed in the location until an orderly wind down.	Melbourne—2 Sydney—4 New York—2 London—2 Auckland—7.4

* State Services has recently merged with Building Management to become Services SA, now under the jurisdiction of the Minister for Industrial Affairs.

Information in respect of SGIC has not been included for the purposes of this reply in light of its recent corporatisation in preparation for sale.

11. **The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS:**

1. How many branch offices of Departments or Statutory Authorities which are the responsibility of the Attorney-General and Minister for Consumer Affairs are located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division?

2. What is the location of each office?

3. What is the role of the office?

4. How many full time equivalent positions are employed in each office?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN:

1	2	3	4
Office of Consumer and Business Affairs—4 regional offices Public Trustee—2 regional offices Courts Administration Authority—18 branch offices	Office of Consumer and Business Affairs and Public Trustee share office accommodation in Port Augusta and Mount Gambier (SGIC Building, 11 Helen Street, Mount Gambier and 13 Flinders Terrace, Port Augusta). Office of Consumer and Business Affairs has branch offices in Berri and Whyalla (30 Kay Avenue, Berri and 1st Floor, 15 Harling Terrace, Whyalla) Courts Administration Authority offices are located at: Dyson Road, Christies Beach, Lyons Road, Holden Hill, Hutchinson Street, Mount Barker, 260 St Vincent Street, Port Adelaide, 15 Frobisher Road, Elizabeth, Ahern Street, Berri, 7 McKenzie Street, Ceduna, Wrights Road, Coober Pedy, Graves Street, Kadina, 41 Bay Road, Mount Gambier, 7 Bridge Street, Murray Bridge, 66 Smith Street, Naracoorte, Beauchamp Lane, Port Augusta, 9 MacKay Street, Port Augusta (leased accommodation, Washington Street, Port Lincoln (leased accommodation), Florence Street, Port Pirie, 40 Murray Street, Tanunda, 1 Whitehead Street, Whyalla.	Office of Consumer and Business Affairs The role of the Office is to ensure fair trading in the State of South Australia. Some examples of issues which are dealt with include taking care of disputes between landlords and tenants, business licensing and generally working with consumers and traders to provide a fair, balanced and competitive marketplace. Public Trustee The Public Trustee Office is responsible for the preparation of wills, administering deceased estates, trusts and powers of attorney, and managing protected estates, and provides this specialist, independent service to the people of South Australia. Courts Administration Authority All locations listed are Registries of the Court pursuant to Section 16(4) of the Magistrates Act 1991 with the exception of Port Augusta, which is the office of the Family Conference Team.	Office of Consumer and Business Affairs: Port Augusta 3.73 + 1.00 Careerstart Trainee; Mount Gambier 3.00 + 1.00 Careerstart Trainee; Whyalla 1.00; Berri 3.00 Public Trustee: Port Augusta 2.00; Mount Gambier 2.00; Whyalla 0.00; Berri 0.00 Courts Administration Authority Christies Beach 8.7; Holden Hill 7.7; Mt Barker 3.6 (Sheriff's 0.7); Pt Adelaide 13.4; Elizabeth 12.8; Berri 3.2 (Sheriff's 0.8); Ceduna 1.5 (Sheriff's 0.3); Coober Pedy 1.0 (Family Conferencing 0.6, Sheriff's 0.2); Kadina 1.0 (Sheriff's 0.2); Mt Gambier 4.5 (Court Reporting 0.5, Sheriff's 1.2); Murray Bridge 3.0 (Sheriff's 0.2); Naracoorte 1.0; Pt Augusta 4.0 (Family Conferencing 1.5, Court Reporting 0.5, Sheriff's 1.1); Pt Lincoln 2.5 (Sheriff's 0.2); Pt Pirie 2.5 (Sheriff's 0.5); Tanunda 1.6 (Sheriff's 0.6); Whyalla 3.0 (Sheriff's 0.3)

12. **The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS:**

1. How many branch offices of departments or statutory authorities which are the responsibility of the Minister for Tourism and Minister for Industrial Affairs are located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division?

2. What is the location of each office?

3. What is the role of the office?

4. How many full time equivalent positions are employed in each office?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The South Australian Tourism Commission has no branch offices located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division.

However, four staff are based in interstate locations. These include one sales representative based in each of Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane and attached to the national marketing group (three positions in total). A position of national media coordinator attached to the media and advertising group is also based in Sydney.

Travel Centres which are located in Melbourne, Sydney and Perth are operated under contract arrangements.

DEPARTMENT FOR INDUSTRIAL AFFAIRS

1	2	3	4
4 (Regional Offices)	Berri Regional Office—30 Kay Avenue, Berri	The role of the Department for Industrial Affairs' country Regional Offices is paramount to the overall functions of Regional Services Branch which is responsible for the application of a wide range of legislation associated with the health, safety and working conditions and the safety of the public in South Australia. The Branch is responsible for the application of the following legislation:	4.0
12 (Electorate Offices)	Mount Gambier Regional Office—11 Helen Street, Mount Gambier		8.0
	Port Pirie Regional Office—104 Florence Street, Port Pirie		6.0
	Whyalla Regional Office—15 Darling Terrace, Whyalla		7.0
	Chaffey Electorate Office—Colonial Court, Barmera		1.0
	Custance Electorate Office—Main Street, Kapunda	Dangerous Substances Act, 1979	1.5
	Eyre Electorate Office—Young Street, Port Augusta	Employment Agents Registration Act, 1993	1.4
	Eyre Electorate Office—Merghiny Street, Ceduna	Holidays Act, 1910	0.5
	Finniss Electorate Office—Stuart Street, Victor Harbor	Industrial and Employee Relations Act, 1994	1.0
	Flinders Electorate Office—Tasman Terrace, Port Lincoln	Long Service Leave Act, 1977 Petroleum Products Regulation Act, 1995	1.8
	Frome Electorate Office—The Ellen Centre, Port Pirie	Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act, 1986 Shop Trading Hours Act, 1977	1.0
	Frome Electorate Office—Main Street, Peterborough	At Berri and Mount Gambier, the Office Managers also manage the local offices of the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs, which in turn provide management for the Department's Port Pirie Office.	0.4
	Giles Electorate Office—Westland Shopping Centre, Whyalla		2.0
	Gordon Electorate Office—Percy Street, Mount Gambier		1.0
	Goyder Electorate Office—Owen Terrace, Wallaroo	The role of the Electorate Office is to enable the local Member of Parliament to adequately service his constituents.	1.0
	Kavel Electorate Office—Main Street, Lobethal		1.0
	MacKillop Electorate Office—Davenport Terrace, Millicent		1.0
	Ridley Electorate Office—Sixth Street, Murray Bridge		0.6
	TOTAL		40.2

DEPARTMENT FOR BUILDING MANAGEMENT

1	2	3	4
9	Riverland Area Office—3 McGregor Street, Berri	The role of these offices is to provide an asset management function to other Government agencies by providing maintenance and minor works service to Government owned assets in these areas.	4.0
	Northern Area Office—63 Victoria Parade, Port Augusta		4.0
	Clare Sub-Office—153 Main North Road, Clare		1.5
	Western Area Office—Marine Avenue, Port Lincoln		5.0
	South East Area Office—Cnr White Avenue and Brownes Road, Mount Gambier		5.0
	Mid North Area Office—12-14 Ellen Street, Port Pirie		3.0
	Fringe Area Office—47 Myall Avenue, Murray Bridge		3.0
	Fringe Area Office—7 Scholz Avenue, Nuriootpa		1.5
	Whyalla Area Office—153 Lacey Street, Whyalla		2.5
	TOTAL		29.5

13. **The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS:**

1. How many branch offices of departments or Statutory Authorities which are the responsibility of the Minister for Mines and Energy and Minister for Primary Industries are located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division?

2. What is the location of each office?

3. What is the role of the office?

4. How many full time equivalent positions are employed in each office?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN:

South Australian Research and Development Institute

1. The South Australian Research and Development Institutes has branch offices at the locations listed in the table below.

The offices included in the table, with the exception of Kybybolite, are shared with the Department of Primary Industries South Australia.

2. The locations of the offices are included in the table below.

3. The role of all of the South Australian Research and Development Institute's Offices is to undertake research projects in primary and aquatic industries to enhance the economic development of the State.

4. The number of full time equivalent positions at each office is included in the table below.

South Australian Research and Development Institute

1.	2.	3.	4.
12	Clare	Field Crops	2
	Pt Lincoln	Field Crops, Pasture and Aquatic Research	
	Tasman Tce		6
	Adelaide Place		2
	Liverpool Street		4
	Sth Quay Marina		1
	Cleve	Field Crop Research	1
	Minnipa	Field Crops Research	1
	Kybybolite	Livestock, Pasture and Field Crops Research	3.4

	South East Regional Headquarters, Naracoorte	Field Crop Research	4
	Mt Gambier	Aquatic Research	1
	Turretfield	Livestock, Pasture and Field Crop Research	24
	Loxton	Horticulture and Pasture Research	9

Primary Industries South Australia (PISA)

1.	2.	3.	4.
33	Ceduna	Horticulture	6.6
	Clare	Sustainable Resources	6.6
		Livestock	2.0
		Field Crops	4.1
	Cleve	Sustainable Resources	5.3
		Field Crops	2.6
	Jamestown	Sustainable Resources	4.6
		Livestock	1.0
		Field Crops	3.8
	Kadina	Sustainable Resources	3.0
		Field Crops	3.0
		Fisheries	2.0
	Kingston	Fisheries	2.0
	Keith	Sustainable Resources	3.0
		Livestock	2.4
		Field Crops	1.0
	Kybybolite	Livestock	1.1
	Kuitpo	Forestry	19.0
	Kingscote	Sustainable Resources	1.5
		Livestock	1.3
		Field Crops	0.5
	Lameroo	Sustainable Resources	1.0
		Field Crops	1.0
	Lenswood	Sustainable Resources	4.0
		Horticulture	23.0
	Loxton	Sustainable Resources	20.1
		Horticulture	24.7
		Field Crops	1.0
	Minnipa	Field Crops	11.5
	Mt Burr	Forestry	25.0
	Mt Crawford	Forestry	18.0
	Murray Bridge	Sustainable Resources	28.3
		Livestock	1.0
		Field Crops	7.2
	Mt Gambier	Horticulture	3.6
		Livestock	3.0
		Field Crops	1.0
		Fisheries	6.0
		Forestry	91.0
	Mt Barker	Sustainable Resources	7.0
		Livestock	21.0
		Field Crops	1.0
	Naracoorte	Sustainable Resources	1.0
	Nuriootpa	Sustainable Resources	4.0
		Horticulture	8.4
		Livestock	6.6
		Field Crops	2.8
	Oodlawirra	Horticulture	3.1
	Penola	Forestry	17.0
	Pt Augusta	Sustainable Resources	10.5
		Horticulture	1.4
		Livestock	2.0
	Pt Lincoln	Sustainable Resources	6.9
		Livestock	2.0
		Field Crops	5.0
		Fisheries	3.0
	Renmark	Horticulture	14.1
	SE Headquarters	Sustainable Resources	8.9
		Livestock	11.9
		Field Crops	5.0
	Streaky Bay	Sustainable Resources	4.5
		Livestock	1.0
		Field Crops	2.5
		Fisheries	2.0
	Struan	Livestock	13.7
	Turretfield	Livestock	2.9
		Field Crops	1.0
	Victor Harbor	Sustainable Resources	2.0
		Livestock	1.0
		Field Crops	1.0
	Waikerie	Horticulture	2.0
	Wirrabara	Forestry	10

Mines and Energy South Australia

1.	2.	3.	4.
7	Peterborough	Staff of the Peterborough Office inspect mining operations in the north east region of the State for compliance with statutory requirements and provide advice and assistance to prospectors and miners on gold mining and recovery techniques. They encourage prospecting and mining of gold in South Australia by processing ore parcels for prospectors and miners through the State Gold Battery.	2.0 full time
	Andamooka	*	0.6
	Coober Pedy	*	4.9
	Mintabie	*The opal field offices at Coober Pedy, Mintabie and Andamooka provide services to opal miners, including issuing Precious Stones Prospecting Permits and licences to purchase explosives, and registration of Precious Stones Claim. Staff undertake field inspections to ensure mines comply with statutory requirements, and provide advice to miners and the public on opal mining.	1.8
	Naracoorte	*	6.1
	Mt Gambier	*	2.0
	Crystal Brook	* Officers at Naracoorte, Mt Gambier and Crystal Brook provide groundwater advice to landholders and undertake investigations of groundwater resources to ensure their sustainable development.	1.0

FULL-TIME EQUIVALENTS

20. **The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS:** How many full-time equivalent positions under the Government Management and Employment Act or other South Australian Acts which are the responsibility of the Premier and Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs and which are located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division, have been lost in the period from 11 December 1993 until 31 January 1995?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: There have been no full-time positions located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division which have been lost under the Premier's and Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs responsibility in the period between 11 December 1993 and 31 January 1995.

21. **The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS:** How many full time equivalent positions under the Government Management and Employment Act or other South Australian Acts which are the responsibility of the Deputy Premier and Treasurer and which are located outside the Adelaide Statistical Division, have been lost in the period from 11 December 1993 until 31 January 1995?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The following figures are provided in response to the Honourable Member's question:

State Services*	18.4 FTE
South Australian Asset Management Corporation (SAAMC)	13 FTE (outside SA)#

* State Services has recently merged with Building Management to become Services SA, now under the jurisdiction of the Minister for Industrial Affairs.

\# This figure relates to the period 1 July 1994 to 31 January 1995. Figures in respect of the period 11 December 1993 to 30 June 1994 (which relate to the old State Bank) are not readily available to SAAMC. The number of full time positions lost to 13 October 1995 is 30 (all outside South Australia).

Information in respect of SGIC has not been included for the purposes of this reply in light of its recent corporatisation in preparation for sale.

24. **The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS:** How many full-time equivalent positions under the Government Management and Employment Act or other South Australian Acts which are the responsibility of the Attorney-General and Minister for Consumer Affairs and which are located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division, have been lost in the period from 11 December 1993 until 31 January 1995?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: One full-time equivalent position (1.0 FTE) was lost from the Berri branch of the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs on 24 June 1994.

3.4 FTEs have been lost in Courts Administration Authority during the period 11 December 1993 to 31 January 1995. These lost positions relate to the decision to cease arrangements that provided for residential magistrates for Mount Gambier and Port Augusta. However, the reduction in positions did not reduce the services provided and, in fact, the level of service has been enhanced.

26. **The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS:** How many full-time equivalent positions under the Government Management and Employment Act or other South Australian Acts which are the responsibility of the Minister for Mines and Energy and Minister for Primary Industries and which are located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division, have been lost in the period from 11 December 1993 until 31 January 1995?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN:

Department of Primary Industries (SA)

The total positions lost from the Department of Primary Industries (SA) from outside the Adelaide Statistical Division between 11/12/93 and 31/1/95 is 40.94 FTE.

Department of Mines and Energy

There has been a reduction by 4 in the number of full-time equivalent positions permanently based outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division in the period 11/12/93 to 31/1/95.

The South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI)

The South Australian Research and Development Institute has reduced their full-time equivalent positions located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Area by 12 in the period between 11 December 1993 until 31 January 1995.

Pipelines Authority of South Australia (PASA)

During the period 11 December 1993 until 31 January 1995, PASA's Northern District Depot, Peterborough, has lost fifteen (15) full-time equivalent positions.

As of 1 July 1995 PASA no longer belongs to the Government due to its sale.

28. **The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS:** How many full-time equivalent positions under the Government Management and Employment Act or other South Australian Acts which are the responsibility of the Minister for Transport, Minister for the Arts and Minister for the Status of Women and which are located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division, have been lost in the period from 11 December 1993 until 31 January 1995?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:

Department of Transport—98 full time equivalents, which are located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division, have been lost in the period from 11 December 1993 until 31 January 1995.

TransAdelaide—There were no TransAdelaide positions lost, as TransAdelaide does not have any offices or staff operating outside the Adelaide Statistical Division.

Passenger Transport Board—No full time equivalent positions, which are located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division, have been lost in the period from 11 December 1993 until 31 January 1995.

Ports Corp South Australia—The number of full time equivalent positions lost in the period from 11 December 1993 until 31 January 1995 which are located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division, by Ports Corp South Australia, formerly Marine and Harbors Agency, for the Government Management and Employment Act and the Port Services Employee Award personnel:

No. of positions lost		Reason
GME	PSE	
0	5	TSP
1	1	Resignation
5	0.4	Transfer of duties to the Department of Transport
6	6.4	

Transport Policy Unit—No full time equivalent positions, which are located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division, have been lost in the period from 11 December 1993 until 31 January 1995.

Office for the Status of Women—No full time equivalent positions, which are located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division, have been lost in the period from 11 December 1993 until 31 January 1995.

Department for the Arts and Cultural Development—SA Country Arts Trust—3 FTEs, which are located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division, have been lost in the period from 11 December 1993 until 31 January 1995.

History Trust of SA—2 FTEs, which are located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division, have been lost in the period from 11 December 1993 until 31 January 1995.

33. **The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS:** How many full-time equivalent positions under the Government Management and Employment Act or other South Australian Acts which are the responsibility of the Premier and Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs are located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: There are 8 full-time positions under the responsibility of the Premier and Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs located outside the Adelaide Statistical Division. They are located in the Agent-General's Office, London.

34. **The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS:** How many full-time equivalent positions under the Government Management and Employment Act or other South Australian Acts which are the responsibility of the Deputy Premier and Treasurer are located outside the Adelaide Statistical Division?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The following figures are provided in response to the Honourable Member's question concerning the number of full time equivalent positions outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division:

Department for State Services*	13.6 FTE (casuals used as required)
South Australian Asset Management (SAAMC)	17.4 FTE (outside SA)

* State Services has recently merged with Building Management to become Services SA, now under the jurisdiction of the Minister for Industrial Affairs.

Information in respect of SGIC has not been included for the purposes of this reply in light of its recent corporatisation in preparation for sale.

35. **The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS:** How many full-time equivalent positions under the Government Management and Employment Act or other South Australian Acts which are the responsibility of the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development and Minister for Infrastructure are located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:

South Australian Water Corporation—As at 29 September 1995 there were 558.2 full time equivalent positions located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division.

ETSA Corporation—As at January 1995 there were 1 246 full time equivalent positions located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division.

Economic Development Authority—Nil

MFP Australia—Nil

37. **The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS:** How many full-time equivalent positions under the Government Management and Employment Act or other South Australian Acts which are the responsibility of the Attorney-General and Minister for Consumer Affairs are located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: There are a total of 99.4 full-time equivalent positions. They are comprised of the following breakdown:

Regional Office	Courts Administration Authority	Public Trustee	Office of Consumer & Business Affairs
Port Augusta		2.00	4.00
Mount Gambier		2.00	3.00
Whyalla		0.00	1.00
Berri			3.00
TOTAL	84.4	4.00	11.00

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Transport (Hon. Diana Laidlaw)—

Reports, 1994-95—
Department of Housing and Urban Development
South Australian Co-operative Housing Authority
Corporation By-laws—Walkerville—No. 1—Repeal and Renumbering of By-laws.
District Council By-laws—
Angaston—No. 8—Moveable Signs on Streets and Roads
Kapunda—
No. 1—Permits and Penalties
No. 2—Moveable Signs
No. 3—Council Land
No. 4—Fire Prevention
Millicent—
No. 1—Permits and Penalties
No. 2—Moveable Signs
No. 3—Streets
No. 4—Garbage Removal
No. 5—Council Land
No. 6—Caravans and Camping
No. 7—Animals and Birds
No. 8—Dogs
No. 9—Bees.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I bring up the ninth report 1995-96 of the committee and move:

That the report be read.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I bring up the tenth report 1995-96 of the committee and move:

That the report be read.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I bring up the eleventh report 1995-96 of the committee.

QUESTION TIME

OMBUDSMAN'S REPORT

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question on the subject of the Ombudsman's annual report.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: The Ombudsman's annual report for the 1994-95 financial year, which was tabled in Parliament yesterday, indicated dramatic increases in complaints in relation to a number of specified agencies. The agencies that were subject to the most striking increases were the EWS, complaints up by 71 per cent; Department of Education and Children's Services, complaints up by 74 per cent; and the Housing Trust, complaints about which were up by 34 per cent. These agencies were singled out for special attention.

As reported in the *Advertiser* today, the Housing Trust complaints related largely to inadequate maintenance. The EWS complaints related mostly to account disputes and behaviour of staff, while Education Department complaints ranged from harassment of students to problems with bus services and report cards. It is no coincidence that each of these agencies have suffered substantial budget cuts at the hands of the Liberal Government. These increases in complaints have no doubt placed an increased burden on the staff of the Ombudsman. My questions are:

1. Has the Attorney considered the possibility that drastic cuts in public expenditure will lead to public dissatisfaction and a consequent increase in complaints?

2. Will the Attorney undertake to increase funding for the Ombudsman's office to ensure that the high level of complaints can be expeditiously and satisfactorily examined?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Ombudsman has not sought additional resources and I do not intend to grant additional resources or to work through that issue unless representations are made to me by the Ombudsman. I know that the Ombudsman is hard worked. The fact is that everybody in Government is hard worked. The Ombudsman is a statutory office holder serviced by staff of the Attorney-General's Department.

I should like to put in context the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition, because the Ombudsman says that there were increases in the level of complaints in some areas in comparison with the previous year. The Ombudsman states:

> In the case of the South Australian Housing Trust, the increase was over 30 per cent; Engineering and Water Supply Department (over 60 per cent increase); and the Department for Education and Children Services (a 50 per cent increase).

He continues, and I stress this:

> These rises may not be attributed to any systemic error or show any special area of concern, but further monitoring by the relevant agencies and my office should maintain quality administration.

Then, to get this into a proper context, the Ombudsman states:

> With statistical information, it is tempting to generalise and say that many complaints may be characterised as being public concern about the perceived quality of official communication or lack of communication. Often these too may be nothing more than individual dissatisfaction with an unfavourable outcome. Many complaints are about delay, which may or may not be reasonable in all the circumstances of a case. All kinds of simplistic abstractions

may be made with statistical data, but I doubt very much whether it would be helpful to any agency. I am reluctant to engage in such exercise, as it has the regressive quality of *reductio ad absurdum* and ultimately everything may be restated simply as an error in thinking, which includes human errors that are reasonably foreseeable (and those which are not) or mechanical and equipment errors (such as warn components of water meters).

In most instances, I have endeavoured to maintain the complainant's description of the grievance, subject of course to any correction of language and due allowance for rationality, proportionality or plain commonsense as may be necessary.

Another general observation is that my office received few complaints that were attributed directly to economic circumstances. This may be significant, I think, because there were times past when complainants made express reference to economic hardship.

Compare that, Mr President. It may be significant because there were times past when complainants made express reference to economic hardship and now he is saying that his office received few complaints that were attributed directly to economic circumstances. Then he goes on to state:

I do not doubt, however, that some complaints relating to problems with payment of accounts, may be at least partly attributable to individual hardship. Reduction of economic concerns may also be partly attributed to the shifts and changes of my jurisdiction such as the case of the State Bank.

He then goes on to make a number of observations.

The Ombudsman is a statutory officer who reports directly to Parliament and that is a position which is to be supported. Quite fearlessly, he has made observations about various agencies and various complaints, and some of them are matters of concern. But that, after all, is the job of the Ombudsman: to ensure proper public accountability. Any Government which seeks to criticise an Ombudsman—or an Opposition member for that matter—for doing his or her job needs to have their motives questioned.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The fact is—as the Hon. Carolyn Pickles not having been in Government will not know and as the Hon. Anne Levy having been in Government will know—that frequently there are things which occur which should not occur because of administrative difficulty, oversight or other particular problem. The important thing is that they are drawn to the attention of the executive level of a particular department or agency, and also to the Minister. It is also important that they are addressed publicly, because being addressed publicly provides a reassurance to the public that they are not being scorned or brushed to one side.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: He's doing a very good job.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Of course, the Ombudsman is doing a good job. I am saying that and I am praising the approach that he takes. For a Government it is healthy if matters which cause concern to people such as the Ombudsman or the Auditor-General are raised publicly because it reassures the public and gives them confidence in our democratic system. In respect of the Ombudsman's office, the report is very comprehensive. It provides valuable information for the public record. The important fact is that, from the perspective of Ministers and agencies, it will be important to ensure that some of the difficulties which have been identified are addressed so that they do not occur in the future. The Ombudsman has my full support. I have no criticism to make of the Ombudsman.

MEMBERS' BEHAVIOUR

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Status of Women a question about parliamentary behaviour.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: Yesterday in this place the Opposition raised the matter of the behaviour of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Multicultural Affairs Commission. That happened after a lengthy statement made by the Leader of the Government in which he read out a number of letters. In that contribution aspersions were cast on people who had raised these issues, and the Leader quoted from a letter. The assertion was, quite clearly—and it was debated in this Chamber—that they were all Labor Party people. We were asked to consider that the correspondence that the Government had received was, in fact, accurate. Today the Opposition has received a copy of a letter, which I understand was sent to the Hon. Dean Brown. It is disturbing, indeed and, as there was extensive reading from letters yesterday, I will quote some of the letter for the benefit of members, to give some indication as to the background of this matter and the genuineness of the authors. The letter reads:

Writing to you was not an easy decision for us to make, and if it were not for the inappropriate and almost shocking behaviour exhibited by Mr Julian Stefani at our annual general meeting, which we found too much to be tolerated further, this letter would not have been written at all. The staff at the Indochinese Australian Women's Association (ICHAWA) have been through very difficult times for trying to raise a number of genuine issues of great concern with regard to the handling of the financial matters at ICHAWA. Over a period of almost two years now, several meetings related to the above issue have taken place between the Executive Council and staff with the sudden appearance of Mr Julian Stefani at one of them.

The presence of a politician surprised the staff; however, in his introductory remarks, Mr Stefani reassured us that he was there to listen to our concerns and assist the association to resolve them. He also accentuated the importance of staff being open and honest in their statements. Mr Stefani listened to what the staff had to say, asked a number of questions and then, in a conspicuously intimidating manner, gave a 45 minute lecture on defamation.

With a fixed stare at each staff member in turn, he concluded this meeting by stating that those who are not careful about what they say pay dearly under Australian law.

This is a point that has often been made by Mr Stefani in this Chamber and to members of the Opposition in particular. The letter continues:

We realised that our genuine concerns had escaped Mr Stefani's attention and had been translated into potentially defamatory remarks. We came to understand that there was obviously no way in which we could raise genuine concerns without compromising ourselves legally and we were at a complete loss as to what to do. This meeting resulted in extreme anxiety and many sleepless nights for the staff. On the one hand, being people with personal and professional integrity, we could not ignore any longer the absence of any guidelines for proper control of financial operations at ICHAWA and, on the other hand, we became acutely aware of our powerlessness and insignificance compared with the forces apparently arrayed against us.

Our fears were confirmed when two more private meetings were held with Mr Stefani and two of the staff members individually at the former President's home. Each meeting lasted 2.5-3 hours and defamation was the continual focus of discussion, with reference to the damage this would do to the community if the issue was pursued further in this way. The clear message was that we should speak of these concerns no further or we would find ourselves in great trouble.

For us, ordinary citizens, the esoteric knowledge of the required professional conduct of a politician is not accessible; however, even the staff of ICHAWA, none of whom has experienced democracy in his or her own country, nor within the association's walls, know that intimidation of people who recognise genuine matters of concern, whatever they may be related to, is not a feature of a truly democratic society. We have taken our courage and our convictions into our hands in writing and using our personal resources to send this letter and we ask that you appoint an independent person to look into these matters.

It is signed by these four people. Yesterday in this place I asked the Hon. Mr Stefani if he would apologise—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: —to the women who were threatened by his behaviour at the annual general meeting of the Indochinese Australian Women's Association and whether he would desist from the threat—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I cannot hear the question and I suspect that *Hansard* cannot hear the question. I would ask that the questioner be given due deference and that he be able to ask his question in silence.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I rise on a point of order, Mr President: I would ask the honourable member whether he will table the correspondence to which he has just referred.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: The honourable member raised a point of order; I assume that there is no point of order, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: If the honourable member moves a motion, it can be debated; it has to be moved in the form of a motion. The Hon. Ron Roberts.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I am sorry that you were unable to hear the question, Mr President, so I will start this part of it again. Yesterday in this place I asked the Hon. Mr Stefani whether he would apologise to the women who were threatened by his behaviour at the annual general meeting of the Indochinese Australian Women's Association and particularly whether he would desist from the threat to further victimise the women. The Hon. Mr Stefani said, 'The answer is "No".' The Hon. Mr Stefani appears to believe that it is appropriate for a member of Parliament to victimise members of ethnic organisations with which he has had a disagreement.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I rise on a point of order, Mr President. That is clear opinion. The honourable member has stood up and said there has been victimisation: that is clear opinion.

The PRESIDENT: Is the Hon. Mr Roberts quoting, or is this your question?

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: It is part of the question, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: That is opinion, so I uphold the point of order. I would ask you to rephrase your question in a different fashion.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I would assert that Mr Stefani believes that it is appropriate to intimidate these members.The Premier has informed the Parliament—

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I rise on a point of order, Mr President. The honourable member is asserting that I believe in something and he does not know what I believe in.

The PRESIDENT: There is no point of order. The Hon. Ron Roberts.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: The Premier has informed this Parliament that threatening and intimidating behaviour towards women members of community groups by senior members of his Government is appropriate as long as those women can be accused of being ALP members. My questions to the Minister for the Status of Women are:

1. Will she act to protect those members of the Indochinese Australian Women's Association from threatened victimisation by the Hon. Mr Julian Stefani and, if not, why not?

2. Secondly, will she as the Minister for the Status of Women support the call for an independent inquiry into these allegations with respect to the conduct of the Secretary of the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to table a copy of the letter of 12 November addressed to the Premier and Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs, the letter being the one which the honourable member refused to table but from which he read in this instance.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: It is important to recognise that as each day goes by it appears that the number of people complaining about these matters drops off. I do not have the letter in front of me now, but I know that it contains four names; I understand that the original complaint came from five. Perhaps that suggests that some of the frustration and concern in this matter is also dissipating. I believe that a number of the matters that have been discussed and addressed to the Premier are matters that the Premier will consider in his role as Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs, and it is proper that it be handled in that way.

KANGAROO ISLAND ECOTOURISM DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister for Environment and Natural Resources, a question about Kangaroo Island ecotourism development.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I have correspondence signed by a number of people who have concerns about the emerging projects that are starting to be discussed—rather than firm projects—with respect to Kangaroo Island. The signatories to the letter from the Kangaroo Island Tourism Operators bus and coach drivers are expressing concern about the way in which projects are being discussed and developed. The operators are not opposed, as they point out in their letter, to tourism development *per se*, nor are they opposed to particular projects *per se*, but they are concerned about some aspects of the proposals.

I have asked questions in this place about protecting some or all of the potential ecotourist areas in this State from over-development. I guess the concerns within the letter that I have received are spelling that out with some detail. One of the areas that triggered their concern was an advertisement placed in the *Advertiser* of 16 October 1995 by the Department for Environment and Natural Resources, re Kangaroo Island West District. The advertisement reads:

> Tenders are sought for the preparation of:
>
> 1. detailed landscape design plans and building specification plans for the construction of a 250 metre boardwalk, access ramp and viewing platform at Remarkable Rocks;
> 2. detailed landscape design plans for a car and bus parking facility at Remarkable Rocks; and
> 3. the preparation of detailed landscape design plans and building specification plans for the construction of a raised 220 metre boardwalk at Cape du Couedic.
>
> All works are within Flinders Chase National Park, approximately 120 km south-west of Kingscote on Kangaroo Island. Specifications for works are available from Flinders Chase National Park or Department of Environment and Natural Resources. . .

The concern that the tourism operators, bus coach drivers and other residents on Kangaroo Island are outlining is that the advertisements are possibly pre-empting the outcomes of the desirability of such programs to be developed—not only the nature but the form and structure by which the nature of those

development programs will be put in place. The operators and signatories to the letter establish the following:

> At this point we would emphasise that we support development of park facilities and do not wish to interfere in general park management decisions. However, as a group of operators who make extensive use of park facilities and contribute very substantially to park revenues, we ask that we be consulted on matters relating to the facilities and services offered to our passengers in the setting up of these priorities.

Basically, their concerns are the detail in establishing these projects. The sensitivities of development on Kangaroo Island will accelerate with the construction of the road. I guess that is what is the driving force behind the concerns that people have on the island. My questions are:

1. What consultation processes will the Government develop for Kangaroo Island to ensure that all groups, organisations and individuals are consulted during the development stages of ecotourism projects?

2. When will the Government set up a process that does involve all those vested interests at the appropriate times?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will refer the honourable member's questions to the Minister and bring back a reply.

HINDMARSH ISLAND BRIDGE ROYAL COMMISSION

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the attendance of people in the public gallery of the royal commission into Ngarrindjeri women's beliefs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: All publicly open sessions of the royal commission have been very well attended, and often there has been standing room only. Indeed, not all interested people have been able to gain entry. I have been informed that a Mr Peter Miller, who happens to be a staff member of the Liberal member for Barker, Mr Ian McLachlan, has attended not just some sessions, but every session, of the royal commission. No matter how crowded the room has been, on every occasion Mr Miller has gained entry while others, who could equally argue an interest, have not been able to get in. My questions are:

1. Why has Mr Miller at all times been able to gain entry to the public gallery of the royal commission when others have not been able to do so?

2. Was some special arrangement made for him and, if so, by whom and why?

3. Does the Attorney-General consider that good use has been made of taxpayers' dollars by Mr McLachlan sending his staff member along to sittings of the commission when he could have found out what had happened via the media, like most other people?

4. Will the Attorney-General report the presence of Mr Miller at the royal commission to the Federal Minister for Administrative Affairs and to the Federal Liberal Party's Wastewatch Committee?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The first thing is that the honourable member's view that the royal commission is an inquiry into women's beliefs quite obviously is wrong. If one looks at the terms of reference, one sees that it is nothing of the sort. The second thing is that I do not have any control over who does or does not attend the hearings of the royal commission: that is within the authority of the Royal Commissioner. I have not heard any complaints about the way she has handled the question of access to the gallery.

I know that there have been closed sessions on occasions, and I am aware that there have been public sessions. People who go are entitled to entry provided that the sessions are not closed and provided that there is adequate room. As I say, it is a matter for the Royal Commissioner. I do not know whether a staff member of Mr Ian McLachlan has been there all the time. I do know that Mr McLachlan did make some representations through his counsel in the early stages of the commission, particularly in relation to his own position *vis-a-vis* the royal commission, remembering that he stood down from his position as the shadow Minister in consequence of some issues which were raised publicly about the Saunders report and material which related thereto. I should have thought that he would have some interest in seeing what happened at the royal commission.

As to whether or not it is a good use of taxpayers' money, the honourable member can ask Mr McLachlan that. The fact of the matter is that he cannot glean from the media all the information about what happens at the royal commission. The media reflects only a very small part of what happens each day. The transcript is quite extensive. There are various interests represented at the royal commission, and all have access to the transcript, as far as I am aware.

I would have thought that it was a matter for Mr McLachlan to determine whether or not it was appropriate in the circumstances for him to be aware of what was happening. If someone from his office has been attending, then obviously he thinks it is appropriate. I would have thought that this royal commission is a matter of interest at the Federal level as much as it is at the State level, particularly in the context of the statements made by the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, some of which have been quite virulent in relation to the royal commission, and I think quite unjustifiably so. In those circumstances, if it is good enough for the Federal Minister to be taking an interest in this, as it is part of his portfolio responsibility, it is equally available to other members of the Federal Parliament, whether or not spokespersons on particular issues, to take an interest in it.

BRIGHTON JETTY

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Will the Minister for Transport detail to the Council the costs so far incurred in the construction of the new Brighton jetty and say whether recent bad weather has delayed construction? If so, what additional costs have resulted? Will the Minister be seeking additional sponsorship funds towards the costs of the jetty?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Bad weather has increased the time frame for completion of the jetty. Initially it was to be completed late this month but the completion date will now be May next year. Another factor was that a number of tests had to be conducted by the marine safety section of the Ports Corporation in terms of the infrastructure and the seabed onto which the jetty was to be placed. Both the bad weather and these additional tests have increased the time for completion of the jetty and increased the cost.

In addition, the costs have been increased by a variety of initiatives that have been proposed by the Brighton community and the Brighton council, for which the Brighton council will be responsible. Telstra recently completed its designs for this venture (it is a joint venture between the Brighton council, Telstra and the Government) and is revising its costs at this time. I will be in a position shortly to advise

the honourable member and the Council in terms of the additional costs overall.

TECHNOLOGY PARK

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to table a copy of a ministerial statement made in another place today by the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development on Technology Park.

Leave granted.

SUBMARINE CORPORATION

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services, representing the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development, a question about the Australian Submarine Corporation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: In yesterday's *Australian* it was reported that the Minister for Defence (Senator Ray) indicated that he will 'ditch a $1 billion option to build two extra submarines for the Navy unless the Prime Minister, Mr Keating, allocates special funding to the project'. I understand that a final decision about these two submarines will not be made until the end of next year, and it was reported in the paper that those comments raised serious doubts about whether construction of those two extra submarines would ever proceed. I understand that the Federal Government has an option to build an extra two submarines at a cost of $500 million each, which in effect is a $1 billion order to a South Australian company—the Australian Submarine Corporation.

The report goes on to say that the extra two submarines would sharply increase Australia's future military strike capability and would provide a major boost to the shipbuilding industry, both facts having been acknowledged as correct by Senator Ray. I understand that in today's *Advertiser* it was further reported that the Australian Submarine Corporation's 930-strong work force will be subject to cuts if this contract is not secured. Indeed, it was also reported:

> In June the ASC's Managing Director, Mr Hans Ohff, warned staff would be shed gradually if extra work could not be secured.

In the light of that, my questions to the Minister are as follows:

1. Will the Minister write to the Prime Minister reminding him of the importance of this project to South Australia and seek an announcement of the extension of the program prior to the next Federal election?

2. Will the Minister write to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Rann) urging him to publicly call on the Prime Minister to announce a commitment to the project prior to the next Federal election?

3. Will the Minister assure the Council that this project will not be lost in the same way that the Hon. Mr Rann lost the Grand Prix to this State?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Did Michael Atkinson write that for you as well? I would be happy to refer the honourable member's questions to the Minister and bring back a reply.

CARCLEW YOUTH ARTS CENTRE

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for the Arts a question about Carclew Youth Arts Centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: There have been persistent rumours in the *City Messenger* that the Carclew building is to be sold. This has been denied by the Director of Carclew, presumably on instructions from the department. Selling Carclew would indeed be like selling the family silver, but if it were sold it would not necessarily mean the end of the youth arts programs devised and run by Carclew as they could, I presume, transfer to another venue. I understand that the Lion Theatre was previously mentioned as a possible site should the Fringe permanently move its location to the east end of Rundle Street.

Just as serious, if not more so, is the persistent rumour that the whole Carclew youth arts program is to be axed. It has had its funding allocated for 1996, but all its plans for 1997—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: It has had funding allocated and you say it can be scrapped.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The Minister is not listening. It has had its funding allocated for 1996, but the rumour is that it will be axed in next year's budget and so receive no funding for 1997. All its plans for 1997 are being thrown into turmoil by suggestions that it will be abolished. For those who are not familiar with the youth arts scene in South Australia, the Carclew program is funded through the South Australian Youth Arts Board known as SAYAB, along with the SAYAB grants program to youth arts organisations and individuals and the Come Out Festival.

Unlike the grants program, which reacts to applications made by members of the community, Carclew is pro-active in its approach to youth arts. It determines needs and deficiencies in youth arts and initiates activities to foster youth arts and develop creativity and initiative in young people.

Tens of thousands of young people have benefited from the activities run from Carclew—young people from all parts of the metropolitan area, I can stress, and from all around the State through outreach programs. The highly successful Artery programs are just one example of the myriad activities coming from Carclew which, incidentally, cater for young people up to the age of 25 years, well past school age, and the declining arts activities funded through the Education Department.

There are many practising artists in South Australia who got their first chance through Carclew and who are loud in their praise of the encouragement and inspiration they received there. Any society valuing artistic activity must pay attention to youth arts as that is where the next generation of artists will come from. Carclew serves that function magnificently. So, suggestions that Carclew will be closed are extremely disturbing and unbelievably short-sighted for the whole future of the arts in this State.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: If you have not heard the rumours, I am sorry for you: I keep hearing them from all over the place.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: No, from many people in the arts area.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ron Roberts.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Furthermore, 1997 is planned to be a national year of youth arts activity, with the federally funded Youth Arts Festival to be known as WIRED scheduled for April 1997. Carclew and Come Out, with the Country Arts Trust, are already working on plans for South

Australia's contribution to WIRED, which will have statewide activity. I understand that some contracts have already been concluded and that considerable Federal funding is expected to come our way as a result. All this would have to be abandoned if Carclew no longer existed, and South Australia would miss out on the national youth arts scene of 1997.

I realise that the Minister is following a policy of closing one artistic institution per year. We had the Film and Video Centre in 1994 and Old Parliament House museum in 1995. Unless the Government changes at the next election, we will be in danger of running out of arts institutions to close, particularly those which are unique to South Australia and which give us the cultural edge on other States. I ask the Minister:

1. Will the Carclew building, the old Bonython home, be sold off by this Government?

2. Is the Carclew program of youth arts to be axed in 1997, despite the incredible damage that this will do to youth arts in this State and to our cultural credibility throughout Australia?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member has been President of this Chamber and she should know that that question was peppered with opinion from go to whoa. I have asked previously for members not to do that. Standing Orders do not allow for it. I ask members to couch their questions in such a way that they do not contain opinion or debate.

The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: It was hard to work out what was the motivation for the honourable member's question. I could not help thinking that the Leader of the Opposition is under some pressure and that perhaps the Hon. Anne Levy was running for that, trying to beat up stories, get some publicity and put on pressure. I know that she is hosting a party tomorrow night because she is the longest serving woman member of Parliament from tomorrow, so perhaps she is on her way out and wants to get some publicity as she goes.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Answer the question: are you going to sell Carclew or not?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I am just saying that it is interesting to wonder what is the motivation for such a foul question in terms of the status of the people who work in the industry and also in terms of youth arts in general. I think it is—

The Hon. Anne Levy: Just answer the question.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Just answer the question! The honourable member went on, inflaming the situation, and beating up a story where there is no story. It is important to put this into perspective. When the Liberal Government established the South Australian Youth Performing Arts Council up at Carclew between 1979 and 1982, the focus of activity was on performing arts. For good reason, when the Hon. Anne Levy was Minister for the Arts, she brought in a Bill that sought to broaden the focus of youth arts activity from performing arts to arts activity in general. That Bill won the support of all members of Parliament at the time. What she did not do, and was not able to do during more buoyant days in the economy than we have inherited, was increase the money for youth arts. She broadened the agenda to include a whole range of activities never contemplated earlier under the original funding base, but she did not increase the funding base.

As a result, the Youth Arts Board came to me and indicated that it would like to undertake a review, which I found acceptable, of all its funding responsibilities in terms of the amount of money it has, the range of applications, what it saw as a heavy preponderance of funding in terms of youth performing arts, which has always been true, and its inability to fund the wider agenda for youth arts that the Hon. Anne Levy correctly, in my view, sponsored but did not fund. It is difficult to find funding today in the budget that we inherited so, in respect of youth arts, the Government has responded to representations from the Youth Arts Board that it review its range of activities, including the grant funds, the project funds and the general activities undertaken by Carclew. I anticipate receiving a report about that towards the end of this year.

I should say that the initial review undertaken by the board focused on the applications received, and the honourable member made a distinction between the applications received from the wider community for funding and the programs through Carclew itself. Initially, the board looked only at application funding, quite rightly, and on reflection the board agreed that all the programs should be reviewed and not just those for which groups and organisations receive funding because of their application. It has been a general review at the request of the Youth Arts Board in terms of where it thinks priorities should be, and that is the responsibility of a board. The board came to see me wanting to undertake the review and I supported that.

Apparently there are rumours about the sale of Carclew. As the honourable member would know, rumours are almost the lifeblood of some people in the arts, and it is true that the board has considered this. It was not my initiative that it do so and it is because of the maintenance costs that it is being considered. The maintenance costs of Carclew are absolutely dramatic. The board has taken the decision that it must look at what it needs for Carclew in terms of the suitability of the accommodation for the range of activities in youth arts and whether it would be a good investment to put money into the maintenance of the building or whether it should consider other options. The board is aware that the Fringe may seek to move from the Lion Arts Centre because the Government has been able to find $200 000 to help it move to the East End in terms of Star Club and other facilities. The Fringe may well move, although I have not heard that the incorporated board of the Fringe has made such a decision. It has a temporary office down there and it may well wish to move.

Quite rightly, the board of Carclew—the South Australian Youth Arts Board—looking at the maintenance cost of its building and having heard that the Fringe might move, is looking around for other options for the base of its activity. With the new University of South Australia establishing right next to the Lion Arts Centre, the board would be aware that it may well be a fantastic site for them, really in the heart of the city, close to the universities, but not out on the hill at Carclew. It is looking at those options, and that is an appropriate activity for the board to undertake. To suggest that there is no funding for Carclew's program in 1997 is so ludicrous that it is outrageous.

In terms of the task force report on arts and cultural development, I am working through all those recommendations and the honourable member would know, if she cared to read it and appreciates what is happening in the arts, that innovation in the arts is absolutely critical. It is vital that we see new blood, new activity and new creativity coming into the arts. That is important for audience development, quality of performance and other output in terms of the arts. No-one could run any arts program in any State at any time without

strong support for youth arts and, of course, there will be continuous support. It is the most stupid question I have ever heard asked in this Chamber. In the meantime, I hope for the sake of the arts, and youth arts in general, that the honourable member will lift her game in terms of support for the activity that is being undertaken in this State.

SOUTHERN EXPRESSWAY

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (11 October).

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I provide the following information in relation to seismic testing for the construction of the Southern Expressway.

1a. During the period 20 to 22 September a seismic refraction study for the Southern Expressway was completed in accordance with normal industry practice in the O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park. On these days blasting was carried out between the hours of 8:00 am and 6:00 pm. A total of 80 individual charges were detonated in augured and tamped holes at an average depth of 0.7m, for the purpose of providing seismic energy into the earth during seismic refraction blasting. Small charge sizes were used, with sizes between 50 and 150 grams. Detonation was controlled via instantaneous electric detonators.

1b. The regulatory requirements for notification are that the owner of the land be notified of the intended blasting operations. The owner of the land, the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, was duly notified prior to the commencement of the seismic operations. The Department of Transport and the Project Manager also were notified of the intended seismic program. Occupiers of properties in the Darlington area, the nearest residential area to the location of the testing, were notified by letter of the occurrence of soils investigations work being undertaken along the Expressway route.

In addition, on 20 September 1995 I released a media statement advising of the field investigations and specifically mentioning geophysical testing.

1c. I regard these notifications as adequate.

2. Regulatory safety requirements for explosives handling are defined in Australian Standards and these standards were strictly complied with. The main requirements are as follows:

- The explosives were handled by a licensed shotfirer.
- All persons in the vicinity of the blasting area were moved to a safe place from which they observed the blast-hole and surrounding area.
- Six (6) warning signs were placed in surrounding areas; two (2) 'Blasting in Progress' signs were located on the western and southern sides of the work area and four (4) 'Explosives' signs were placed on the vehicle appropriately licensed to carry explosives, restricting any approach of unauthorised personnel and traffic.
- During operations the shotfirer decided that a whistle, not a siren, was to be used as a warning system due to the frequent use of nearby Main South Road by emergency vehicles with such sirens. As stated in the Australian Standards, 'the device used to give audible warning should produce a sound that is understandable and clearly different from any other sound which might be used for warning or other operational signals'. The whistle was audible at the lookout opposite referred to in the honourable member's question.
- The following warning system was given for each shot:
  - long blast of 15 seconds duration approximately 1 minute before blasting;
  - on all shots the shotfirer gave the signals 'arming' and 'firing';
  - 3 short blasts separated by 1 second were given for the all clear; and
  - in addition the vehicle's yellow warning light was turned on during the blasting except at the first site where there was no vehicle access.
- During operations the closest blasting carried out to houses was approximately 100 m from an unoccupied house and approximately 250 m from occupied houses. No complaints were received from residents of these houses during operations.
- These precautions were adequate and their efficacy was demonstrated on 21 September 1995 when a man and woman ignored the warning signs and walked to within 150 m of the area where blasting was to commence. These people were detected and advised of the work to be carried out and asked to leave the area. They immediately complied.

3. Blasting activities will be required during the construction of the Southern Expressway and obviously all the regulatory requirements for notification and public and worker safety in relation to blasting and indeed all construction activities, will be complied with.

Further, the environmental implications of the construction of the Expressway are being addressed in an Environmental Report to be released in November. This Report will be supplemented by an Environmental Management Plan that will identify environmental safeguards, standards and particular methods of construction.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Hon. ANNE LEVY** (12 October).

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations has provided the following information.

1. The Local Government Reform Board will establish and publish criteria against which the performance of Councils can be assessed.

The Board will then have the ability to assess the performance of Councils in the State against those criteria to determine if any Councils warrant further investigation and possibly the initiation of an amalgamation proposal, should those Councils not have participated in a voluntary amalgamation proposal.

It is not proposed to involve the Auditor-General's Department in the performance assessment process.

2. and 3. If the Board believes that a Council warrants further investigation and initiates a proposal then any information relating to the performance of the Council would be made available to the public and to Parliament.

CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT PLANS

In reply to **Hon. T.G. ROBERTS:** (19 October).

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources has provided the following information.

1. The Catchment Water Management Act 1995 is the primary instrument by which the Government is able to facilitate integrated catchment management planning. This Act has been particularly successful in the Torrens and Patawalonga catchments, where the new boards, the councils and community groups are now getting on with the job of cleaning up their catchments. The usefulness of this legislation is now apparent, with additional boards for the River Murray, the Gawler River and the Onkaparinga River catchments under active consideration. The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources would expect effective arrangements to be in place for the Onkaparinga Catchment within one year, but this will depend largely on the efforts of the community and Local Government in the catchment with, of course, every assistance from the Government.

2. The Christie Creek flood mitigation and erosion prevention program has not stalled. The council has only recently decided on which option in the management plan to proceed with. Currently, the council is investigating both funding options and future responsibilities for the works. The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources recently met with the Mayors of Noarlunga and Marion and several officers of the City of Happy Valley to discuss the issue.

The Community is obviously keen to have work proceeded with as is the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. Management arrangements will be put in place that include Christie Creek. Further discussions are planned over the next few weeks to ensure that implementation is progressed and funding sources identified.

3. The Torrens Lake clean-up project has not stalled. For sustainability the clean-up is being approached on a catchment wide basis and community education programs have commenced.

Options for the clean-up of the Torrens Lake are being pursued jointly by the Adelaide City Council and the River Torrens Catchment Water Management Board. The first action is to develop a management plan for the lake and its surrounds. This plan will consider all aspects but particularly maintenance issues including the build up of sediment in the lake. The plan will investigate both how much sediment needs to be removed and how it should be handled and disposal methods. Development of a brief for this project is underway.

COTTON FARMING

In reply to **Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT** (12 October).

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources has provided the following information.

1. Development proposals in Queensland do not fall within the legal jurisdiction of the South Australian Government. However, it is a policy of this Government to seek the active cooperation of the other States and the Northern Territory in total catchment management of the Lake Eyre Basin.

To this end, the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources approached the Queensland Minister for the Environment and Heritage in early October 1995 to re-affirm South Australia's commitment to the total catchment management of the Lake Eyre Basin, which includes the Cooper Creek catchment. The proposed cotton development on the upper Cooper system at Currareva was cited as a point of concern.

2. The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources is not aware of any proposal to engage in large scale irrigation development in the South Australian part of the Cooper system.

It has been a long standing and consistent policy of the South Australian Pastoral Board not to encourage the development of cash cropping on pastoral leases, which covers the area in question.

TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD

In reply to **Hon. T.G. CAMERON** (18 October).

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing has provided the following information.

As at 21 October 1995 TAB turnover was down $17.8M on the corresponding period last year, and down $1.7M on the budget estimates for the current year.

The SATAB has advised that the predominant reason for the decline against last year's turnover figures is the impact of poker machines. The Board has estimated that, during this current financial year, there will be a negative impact from poker machines of $23.5M. The Board has advised that TABForm has also contributed to the downturn in turnover and has estimated a negative impact of $5M this financial year. Additional reasons, advanced by the TAB, which have contributed to reduced turnover for the year to date include the loss of ten racemeetings due to abandonments resulting from poor weather, and poor fields during the period leading up to the Spring Racing Carnival.

With regard to whether the decline in turnover is stabilising or trending downwards, it is the view of TAB that the full impact of poker machines appears to have substantially materialised. The Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing has been advised that the Board remains confident that the TAB will reach its turnover target of $505M, although the Spring Racing Carnival will be a very important indicative period.

The Government has introduced, since coming to office, two major revenue assistance measures for the Racing Codes. The first of these was the adjustment to TAB profit shares which resulted in the Codes receiving an additional 5 per cent of TAB surpluses, amounting to approximately $2M per annum. The second major initiative of this Government was the re-direction of 50 per cent of the TAB Capital Fund allocation to the Racing Codes. This measure has resulted in additional distributions to the Codes totalling approximately $2.5M per annum. Other matters in regard to the financial position of Racing are under consideration.

With respect to the TABForm publication, the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing's Office has received many complaints which the Minister has followed up, both through regular meetings with the TAB Chairman and General Manager, and through correspondence to the Board seeking explanations and comments on the suggestions that have been put forward by interested punters.

In addition, the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing has, in recent weeks, had input into the TAB's proposed Market Research Survey which will seek to identify customer reaction to several issues including the format and content of TABForm. The survey questionnaire will include opportunities for those surveyed to suggest improvements to style, layout and information provided by the TAB publication.

ROAD SAFETY

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport a question about road safety.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: The *Bulletin* of 17 October 1995 contains an article dealing with the practice of placing memorials by the roadside to remind passers-by of deaths by road accidents at that place. The article's content is fairly well summarised in its headline: 'Perth's roadside crosses, stark shrines to senseless slaughter, are more effective than shock-style advertising in slowing traffic'. The article states:

> Such impromptu memorials have been springing up around Perth, on stretches of treacherous road leading over the hills to the interior and along busy coastal highways.

It continues:

> Anyone travelling the Great Eastern Highway route out of Perth will pass by a dozen simple white crosses, mutely marking the treacherous bends along this stretch of road that, over a decade, have witnessed 689 accidents, including 29 head-on collisions [and] 22 fatal accidents.

Reference is made to a report released apparently in September of this year by researchers at the University of Newcastle who found that roadside memorials are more effective than shock-style advertising. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Are such memorials permitted in South Australia? Members will have seen a number of them springing up now.

2. Does the Minister have a view on their effectiveness?

3. Has the Minister seen the research attributed to the University of Newcastle and, if so, what comments does she have on it? If not, will she examine that research with a view to considering whether it impacts upon what we should do in South Australia about the road toll?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I thank the honourable member very much for drawing this article to my attention. I have not seen the research. Certainly, I will examine the matter in further detail. I have seen a number of memorials in South Australia on the way to Victor Harbor and the South-East, which, I suspect, have been put up on an *ad hoc* basis by family members when a death has occurred on the roads. Certainly, I have received correspondence advocating that this should be a more ordered program adopted in relation to road safety in South Australia.

It is interesting that the research by the University of Newcastle has indicated the effectiveness of this initiative, because all the advice that I have received to date from the Office of Road Safety and the South Australian Road Safety Consultative Council has highlighted that these memorials are not an effective use of time and effort in road safety terms. I have always found that a surprising result, and therefore I have continued asking questions of both those authorities. I indicate also that I have questioned the latest advice I have received from the South Australian Road Safety Consultative Council in terms of the road safety strategy for South Australia, which again highlights that this memorial initiative would not be an effective road safety measure in South Australia.

The information that has been highlighted by the Hon. Mr Lawson in Parliament today is an important contribution to the debate on road safety in South Australia and, certainly, this research from the University of Newcastle will enable me to pursue this matter further. It is particularly important to note that the study found that 50 per cent of young males in the region drove more cautiously. Regrettably, it is young males, who, for a whole variety of reasons, have less patience and attention on the road and who figure so highly—well out of proportion to their age group in the community—in crashes that lead to death and injury, and therefore also a very

high proportion of cost to the community overall in insurance and health terms. The fact that it has been so effective on this age group is further reason why I will explore this matter with even more enthusiasm within the road safety circles in South Australia.

MATTERS OF INTEREST

PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I wish to make a few remarks about service to the Parliament. As a number of people would know, Jessie Cooper was elected to this Council on 7 March 1959. She was the first woman ever to be elected into this Parliament. She retired on 10 July 1979 and was replaced by the Hon. Legh Davis. She served here for 20 years, four months and three days. I was elected to this Council on 12 July 1975: as of today (15 November) I have served 20 years, four months and three days, exactly the same length of time as Jessie Cooper. Unless I have an unfortunate encounter with a bus this evening, tomorrow I will exceed Jessie Cooper's record by one day. Since 1959 a total of 25 women have been or are members of this Parliament but, until today, Jessie Cooper was the longest serving female member of this Parliament. I hope that, if I survive the night, the title will transfer to me tomorrow. I should say that, when it comes to time in Parliament, women so far have nothing compared to the men. The Parliamentary Library informed me that, since responsible government began in 1857, a total of 821 different individuals have been members of this Parliament. Of those 821, only 25 have been female: a very small percentage, indeed.

When it comes to length of time in Parliament, 118 of those 821 have served 20 years or more, but only two of those 118 have been female, that is, Jessie Cooper and me, a grand total of 1.7 per cent. The record, which I very much doubt that many members would wish to emulate, is held by Sir John Lancelot Stirling, who served in both Houses of this Parliament for a total of 48 years and nine months. He served nearly eight years in the House of Assembly and nearly 41 years as a member of this Chamber, 31 of them as President in your chair, Mr President. I would be very surprised if anyone would aim to break that record and spend nearly 50 years in this Parliament. I think that life must have been very much more gentle and less demanding in those days. I very much doubt, given the pace of work, whether any of us would survive that long.

I may say that Sir John Stirling died in his eighties as a member of this Parliament: he never retired. He was still President of the Council at the time of his death. In the list of 118 with long service in this Parliament is Sir Walter Duncan, with 43 years. He also was President of this Chamber but for a total of only 18 years, nothing compared to Sir John Stirling. But all these members with long periods of service are from the conservative side of politics. There is no Labor member until we come to Mick O'Halloran, who spent nearly 28½ years as a member of this Parliament.

VIETNAMESE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY CENTRE

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: Today I wish to speak about the magnificent achievement by the Vietnamese Christian community, which recently celebrated the completion of its community centre at Pooraka. The centre was officially opened by the Hon. Dean Brown (Premier of South Australia) and was blessed by His Grace Archbishop Faulkner and the Provincial of the Jesuit order, Reverend Father William Uren. The opening and the blessing of the Our Lady of the Boat People centre was organised by the Vietnamese Christian community to celebrate the completion of the first stage of this beautiful cultural centre, which was built at a cost of approximately $1.2 million. The inauguration and official opening of the centre was an expression of thanks by the Vietnamese Christian community to the Catholic Church, the Society of Jesus, the State and Federal Governments, the Salisbury council, the Hindmarsh and Woodville council, and to all the individuals and the many members of the Vietnamese community who, over many years of personal sacrifice and fundraising, were able to achieve their dream and build a permanent community home in South Australia.

Through my longstanding commitment to and involvement with the Vietnamese people in South Australia, I was privileged to be amongst the invited guests at this memorable event. I am also proud to have assisted and supported this community group throughout its efforts to build this important cultural centre. From the very beginning in 1989, when I was present at the council meeting at which the Vietnamese Christian community was seeking planning and building approval against some local opposition; to the celebration of mass and the blessing of the land in 1990; to the laying of the foundation stone on 29 September 1991; and, finally, to the official opening and blessing of the Our Lady of the Boat People centre on 8 October 1995, I have been privileged to share and to be part of the efforts of the Vietnamese Christian community in achieving its dream.

Although this is only the first stage of construction, the Vietnamese Christian community, through perseverance, commitment and hard work, has established its permanent base to fulfil a dream and to meet the spiritual, social and recreational needs of the community. This achievement clearly demonstrates the importance and benefits that the Vietnamese people have attained by working cooperatively with other agencies and individuals to achieve a common goal. Those who were present at the foundation stone laying ceremony on that cold day in September 1991, on what was then a patch of grass and, in some places, muddy ground, will appreciate the transformation that has taken place with an enormous amount of hard work by so many people within the Vietnamese community.

In building the centre, the aim of the Vietnamese Christian community was to provide a focal point for its members where religious, educational, sporting, cultural and social activities could take place. The centre is also designed to become a multicultural centre, as it will welcome the local community and other groups to participate in activities and make use of the facilities. It was fitting, therefore, that the inauguration and blessing ceremony should take place in 1995, the International Year of Tolerance. The Vietnamese community, like many other communities that came to Australia as refugees, has undergone much suffering and experienced first hand the tragedy and turmoil of war in its homeland. The young people who were present at the official

opening ceremony will, hopefully, never experience the trauma and displacement felt by their parents and families as they began their lives in South Australia. I am sure that they will be eternally grateful for the sacrifices that have led them to South Australia and to the Our Lady of the Boat People centre. I congratulate the Vietnamese Christian community for the achievements it has accomplished and, in particular, for the completion of the first stage of this centre. Chook mun (congratulations)!

MFP GREATER LEVELS DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I want to address the question surrounding the MFP development at Greater Levels. As a member of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee I have been following the MFP development very closely, and we have already had a chance to look at the development that took place out at New Haven estate, a development that one brochure put out by the MFP Corporation claimed to be 'Future housing today'.

I personally do not believe that the New Haven village has particularly broken new ground. It is certainly using technologies which are relatively new in Adelaide, in particular geothermal heating and cooling, but one would hardly call it world beating. Looking at the design of the houses at New Haven, I must say that one of the reasons they need to spend so much money in geothermal heating and cooling arrangements is that they have not designed the houses properly in the first place so that they would passively heat and cool. I suppose one can give the MFP the benefit of the doubt, in that this was its first try. What will be crucially important is what the MFP Corporation achieves when it proceeds with the development out at the Greater Levels.

So far, the public has received no real information at all about the Greater Levels development. From phone inquiries made from my office about a week ago I am aware that the business plan, which was originally due to be a draft business plan in May this year and a final business plan supposed to be completed by July, still had not been completed. Here we have a business plan being worked up by a consortium involving Delfin and Lend Lease when at least at the public level there is no information as to the basis on which they are preparing a business plan.

What instructions have been given to Delfin and Lend Lease and to others involved as to what this development is seeking to achieve? We all have these very vague notions that it will be some high-tech village, but what standards have actually been set? If the MFP is to be genuinely world leading, then standards will have to be set at the Greater Levels that are not just near the forefront of what is happening elsewhere; we really should be aiming to be well in front. That means that guidelines need to be laid down now in a number of regards. I have no doubt that there will be requirements that each house will get cabling and will have all the latest whiz-bang gadgetry. I have no doubt at all that the Government will give instructions via the MFP that it wants to see that sort of thing happening. But, as to whether urban and housing design are to be world leading is another question.

If we are talking about producing a city that is sustainable, we need to be producing housing and collections of houses which require very few inputs and have very few outputs. In other words, they should have very low energy demands, which means that they will largely be passively heated and cooled without any additional injections of energy. It means that they will be designed so that water will largely be retained on site; it means that wastes will largely be retained if not on an individual site then perhaps within the general area. The final goal is that inputs and outputs are down. Without setting quite strict standards in that area, we will not be moving to genuine sustainability. 'Sustainability' is a word that is now on many politicians' and bureaucrats' lips, but the proof is in the eating, and so far we certainly have not seen the proof in relation to New Haven. I only hope that we will see it at the Greater Levels development.

ECONOMIC RATIONALISM

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I begin my contribution by quoting a journalist from that well-known and respected English newspaper, the *Guardian*, Larry Elliott, on 21 August this year. He states that during the Thatcherite 80s we were assured that large chunks of the working class were being absorbed into the ever expanding middle class, which could look forward to a secure and prosperous future, and that the old conflict between capital and labour was dead. He states:

> Certainly, popular capitalism seems to have lost its lustre. The middle classes, who believed their loyalty to the corporation meant a job for life, are living in fear of the sack. The skilled working classes have seen their homes repossessed.

He also noted in the article:

> There is no sense that management and work force are on the same side, and why should there be, given the disparities of income and the knowledge that the redundancy notices will be handed out at the first sign of trouble?

Elliott then concludes that all this, plus a growing awareness that most workers are just one pay packet away from penury, is forcing the belief that we are all working class now. He then paraphrases Mark Twain's response to reports of his own death: he says that reports of the death of the working class and the class struggle are greatly exaggerated. I happen to think he is right.

Like the Government here, many members of my own political Party are economic rationalists. We have a role model, and the role model is the economic rationalism that was undertaken in Great Britain during the 13 years of Maggie Thatcher's tenure of the prime ministership of that nation. I want to know what anyone can show me about the British economy that advances the theory that economic rationalism will work, and will work for the betterment of all human kind. The facts that I currently have at my disposal certainly belie that. The last figures I had on employment levels in Great Britain were as at December 1994, when 9.2 per cent of the work force was out of work in that nation. Remember that the manner in which Great Britain calculates its unemployment is not as accurate as ours, because it calculates only those people who are being paid unemployment benefits, whereas here in Australia we calculate the numbers who have been to the CES inquiring about job placement.

When a conservative Prime Minister, elevated to the House of Lords as the Earl of Stockton, Sir Harold Macmillan, gets up in the House of Lords (he died six months later) and makes his maiden speech at the age of 92, decrying economic rationalism and comparing it to selling off the family silver, I have to start thinking about where that will take us. Perhaps some time in 20 or 30 years people might discover this little gem of futuristic prediction. It has been tried before: there has been private ownership of water, buses, public transport and the capacity to generate electricity power

and they were taken over by the Government because they had failed in their total task of delivering to us as a community. I put on record on this day that I think that sooner or later there will be a price to be paid for buying back the farm—and the farm will have to be bought back. The problem I foresee there—and I am not advocating this—is that there will not be sufficient money in the community to buy back that farm, so the worker—the under-privileged classes in this society—will take the farm back by the bomb and the bullet and there will be bloody revolution, just as we witnessed in 1916 in Moscow and in 1798 at the Tuileries and the Bastille in Paris.

DEFAMATION LAW REFORM

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I use this time to comment upon defamation law reform in Australia. It is timely in view of the release last month of the report of the New South Wales Law Reform Commission on this subject. That Law Reform Commission arose out of events in 1990 when the Attorneys-General of New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria initiated a project with the aim of achieving uniformity of defamation laws in Australia.

A defamation Bill was introduced in the New South Wales Parliament in 1991, and that Bill was the culmination of that work. Similar, although not identical, Bills were also introduced into the Parliaments of Queensland and Victoria. It is a matter for regret that none of those Bills was ever enacted. The New South Wales Bill was referred to the legislation committee of the Legislative Assembly in November 1991. It published a report in October 1992 recommending that the Bill be referred to the Law Reform Commission for a comprehensive review and redrafting. That request was made to the commission in November 1992. Finally, in September 1995 we have the report.

During the course of that reference to the Law Reform Commission, there were a number of significant developments in relation to defamation law in this country. First, there have been a number of decisions in which very large awards for damages have been made, especially in New South Wales. In *John Fairfax v. Carson*, Mr Carson, a prominent Sydney solicitor, was awarded $600 000 damages by a jury for defamation in respect of articles published in the *Sydney Morning Herald*. That award of $600 000 was held to be excessive in the New South Wales Court of Appeal, which ordered a retrial. There was an appeal to the High Court, and that appeal was dismissed by a majority. On the retrial, again Mr Carson was successful, and on this occasion the jury awarded him not $600 000 but $1.3 million in damages. In addition to that, Mr Carson would have received interest on the damages and costs. The newspaper appealed but the case was settled before the appeal was heard, so the matter was never ultimately resolved.

More recently, an alderman of the Fairfield council in New South Wales was defamed by allegations published in the course of discussing his conduct as an alderman. He was awarded $935 000 damages, together with interest, etc., on top.

Next was the decision of the High Court in the celebrated cases of Theophanous and Stevens, in which the court decided by a majority that there was an implied constitutional guarantee of freedom of expression which extended to State defamation laws. That decision has had widespread ramifications in the area of defamation.

The Law Reform Commission has made a number of recommendations, including consideration of the introduction of privacy laws and a number of reforms which we in South Australia would regard with a sense of *deja vu* because they refer to a judge rather than a jury certain questions to be decided. The commission recommends that plaintiffs in defamation actions can seek a declaration of falsity rather than an award of damages. The commission goes into these matters in a great deal of technical detail. I do welcome the report as a further contribution to the learning on this subject, but I regret that it reflects a rather narrow and somewhat blinkered approach to this issue, because the New South Wales commission's recommendations seem to me to be tinkering on the edges with a problem that requires a more direct and also a national approach. The innovation of the High Court shows that bold, new means of reform rather than a patchwork approach are required.

SOUTHERN DISTRICTS WAR MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: This evening the residents of the southern suburbs of Adelaide will be attending a public meeting to discuss the future of the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital at McLaren Vale. Unfortunately, that hospital closed its operations last week and, even more unfortunately, that hospital has been the victim of some politics played by the Liberal Party down the years, for which it is now reaping the reward.

The concept of a hospital in the southern suburbs of Adelaide was a big issue during the 1980s. The Liberal Party was quite prominent in pushing—indeed in demanding—for a new hospital to be built in the south. As a consequence of that, the Labor Government of the day did construct the Noarlunga hospital. It was inevitable when that hospital was completed that it would have some effects on other hospitals in the area.

The proposition that the previous Labor Government put to the community was that the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital would become smaller in scope with some of the more acute cases going to the new Noarlunga hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre. What the Labor Government offered was a sustainable solution for the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital—smaller, yes, but sustainable.

But what happened? The Premier, Mr Dean Brown, when Leader of the Opposition, came down to the southern suburbs and promised against all advice that he would reverse the decisions of the Labor Government and, following the election, he would increase the funding of that hospital to its previous level before the Noarlunga hospital was opened. Of course, there was never any chance that that promise would be kept. The Premier not only said this at a public meeting but he also actually put it in writing to a number of people involved with the friends of the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital. He said:

> I would like to confirm the commitment I made verbally to the friends of the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital at a meeting at McLaren Vale in July that the Liberal Party will restore the hospital funding to its original level before the State Government decision to reduce its financial support.

Unfortunately, as I said, that hospital is now closed, and tonight there will be a public meeting to discuss its future. A number of other Liberal politicians in the south played politics with this issue before the last election. In 1992, Mr

Brokenshire, the current member for Mawson, criticised the South Australian Health Commission for delays in the hospital's going private. I will quote from an article in the *On the Coast* magazine in July 1992, as follows:

He said, 'The negotiations to go private were a step taken by the board in a desperate bid to remain financially viable.' He described the delays by the Health Commission as totally insensitive and incompetent. 'Why on earth didn't the Health Commission tell the Southern Districts Hospital about the incorporation requirements when negotiations first commenced?' He said he hoped the public and specialists would get behind the hospital when the private facilities were finally operational and said the Health Commission should endeavour to assist the hospital wherever possible to ensure it remained viable.

What does Mr Brokenshire say now, two years later in 1995?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! One at a time.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: This is what Mr Brokenshire says:

It [the hospital] had the opportunity when the Labor Government cut its budget to be incorporated under the Health Commission and become a public hospital, Mr Brokenshire said. 'However, the board of the day, (early 1990s), chose to remain independent as a community hospital and now cannot expect the Government to continue to bail it out using taxpayers' money in light of the problems.

Well, what a change of Government and a couple of years make. Of course, Mr Brokenshire expects the community to forget. Well, at the public meeting this evening, I am sure Mr Brokenshire and his colleague Mrs Rosenberg, the member for Kaurna, who made similar claims, will have the opportunity to put her views and say whether they will deliver the promises they made.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: What the Labor Party said, as I repeat for the Minister, was a consistent policy. The Labor Party policy was that the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital should continue in a sustainable way, meaning that it would be somewhat smaller as a consequence of the Noarlunga hospital. However, it was clearly promised by the Labor Government of the day that the hospital would continue, and that is a promise that the Labor Party will continue to uphold.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister is misrepresenting what the Leader said. I wish I had more time so that I could address that matter.

GRAND PRIX

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I want to reflect, in the few minutes I have available to me today, on the Adelaide Grand Prix. I actually attended the main race in 1986. I have attended two pre-race days in 1994 and this year, and I have watched the race at home on television every other year. However, I have never been an ardent supporter of the race. That is not to say that I detract one little bit from the way in which the Grand Prix carnival has been staged from 1985 to 1995. Everyone involved, from the Premiers and Lord Mayors right down through the chain from 1985 to 1995, deserves great praise for their outstanding organisation, which has been evident every year. Everyone has heard the praise heaped on Adelaide and South Australia by worldly commentators whose experience and reliability are unquestioned.

Last Saturday night I was at a function hosted by the Grand Prix Board and the Duke of Edinburgh Award which was attended by Bernie Ecclestone and which had as its master of ceremonies Mr Jackie Stewart, who spent some time running through the magnificence of the Adelaide race and said that it was one of the best events in the world. I was moved to interject rather loudly and ask Jackie Stewart whether he could ask Bernie Ecclestone why on earth, then, was South Australia losing the event to Victoria.

Adelaide is the best race in the world, it has the best circuit, carnival and attendance in the world, so why on earth would anyone want anything more than that? I then answered my interjection, again probably too loudly, 'Of course, it is money.' Nothing speaks more than more money—never mind how good the event is that you are leaving behind. What a hollow ring that argument has to it. With the last race over, it is time—for me, anyway—to do some thinking and remembering.

The race/carnival had its ups and downs with the weather, a pilots' strike and many other usual hindrances. That is not unusual for a major sporting event anywhere in the world. The 1993 Grand Prix was the first real Government attempt to cash in on the selling potential of the event. The 1994 and 1995 efforts by the present Government really saw this aspect being performed here and overseas properly and with very telling effect. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a purely statistical table showing crowd estimates at Adelaide Grands Prix from 1985 to 1995.

Leave granted.

Crowd estimates at Adelaide Grands Prix

1985	
Thursday	20 000
Friday	46 000
Saturday	80 000
Sunday	107 500
Total	253 500
1986	
Thursday	15 000
Friday	30 000
Saturday	85 000
Sunday	120 000
Total	250 000
1987	
Thursday	30 000
Friday	65 000
Saturday	80 000
Sunday	125 000
Total	300 000
1988	
Thursday	61 000
Friday	65 000
Saturday	70 000
Sunday	108 000
Total	304 000
1989	
Thursday	60 000
Friday	65 000
Saturday	75 000
Sunday	80 000
Total	280 000
1990	
Thursday	65 000
Friday	72 000
Saturday	81 000
Sunday	115 000
Total	333 000
1991	
Thursday	50 000
Friday	75 000
Saturday	84 000
Sunday	102 000
Total	311 000
1992	
Thursday	50 000
Friday	60 000

Saturday	70 000
Sunday	80 000
Total	260 000
1993	
Thursday	46 000
Friday	58 000
Saturday	75 000
Sunday	114 000
Total	293 000
1994	
Thursday	55 000
Friday	74 000
Saturday	72 000
Sunday	127 000
Total	328 000
1995	
Thursday	74 000
Friday	102 000
Saturday	130 000
Sunday	205 000
Total	511 000

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: After the building and learning years of 1985 to 1988, the 1989 attendance was disappointing, with the four day attendance down 24 000 and down 28 000 on the race day attendance to 80 000 people from the year before. The year 1990 saw the introduction of the first international concert star, Cher, and saw attendances climb by 53 000 for the carnival and by 35 000 for the race day on Sunday. Of course, there may have been factors other than Cher to contribute to this attendance increase.

Other than this year, the carnival has averaged 291 200 people over its four days and 107 800 people for the Sunday Grand Prix. This year we saw the carnival and Sunday total nearly double the 10-year average. There is no doubt that this year's race carnival was a once-off for many reasons—and I do not have time to debate or argue them, except to say that I do not believe that it could be repeated on an annual basis. It was a culmination of excitement, having had 10 races, the fact that it was the last one and we were losing it to Victoria, and the magnificent weather. All those factors came together to give us that enormous tally of 511 000 people, with a Sunday attendance of 205 000 people.

South Australia can be very proud of its record and achievements of excellence every year. I have no doubt that the sporting capital of the world—Melbourne—will provide a good carnival. It has done so in every other sporting event. It has a world reputation for people turning out to follow sporting events, and I have no doubt (even though it is difficult to say it) that Victoria and Melbourne will provide a very good carnival and super crowds in 1996, perhaps getting near the crowds we had this year. It is a challenge for them, and I have no doubt that they will take up that challenge. I have always said that I think the carnival should move from State to State throughout Australia over maybe a 10 year cycle, and I think that will happen.

REFUGEES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. Bernice Pfitzner:

That in view of persistent and long-standing claims that the screening process for determining the refugee status of Vietnamese boat people is seriously flawed, and that these claims have been substantiated by documented evidence produced by the boat people and supported by the Australian Vietnamese community and prominent Australians, the Legislative Council of the South Australian Parliament calls on the Federal Government to investigate these claims and to report back to the Australian community, as a matter of urgency.

(Continued from 18 October. Page 246.)

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Today I have circulated an amendment to the motion. I move:

1. Insert 'I.' before the commencement of the motion.
2. After the words 'screening process' insert 'in the first country of asylum other than Australia'.
3. At the conclusion of the motion, insert new paragraph II as follows:

'II. The Legislative Council directs the President to convey this resolution to the Prime Minister and the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs.'

I wish to amend the motion for reasons of clarity. In its current form, the motion could be read as applying to any country where Vietnamese boat people arrive, when it is quite clear from the Hon. Ms Pfitzner's speech that she is referring specifically to Indonesia.

I did approach the honourable member to seek clarification on this, and she confirmed to me that it was Indonesia, although it may not exclusively be Indonesia. She suggested perhaps at least one other country. I wish to insert the words 'other than Australia' because I believe that Australian authorities at Port Hedland are doing a very good job.

As to the latter part of the amendment, rather than have 'Australian Government' I have had it changed to the 'Prime Minister and the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs' so that it is more specific. Also, I think it has more impact to have the President conveying this resolution. We did this recently with the motion on French nuclear testing, and I think we have had from the Federal Government two responses which have come to all members of the Legislative Council as a result of that sort of wording. So, I have attempted to make sure that we get more direct feedback as a result of the motion.

The Hon. Ms Pfitzner quoted from a letter by Mr Peter Hanson which had been written to the Melbourne *Age*, and he refers particularly to the comprehensive plan of action (CPA), and his major concern that 'the screening procedures are left entirely in the hands of first asylum nations'. It appears that in some countries these screening procedures are less than desirable, yet in 1994 the Federal Government passed legislation, with the support of the Liberal Opposition, to prevent people who had had access to the CPA in their first country of asylum other than Australia from claiming asylum in Australia.

That legislation must have been based on a view that the screening procedures in the first country of asylum had been fair. I point out that the Democrats believe that refugees should be the highest priority in Australia's immigration program, and I would personally prefer that business immigrants be replaced by refugees. However, we must also recognise that there are various categories of refugees. There are the ones we have traditionally acknowledged: those who are fleeing their country because their political views do not accord with the Government of the day and who have a consequent fear for their safety. Another category of refugee is also not well recognised, namely, the environmental refugee. These people could have lost their homes in a major natural catastrophe such as a tidal wave. In a short time we will see another type of environmental refugee—people fleeing their country because they are facing man-made catastrophes. If we look at some of the small islands in the

Pacific or at parts of Bangladesh when they go permanently under water because of the greenhouse effect, we will see large numbers of this new type of refugee who will probably want to settle on our shores.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Exactly. Then we have a third category of refugee—the economic refugee—which brings us back to this motion. The comprehensive plan of action to which I referred before was adopted because of concern that an increasing number of refugees from Vietnam were economic refugees. I have no argument with people in countries poorer than Australia wanting to better themselves economically, but knowing that Australia already has an exceptionally high immigration rate, knowing that Australia cannot take responsibility for all the refugees in the world, and preferring that we give priority to the political and environmental refugees over the economic refugees, I have some sympathy for the position which Australia took at the international conference on Indochinese refugees in June 1989.

When enacting the ensuing legislation in 1994, I do not know whether the Federal Government and the Opposition took into account the growing evidence of abuses taking place in some first countries of asylum. If they did not, it is time they did and this motion will act as a catalyst for them to reconsider their position in relation to some countries of first asylum.

The Hon. P. NOCELLA: I rise to signify Labor Party support for the motion moved by the Hon. Bernice Pfitzner as well as for the amendments just moved by the Hon. Sandra Kanck, which seem to ameliorate the motion and make it more direct and focused. However, at the same time it would be useful to members of this Council to acquaint themselves with some of the facts that surround this motion. In other words, while it is highly desirable to be aware of the alleged cases of corruption, such as the ones that the Hon. Bernice Pfitzner brought to this Chamber, it is also appropriate to realise that some of the work that has been called for in the motion has already been done.

In other words, as the Hon. Sandra Kanck just stated, legislation aimed at preventing those who do not come up to the definition of 'refugee', as described by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, that is, those who have a well-founded fear of returning to their country of origin, to be persecuted or harmed in any way on the basis of their views, be they religious, political or whatever, are then excluded from having access to Australia.

During the process that led to that legislation's being passed federally, a parliamentary committee investigated cases similar to the ones that have been indicated by the Hon. Bernice Pfitzner and reported by various sources. It appears that the majority of those cases and those allegations were vetted by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and that evidence was accepted by Liberals and all members on that committee. It would seem that, in order to have a proper case to reopen investigation, one would need to gather additional evidence and possibly new cases of corruption, if there are any, that have been reported or come to the knowledge of the mover of the motion—abuses that are alleged to have happened in the camps where refugees have been held pending the definition of their case.

It is also useful to notice that the Australian Government has been acutely aware of the situation and has taken action in order to remedy situations that would almost fall in the cracks of the various programs. We are talking about a major initiative in the region. Some 76 countries are involved in the comprehensive plan of action referred to. Australia has been a very active member of this group of countries, has invested nearly $10 million in this program and has as a result accepted about 17 000 Vietnamese refugees. This gives an indication of the magnitude of the program and the resources that have been invested in such a program.

When we talk about taking action, it would be appropriate for Australia to be in sync with other partners in this program (and there are 76 countries), because the program involves not only Australia but the whole of the South-East Asian region as well as the Pacific region. In order to be effective in stamping out, as is desirable, any form of corruption that may exist, the more coordinated the action the more it is likely to succeed.

In conclusion, I point out that, for those special cases that have been rejected by virtue of the criteria of the program, the Australian Government has instituted a special assistance category (SAC), which allows groups with close family or community links in Australia, while in vulnerable situations but who do not meet refugee or special humanitarian program criteria, to settle in Australia, despite the fact that they do not measure up to the definition.

Some 600 places will be available under the Vietnamese special assistance category in 1995-96. There will be two components: one for the Vietnamese from camps administered under the comprehensive plan of action and for Indochinese asylum seekers and for those Vietnamese held in camps or coming from Germany. The special assistance category is expected to commence operation this month and application forms will be available from the regional offices of the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs throughout Australia at about this time. To be eligible for the CPA camp component in the special assistance category, applicants must have resided in a camp administered under the CPA at any time since its inception in June 1989 and have returned to Vietnam before 1 January 1996. Applicants must be in Vietnam at the time of the application. The component of the special assistance category will be administered by the Australian Consul-General in Ho Chi Minh City. In conclusion, while I signify the Opposition's support for the motion and the amendment moved by the Hon. Sandra Kanck, I think that, with this information, the motion comes more into focus.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON secured the adjournment of the of the debate.

ELECTRICITY TRUST

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I move:

That the interim report of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee on a Review of the Electricity Trust of South Australia (Accounting Issues) be noted.

In speaking briefly to this motion, I indicate that this is one of a series of reports that the Statutory Authorities Review Committee is tabling with respect to its review of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. The committee took evidence from the Auditor-General and officers of the Electricity Trust of South Australia with respect to its accounting methods and presentations. As a result of the evidence received and its discussions, the committee resolved to recommend that, in future, the Electricity Trust should publish half yearly financial results, which need not necessa-

rily be audited. The committee also recommended that the Government should look particularly at commercial operations of Government with a view to the possibility of publishing interim financial reports for these business enterprises and to make the necessary legislative changes to enable the production of interim financial statements for these State-owned business enterprises.

The committee was conscious that in some instances, for example, the State Government Insurance Commission, interim reports are already published, which enable the Parliament and the community at large to be more aware of the financial performance and issues of importance with respect to such commercial enterprises. In recommending that ETSA publish its half yearly financial results, the committee believed that this would bring ETSA into line with other major business organisations, particularly those in the private sector where, for instance, if a company is listed on the Stock Exchange, it is required to present an interim financial statement.

Indeed, if one remembers that the Electricity Trust of South Australia is the largest business enterprise in the public sector in terms of annual revenue and that it is the eighth largest business enterprise all told in South Australia, in both the public and private sectors, it is easily recognised that ETSA is a very important part of the South Australian economy. I certainly believe, as did the committee, that it is in the public interest that interim reports of its financial statements would be appropriate and not necessarily an inconvenience because those reports would already be produced for internal purposes.

The committee also recommended that, in future, the ETSA annual report should include the individual reporting of financial results for mining, generation, transmission and distribution components of ETSA. ETSA is a vertically integrated operation, starting out at Leigh Creek with the mining of coal, which is then transported by rail to Port Augusta where it is converted into power and, in turn, the power generated there is transmitted and distributed throughout most of South Australia. There are those separate elements of the Electricity Trust, but they are not separately accounted for. We believe that, in future, it would be appropriate if that were to occur.

The committee also recommended that the performance measures published in ETSA's annual report should be presented in more detail and it recommended that the performance targets for the financial year just passed and for the financial year to come should be built into the annual report. The committee believes that that practice is appropriate and that ETSA should be looked at in relation to the performance targets that have been set in any one year. For example, the committee recognised that ETSA produces an annual environment report, which has a range of environmental indices. That is an issue of great importance to ETSA and to the general community, and we think it is prudent to increase the reporting standard in that area.

The committee also recommended that ETSA should include a list of its community service obligations in its annual report and that the cost of the major community service obligations should be specifically identified. The State Treasury and Commission of Audit accepted the definition of community service obligation as it was defined by the Industry Commission in 1994, as follows:

> A community service obligation arises when a Government specifically requires a public enterprise to carry out activities relating to outputs or inputs which it would not elect to do on a commercial basis and which the Government does not require other businesses in the public or private sector to undertake or which it would only do at commercially higher prices.

ETSA undertakes a number of community service obligations, for example, the under-recovery of costs in non-metropolitan areas because Governments of both persuasions have adopted a uniform statewide tariff policy. There is also the recognition of a discount for pensioners or people over a certain age and for disadvantaged people. There are also emergency payments for customers in financial hardship.

They are some of the community service obligations recognised by the committee, and we believe that the information for these and other activities that are deemed to be community service obligations should be more fully incorporated in the financial statements and that the costs should be outlined in real terms. That would give Parliament and the community a greater appreciation of the extent and the cost of these community service obligations, because the discount of tariffs to pensioners or the cross-subsidisation of tariffs affects the financial result of the organisation, and it really means that ETSA's profitability is lower than it would be otherwise. The committee has several more reports to table in its ongoing inquiry into the Electricity Trust of South Australia. The report that I am speaking to now dealt with just accounting issues.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I support the motion and the remarks which have been made by the Hon. Legh Davis, who gave a very accurate summary of the main thrust of this report dealing with accounting issues in ETSA. I should perhaps stress that the committee, despite its recommendations, is in no way critical of ETSA or its accounting procedures. We noted that ever since 1978 ETSA has used accrual accounting methods, unlike many statutory authorities which are only at this time switching to accrual accounting procedures as is now recommended throughout Australia under the accounting standards. That certainly did not apply when ETSA adopted accrual accounting so many years ago.

The Hon. Mr Davis has mentioned the recommendations regarding costing of community service obligations. The committee felt this was important in a climate where the whole electricity market in Australia is being deregulated following the Hilmer report; that there may well be comparisons and competition between electricity generation and transmission and distribution companies throughout Australia; and, when making these comparisons, it is important that the financial constraints which are placed on ETSA through community service obligations are properly identified so that efficiency comparisons are not misleading if community service obligations are not taken into account. It will not be easy to cost some of these community service obligations—and I particularly refer to the cross-subsidisation which occurs from metropolitan electricity users to those in many regional areas—but we felt it was important that they should be costed and indicated in the accounts from ETSA.

In making these recommendations I stress that we are in no way criticising the existing community service obligations or, in any way, suggesting that they should be abolished or reduced. They are highly desirable social policies which are supported by all Governments in this State and there is no suggestion that the committee in any way would wish to see these community service obligations reduced or changed. In fact, there may well be a case for increasing them. But, when making these interstate comparisons, it is important that they

be quantified so that apples will be compared with apples and incorrect comparisons not made.

One other matter which arises in the report concerns the accounting for the establishment of the new Leigh Creek township. A suggestion was made to the committee that this had not been properly accounted for and that a number of Government resources had been supplied—paid for by the taxpayer—and had not come into the ETSA accounts at all. We sought the assistance of the Auditor-General in this regard. While a number of the older records of ETSA are no longer available for detailed analysis, the Auditor-General did reassure us that there had been proper accounting for the construction of the new Leigh Creek township and that there was infrastructure provided by the Government but this could be compared with the infrastructure provided by the Government for the construction of the Roxby Downs township, which is a township established to service a privately owned mining operation. It is normal for Governments to supply things such as hospitals, roads, schools and other such community services for any new township. This was done by the Government both for the new Leigh Creek township and Roxby Downs.

I refer to one paragraph from the committee's report which states:

> It would appear to the committee that ETSA may have actually carried more of the costs associated with the moving of the Leigh Creek township than if it had been run by a non-Government body. By way of comparison, the State Government has provided considerable assistance in the establishment of the Roxby Downs township, which serves a non-Government mining operation. Thus, on the evidence available the committee is satisfied that the treatment of the costs associated with the moving of the Leigh Creek township have been appropriately reported.

It is important to stress that in order to put an end to stories that ETSA received more favourable consideration with the moving of the Leigh Creek township than has applied for the establishment of other mining towns where the mining is a private and not a public operation. I hope that furphy will not be raised again.

There will be further reports on other matters relating to ETSA. Members of the committee begin to feel we will never finish with ETSA, but we hope that before too long we will be able to finalise reports relating to ETSA and move on to other statutory authorities as our charter of obligations indicates we should. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

EDUCATION POLICY

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. Carolyn Pickles:

That this Council condemns—

1. the way in which the Minister for Education and Children's Services has broken the Government's election promises on education and embarked on a policy of cutting resources for education in South Australia.
2. the reduction of 790 teachers and 276 ancillary staff between 30 June 1994 and 31 January 1995.
3. the Minister's decision to cut a further 250 school service officer full-time equivalents from January 1996 that will result in up to 500 support staff being cut from essential support work in schools.
4. the Minister's decision to cut a further 100 teachers from areas including the Open Access College, special interest schools and Aboriginal schools.

(Continued from 25 October. Page 338.)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I rise on behalf of Government members to oppose the motion and in doing so would seek to correct a number of the statements that have been made by the Leader of the Opposition in her contribution over some two weeks. First, the Leader of the Opposition claimed that the Government's policy is to reduce everything in our education system to the national average. As I have indicated on many previous occasions, the position, even after the reductions of the first two Liberal Government budgets, will mean that, on all the indicators that are nationally produced by the independent umpire (the Australian Bureau of Statistics), South Australia will still have the best student-teacher ratio of all the States in Australia. Secondly, South Australia will still have about 9.2 per cent more school support staff than the national average for all other States; and, thirdly, South Australia will still spend more dollars *per capita* on education than any other State in Australia.

So, it is not correct, as many have claimed (and the Leader of the Opposition continues to claim), that the Government budget reductions will lead to South Australia's either trailing the other States or being reduced to some national average. That was the recommendation of the Audit Commission in April or May of last year. The Government and I, as Minister for Education and Children's Services speaking in the area of education, rejected the notion that we be reduced to the national average figures as recommended by the Audit Commission. However, for the reasons that we have indicated on many occasions in the past two years, we conceded that we had to make some reductions in terms of the expenditure in key portfolio areas including education, health and police.

In her contribution the Leader of the Opposition went on to come up with a figure to show that, in some way, the Government has got rid of 1 600 jobs in education in just one year. I have indicated on so many occasions that I have lost count that that figure is just fanciful nonsense, and it is arrived at because the Leader of the Opposition continues to add differing things together and come up with an incorrect figure in the end, then does not take into account offsetting factors such as new jobs provided or new people employed in country areas. If I could just give a simple example as I highlighted in Question Time recently, the Leader of the Opposition talked about various occasions when the Government has had a surplus of teachers in the city and we have offered targeted separation packages to reduce 200 or 300 teachers and, at the same time, we then hire 200 to 300 new teachers to go to the country because teachers will not go to the country to fill those country vacancies.

The Leader of the Opposition counts the 200 to 300 reduction but conveniently ignores the fact that there has been an offsetting increase in country teachers replacing those teachers. So, this figure of 1 600 jobs is fanciful nonsense. In relation to the most accurate figure—and there has been a Question on Notice from someone or a question in another place that I have responded to along these lines—the best estimate is that about 530 teaching positions and about 40 school support staff have been reduced between June of 1994 and June of 1995. That is 570: it is a long way short of 1 600. Obviously, it does not attract as much of a headline—not that the 1 600 has attracted much of a headline—as 1 600 jobs having disappeared.

If 1 600 jobs had disappeared we would be talking in terms of about $80 million worth of savings to the Education Department budget. Even the Leader of the Opposition is claiming in her speech only that we budgeted for an annual cut of $40 million. But the 1 600 jobs she claims would come to about $80 million-plus, in terms of budgeted savings. It is

just incorrect. I pointed out to the Leader of the Opposition that either she or the Deputy Leader had asked a question concerning the number of people employed by the department in January compared to the previous June, and in that period she evidently said that the total number of staff fell by 1 000 and that we approved 900 targeted separation packages. Again, as we have highlighted to the Leader of the Opposition, because it is still the holiday period or just the start of the school year and we have not taken on all our staff in terms of contract positions, and student numbers increase through the year so we have to employ new teachers during term 1 and term 2, it is incorrect to compare a January figure with a June figure and purport to indicate some sort of fair comparison of the numbers of teachers and school support staff.

In summary, the claim that 1 600 jobs have been reduced in the education system is fanciful nonsense, and the Leader knows that. The closest estimate, as I said, from June 1994 to June 1995 would be of the order of 530 teachers and about 40 school support staff. One can, of course, add to that the projected reductions of 250 school support staff during the early part of next year and 98 further above-formula teaching positions. At the start of this year we had to carry surplus teachers in the system, because under current Government policy we do not retrench surplus employees from the department, so if people do not take targeted separation packages or do not move around the system, in accordance with their current industrial rights and conditions we are not in a position to retrench officers to get down to the formula establishment, therefore we do carry surplus staff.

Again, earlier this year it looked as though we had up to 250 surplus teachers in the system because we had 4 000 fewer students than were predicted by principals but, in the end, only about 80 or 90 teachers took targeted separation packages in that first round at the start of this year. The Leader of the Opposition went on to claim that the Government was going to sack 500 people. Somehow the Leader got that claim from the budget announcement that we are going to reduce school service office staff within schools by 250 full-time equivalents at the end of the year.

As I have indicated before, the Government's policy is not to sack or retrench public servants or teachers, so we will not be sacking anybody, let alone 500 people, as claimed. I am not sure where the Leader's figure of 500 comes from. The budget announcement makes clear that it is 250 full-time equivalent persons; the Government has certainly not made any announcement about 500, and we are certainly not sacking 500 people.

The Leader of the Opposition then goes on to imply that before the Government makes budget decisions we should go out and consult the union, teachers, parents, school councils and principals. I know that the Leader of the Opposition was not a member of the Cabinet during the last Labor Government, but I should have thought that a person in her senior position would realise that budget decisions are not taken on the basis of going out and polling community perceptions in relation to a particular budget decision.

Obviously, budget decisions are taken on the basis of the budgets allocated to agencies and then judgments that individual Ministers have to make as to how they will keep spending within their budget over the financial year. It has never been and will never be a possibility for budget decisions to be taken on the basis of going out and polling community opinion, particularly in relation to budget reductions.

Another misunderstanding of the Leader of the Opposition and some who have opposed the Government's decision is that in some way the Government did not expect there to be widespread community opposition to the decisions to reduce spending in the education portfolio. In particular, when I speak at protest meetings or when deputations come to me, people and union representatives put the point to me, 'Now that you realise that we are so adamantly opposed, when will you reverse your decision?' Again, the thinking behind those sorts of submissions is that in some way people believe that budgets are run on the basis of community polling or community perception. These decisions—difficult and painful decisions, as I have indicated—were taken in the full knowledge that there would be widespread opposition to them. That was the case last year when we reduced classroom teaching numbers and increased class sizes: there was widespread opposition. We also expected there to be widespread opposition to the decisions this year, and even more so, because the memories of the State Bank were a little dimmer for a lot of people. People believed that the significant financial problems that confronted the State could be resolved quickly in the space of one budget. Thirdly, people believed that they had had one taste of the bad medicine in the Government's first budget in 1994. They might have gulped that down and hoped that that was the end of it but, when they were required, as we are in the community, to have a second dose of medicine in terms of reducing expenditure, it was much less palatable for the community.

There has been and there will continue to be widespread opposition to Government decisions to reduce expenditure in areas such as education, health and the police. So, it is not unexpected; it is not something new or different for me as Minister to find that there has been widespread opposition to a difficult or painful decision to reduce school support staff or instrumental music teachers within our schools. That was all factored into the original decision, and the decisions were taken in the full knowledge that they would be opposed. I think it is important to place that on the record again. I have indicated to many of the deputations, delegations and protest meetings with which I have been associated over the past four to five months that the opposition was expected and that the Government is not in a position to reverse these difficult decisions if it wants to resolve the financial dilemmas of the State and also provide an economic future for our children.

The Leader of the Opposition then indicates that executives in the department—and I guess there are only six to eight of those left at the senior levels, because we have reduced the number of executives—have complained to the Opposition that they were not consulted. I can only say that that was obviously just made up by the Leader of the Opposition to try to add effect to her contribution. There is certainly no substance in those claims.

The Leader of the Opposition also claimed that after the next election the member for Wright would have the distinction of being a oncer twice—twice a oncer—being outed not once but twice, a unique distinction. On behalf of the member for Wright, I can say that he is an extraordinarily hard worker in his electorate. He is well known amongst his constituents and certainly amongst his schools. I think he has 22 schools in his electorate, and I visited all of them with the member for Wright within 12 months of his election. He is well known as an assiduous supporter of his constituents and his schools and a fearless advocate of the views of his constituents. His constituents can rest assured that as the local member he leaves no stone unturned in putting and representing their

views to all Ministers and to me in particular in relation to the decisions that are taken on education.

The honourable member shares with me as Minister for Education and Children's Services the concerns of his constituents, his parents and teachers, in relation to the difficult decisions that the Government has had to make within education. He understands those concerns and has represented them to me. I understand his concerns and I share those that he and virtually all other members of the Government—backbenchers and front benchers—have about the painful decisions that we have to take.

The Leader of the Opposition then goes on to claim that as a result of the cuts there will be no-one to answer the telephone at schools or to look after children if they have accidents in the school playground. That is emotional nonsense. We have almost 10 per cent more school support staff than the national average of all other States. If schools in other States can answer telephones and put a bandage on a cut knee as a result of a playground accident and we have almost 10 per cent more school support staff, there is no doubting that, whilst other things might have to be reduced, the essential tasks such as first aid and answering telephones will continue to be conducted by school support staff in their schools.

The Leader also said that I had not rejected a proposition that parents could take over all the specialised tasks of school support staff within schools. That is not correct. I have indicated publicly in terms of a radio interview and newspaper interviews that I do not believe that parents can take over all the specialised roles of school support staff within schools. I also said that most schools would actively encourage and welcome more parents, both employed and unemployed, working within their schools, as they already do. Many parents undertake many tasks within schools, ranging from learning assistance programs, taking children for reading and a variety of other tasks, some even ranging through to some administrative deeds and tasks within schools as well. I do not support (and have said so publicly) the notion that all the specialised tasks of school support staffers could be taken over by parents. I do support the view that parents and schools will continue to want to see more parents—employed and unemployed—working within their schools.

I weary of rebutting this one, but the Leader of the Opposition has claimed that the Government withheld the annual $360 000 grant to schools to buy computers. I have answered this question in the Council. I have issued public statements. Clearly the Leader of the Opposition chooses not to want to hear the answer to this. It is simply not correct to say that the Government withheld the annual $360 000 grant to schools to buy computers.

The complete grant for 1994-95 was expended in the area of assisting schools in the purchase of computers: full stop, end of story. There is just no further explanation required. The money was spent. There is an acquittal of it within the Auditor-General's Report. Any amount of detail is available, and certainly the Leader of the Opposition knows that when she makes that claim she is not telling the truth.

The Leader of the Opposition then raised a series of questions from some parents at a particular school, and I will quickly address some of those questions. First: why is the Government not listening to key education bodies (and they are all listed) as well as the general community in their strong and consistent opposition to the proposed cuts? Again, I have referred to this earlier. The Government realises that there is widespread opposition. We are not running Government on the basis of community polling of the individual decisions that we take. We are running the budget on the basis of how much we can afford to pay for various programs. Therefore, my response is on the record in relation to this question.

The second question is why the Minister is saying that the savings are necessary to cover the anticipated increase in teachers' wages when the $7 million anticipated savings is less than 5 per cent of the anticipated cost. As I have indicated previously, the Government has made an offer of some $36 million to teachers and school support staff. We believe that teachers and school support staff deserve a pay increase, and we believe we have offered them a very generous one of a total of some $35 or $36 a week, an increase which many in the community would be quite happy to accept. The Treasury will provide about $15 million to education to pay for that pay increase. The Department for Education and Children's Services has to budget for the rest of that pay increase. The teachers union has claimed some $137 million in salary and conditions improvements, and clearly we as a Government had to budget for a significant salary increase for our teachers and school support staff.

The notion has also been suggested by some that it will not be required for this budget because we are fighting the move in the Federal award. It is correct to say we are fighting the Federal award because, on behalf of taxpayers, we cannot afford $137 million, as is being claimed by the Institute of Teachers. But certainly the institute has not stated to me as Minister that it does not want its pay increase as soon as it can get it. It is prepared to forgo the pay increase for 12 months or 18 months. It is fighting for it as soon as it can get it and will fight us in any commission, court or jurisdiction it can find. It has unlimited money within its budget. It is spending hundreds of thousands of dollars of its members' money in fighting both industrial, election and political campaigns, together with paying the wages of hard working staff in the Institute of Teachers. I will not mention all the names, but it seems to have unlimited buckets of money to mount these campaigns. And, on behalf of taxpayers we have to fight this claim for $137 million.

Even if the salary increase did not arrive until June or July of next year, the Department for Education and Children's Services would still have to budget to be able to pay for that salary increase from June or July next year. Given that the only time we can sensibly make adjustments to our school system is at the start or end of a school year, then any significant increase any time through next year, whether it be February, June or July, has to be implemented at the end of this year and at the start of the year so that we are in a position to pay for it whenever it occurs through 1996. Not to do so would mean one of two things: that is, in the middle of next year, in June or July, when the salary increase comes through, the Government would have to reduce teacher numbers or school support officer numbers in the middle of a school year, with all the disruption which that would cause to students.

We have taken the decision, in the interests of students, not to make those sorts of changes in the middle of a school year but to make changes at the end of a school year or the start of a school year as being the most appropriate time. That is why we have had to make the decisions in this budget for the end of this calendar year and before the start of the next school year.

The school support staff reductions will involve some $7.5 million in savings, and in some way the questioner is

downgrading the importance of that or downplaying the importance of the size of that particular reduction. I can only say that, with the $7.5 million in savings there and the $5 million in savings in the above formula teachers salaries, we have $12.5 million to go towards the $20 million-plus that we require to pay for the salary offer to our teachers and school support staff.

Other questions are raised about why politicians do not have to pay for their pay increases with offsetting reductions. I am not sure how the Leader of the Opposition will respond to that. I can say that, in my office, previous Ministers for Education under the Labor Government had between 16 and 19.5 support staff in their ministerial office. I have reduced the number of support staff in my office to 14, so there is a reduction of some 12 per cent to 25 per cent.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: More than that. It is not consistent. The Hon. Terry Cameron says that is consistent. That is a much deeper cut in the Minister's own personal office, as an indication of the preparedness—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Ron Roberts says that I am a saint. I would never claim that I am a saint, but certainly teachers and parents would welcome leadership from the Minister in terms of being prepared to—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, I can assure you the Minister is generating a lot more work because we are getting tens of thousands of letters of protest at every budget decision!

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: I withdraw the saint comment, Mr Acting President—I apologise!

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. T. Crothers): Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I can tell you, Sir, that my staff are feeling the effects of much more work and fewer staff to undertake their duties. But, it is an indication of preparedness by me, from the top as Minister, to lead and indicate that we are prepared to reduce the staff within our office to a much greater degree and percentage than we are asking in schools or—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: It is good to see that you're not hypocritical.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Mr Cameron says that it is good to see we are not hypocritical, and I thank him for that generous comment and place that on the public record as well.

The next question is whether the Liberal Government believes that a funded quality public education system is a fundamental right for all students? The answer to that is 'Yes.' In response to the earlier question, I should place on the public record my thanks to my remaining hard working staff for all the work they do. They work above and beyond the call of duty in terms of—

The Hon. G. Weatherill: Is this your farewell speech?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, but I think it is important publicly to acknowledge the value of one's own staff. Certainly my office has excellent staff in it, and I as Minister would not survive without the hard working staff within my office and within the department as well.

The next questions were: can you explain how the benefits of the cuts to the State education system exceed the social costs? What are the long-term social costs? Is the Liberal Government concerned about our low ranking within the OECD as regards education funding? If so, what does the Government intend to do about it? Let me take the last question first. If it is correct that the national figures in relation to Australia's spending on education are at a low level within OECD rankings, then that is a responsibility not of the South Australian Government but of the other State and Territory Governments. As I have indicated, we spend more per head on education than any other State in Australia. So, if Australia is lagging the field amongst OECD rankings, the dilemma is not with the Liberal Government of South Australia but clearly there is a problem in the other States and Territories. If the other States and Territories were prepared to spend as much as the South Australian Government is prepared to spend on education, then we may well climb those OECD rankings.

In terms of the social cost to the State, as I have indicated before, government is all about making difficult decisions and trying to get the balance and mix right. It is not much use spending all your money on education if, in the end, you do not have jobs for your young people in your State. Over the past five years we have seen hundreds, if not thousands, of young people leaving South Australia seeking employment in Queensland and other States. We have had unemployment figures of over 11 per cent to 12 per cent; we have had consistently high youth unemployment in the low 40 per cent; and we have had major economic and industrial development problems confronting South Australia.

The Government took the decision that we needed to try to resolve those dilemmas whilst, at the same time, trying to maintain a quality education system. We have to get that balance. Therefore, we have had to reduce some of the spending on education and health but, at the same time, try to resolve the economic dilemma confronting South Australia. In the end, as a Government at the end of our parliamentary term we will be judged on whether we got that mix right, on whether we have started to resolve the economic problems confronting the State and whether we have been able to protect a quality education system. There are still two and a bit years to go before that judgment will have to be made.

I think that I have addressed all the questions that were asked by that school and relayed by the Hon. Carolyn Pickles. In her contribution in the second week the Leader asked some questions about cuts to instrumental music, and I have answered those in this Council previously. In particular, she talked about cuts to special interest music schools. I again highlight the fact that currently we provide to each of the special interest music schools one extra deputy principal, one extra coordinator, two extra teachers and extra school support officer time, as a total package of almost $250 000 in additional resources. This budget continues to provide a deputy principal, coordinator, and teacher and school support officer time but removes one teacher from the additional package that we give to those schools. We acknowledge the concerns felt by those schools and that there will be some restriction on what they can do. However, I have every confidence in the leadership of our schools and in the talent and expertise of our staff and that we will continue to offer and maintain a quality specialist music program at each of those four special interest music schools.

Finally, the Leader of the Opposition asks why woodwork, for example, has not had reductions to the same degree as instrumental music. As I interjected at the time (but it did not get on the record), the simple answer is that we do not provide 102 additional woodwork salaries to our schools in terms of a specialist woodwork program but we do provide 102 specialist instrumental music teachers (or music instructors, I guess, because some of them are not trained teachers)

and, therefore, we could not make a reduction of some 23.9 per cent. For all those reasons, on behalf of Government members in this Chamber, I reject completely the Leader of the Opposition's motion.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS secured the adjournment of the debate.

FISHING, NET

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.R. Roberts:

That the regulations under the Fisheries Act 1982 concerning ban on net fishing, made on 31 August 1995 and laid on the table of this Council on 26 September 1995, be disallowed.

(Continued from 27 September. Page 39.)

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I rise to continue my remarks with respect to this motion. The reason for moving this motion goes back some years and we have to look at the history of recreational net fishing in South Australia. It is important to note that there are three types of scale fishers in South Australia: the amateur fisherman, the recreational line fisherman; the professional line fisherman and the professional net fisherman; and the recreational net fisher. Clear distinctions must be appreciated when considering whether or not to support this motion.

With regard to power hauling by professional net fishermen, for many years it has been alleged that they take too many fish and create problems for recreational and other fishers who participate in the industry. I point out that by and large the target fish of professional fishermen throughout South Australia is King George whiting and snapper. It is clear from all research undertaken that those two species in the South Australian fisheries estate are under extreme pressure. However, it is also clear that the target species for recreational net fishermen are tommy ruff (now called Australian herring, according to the latest Primary Industries release), mullet and salmon trout.

For many years there has been the opportunity for South Australians to engage in the pursuit of recreational net fishing. This fishing takes place between the high and low watermark and is normally a recreational pursuit which involves families. This is not an intensive industry. You will find that most fishers fish only two or three times a year: as I said, it is more a family pastime than an occupation or ongoing pursuit.

So there has been the opportunity for many years in this State for people to take up the opportunity to get a recreational net. Prior to 1985 it was open to virtually anybody to apply for a recreational net when there were more than 7 000 recreational net fishers. It is important to remember that at least 300 000 amateur fishermen who fish today, plus 7 000 recreational net fishers, could potentially have had a recreational net, but a very small percentage have them.

It has always been my contention that when a fishery is under pressure all participants in the fishery must assess their position and place in the fishery and make appropriate adjustments for the benefit of the whole fishery estate in South Australia. It has been my view that it is the Government's responsibility to ensure the maintenance of the public fishing estate for all South Australians, and that includes consumers, professional fishermen and recreational net fishermen. It is often forgotten that professional fishermen in the fisheries industry represent the consumer, that is, you and I, Mr President—those people who do not engage in fishing activities themselves but rely on professionals to catch fish to provide the market in South Australia so that we can all reasonably access fresh fish.

When a previous Labor Government looked at this issue it said that rights people have enjoyed for many years should not be taken away unilaterally but that there had to be some adjustment. A process of natural attrition was implemented and, as people gave up their licences for one reason or another, those licences would drop off the list of registered recreational net fishers in South Australia. That was the attitude of the Labor Government and I will contrast, as I go through my contribution, the difference in attitude of the Labor Government with respect to the rights of people in the fishing industry and those now being expressed by this Government about those persons who participate especially in recreational net fishing.

We were of the opinion that those rights had been developed over many years, that to take them away unilaterally was unjust and that they ought to be phased out by process of natural attrition. Many members of the fishing community since 1987 in particular have sought to get a recreational licence and that has not been available to them. Sometimes they would mumble, but that has been an accepted principle in South Australia and everybody knew what it was about. When this Government came to power, it decided that it would have a review of fisheries in South Australia. Many promises were made during the election campaign and many promises were made in certain electorates, one in particular being in the electorate of Flinders with regard to Coffin Bay.

In the structure of the South Australian fisheries management a number of IMCs in South Australia managed the various aspects of fisheries. The scale fishing IMC looked after the matters addressed in this disallowance motion today. Prior to coming to Government it was well accepted by the present Minister for Primary Industries that those IMCs were doing a good job and, on occasions, if he had dignitaries visiting South Australia he would point out the benefits of the system of fisheries management in South Australia and laud the actions of those people involved.

Upon coming to Government he decided not to go with the IMC but rather set up a Net Review Committee. Prior to that these committees were set up and representatives from each group would be nominated by those organisations to look after the industry. The history of that process has been well lauded by many before. The Minister decided that he would appoint his own committee and, having done that, he honoured unilaterally some of the election commitments he made with respect to closures in Coffin Bay, amongst other things, before the committee had met. He decided that he would ban power hauling before the Net Review Committee had conducted the test. He made the announcement the day before it went out to do the testing to see whether any damage was being produced by this process.

Having gone through a tortuous program and a very intensive investigation by his own Net Review Committee, on 17 May this year the Minister announced that there would be major changes to South Australia's fishing industry. Mr Baker announced that 'the decisions were based on sustainable management of the State's marine scale fishery resources and took into account extensive community and local government consultation on the issue'. I have no problem with that, but point out that a representative of local government, with the greatest respect, is not always well versed in fisheries practice and fisheries biology.

I can point to a situation in my own home town where great angst has developed over closure policies in particular waters. Mr Baker said:

> I have been particularly concerned about the continual pressure on King George whiting stocks in particular, since they are one of the State's best known fish, and I have therefore decided to immediately increase the legal minimum length for both commercial and recreational fishers by 2 cms and another 2 cms in 1998.

I do not want to dwell on the size of King George whiting, but this release points out that the decision follows an extensive netting review undertaken in South Australia over the past year, which resulted in 14 major recommendations, of which 13 were accepted. One of the 13 was a recommendation in respect to King George whiting. The Minister's claim in his media advice is not totally accurate. The major recommendation that he did not accept was in relation to recreational net fishermen, but in many of the other 13 recommendations he substantially altered the recommendation.

With regard to King George whiting, the recommendation was clearly that there be an increase by 2 cms and after extensive scientific review and monitoring they would look at increasing it again later. However, the Minister unilaterally decided, with the support of his Cabinet, that he would make that criteria even stronger. It is clear from anecdotal evidence, phone calls and letters the Opposition is receiving that this is causing great hardship and, further, is causing an influx in black market fish throughout South Australia. I refer to that matter because it is part of the package of regulations which we have moved to disallow. However, I emphasis that my major contribution is in respect of recreational net fishers.

I put on the record that the recommendation that was presented to the Minister from the committee with respect to recreational net fishing at paragraph 2 on page 10 stated:

> The Net Review Committee agreed that, while there is a lack of statistics relevant to catch and effort in the recreational net sector, there is little evidence to suggest that the current level of recreational netting activity is creating conflict or having detrimental effects on fish stocks. It is proposed that the number of licences issued will be restricted to the current number of net registrations and that greater restrictions should apply to the use of these nets. Unlike commercial haul netting, the committee noted that recreational netting rarely targets species important to commercial or recreational line fishers, such as King George whiting and snapper in particular.

That is an extremely important point in making judgments with respect to the rights of recreational net fishermen in South Australia. There were suggestions that all recreational net fishing in South Australia should be prohibited, but most submissions supported the current phase-out arrangements. I put on the record that the Opposition's preferred position is that the phase-out on a natural attrition basis ought to proceed. The committee believes that the legislated attendance requirement should be retained. The Opposition supports that. The committee considers that attendance as defined in the regulations should be amended such that the licence holder is within eyesight or shouting distance of the net. Again the Opposition supports that.

With respect to recommendation 14(1) to (6), I put on the record that recommendation 14(1) suggests that current restrictions on the registration of recreational nets be removed and that the existing number of registrations be reallocated as licences to the general community by way of ballot as the current registrations are handed back or cancelled. In respect of that clause, the Opposition has made the point, as I stated earlier, that there needs to be an overall relief from all participants and our view is that the natural attrition policy ought to continue. We also agree that licence fees for the nets rather than a registration fee is the better way to go. The committee also recommended that an entrance fee of $250 apply to new applications and that all licence holders pay an annual licence fee of $50. All standard concessions ought to apply. I will touch on what the income effects of that would be to fisheries and to compliance later in my contribution.

In point 3, the committee recommended that all current contracts and registrations be converted to licence with no entrance fee to apply and, as I have said, I agree with that. Recommendation 14.4 states that the provisions of annual statistical returns to SARDI be mandatory as a condition of the licence, with catch and effort to be recorded at the time of fishing. We agree with that because, quite clearly, there has been very little research into the effects of recreational net fishing in South Australia, and this new licensing requirement would provide not only the funding but would enable the research to be done so that proper statistics and a proper monitoring of this recreation industry could take place.

Recommendation 14.5 of the committee states that it is a requirement that nets be lifted and cleared of all meshed fish every hour. We also agree entirely with that, because that ensures that, if some fish are unwanted species, there is the opportunity for them to be released before they die in the net. Indeed, it is an efficient way of conducting the operation. Point 14.6 of the committee's recommendations states that penalties for breach of these requirements be substantial and in line with penalties that apply to commercial net fishers, including permit revocation of the licence fee after three convictions. Those very sensible recommendations were made after intensive inquiry by the committee; yet the decision was overturned on the advice that Mr Baker had said that it was inconsistent with fisheries management in other States.

I point out that one of the things that we have to remember is that fisheries management in South Australia has not always been a bed of roses. There has always been angst and we always get that when people compete for a resource but, by and large, fisheries management in South Australia has been well conducted compared with the other States. As a result, recreational net fishing has been able to take place, it has not caused any damage to the fishery and it has provided entertainment.

Given that situation and given that the Minister was not prepared to accept the recommendations of the committee, I asked a question in this place on Thursday 1 June, bearing in mind that the Minister was quite emphatic that he would not assist recreational net fishers in pursuit of the pastime that they had enjoyed for many years. I asked:

> 1. What overwhelming evidence suggested full exclusion of recreational fishing?
> 2. What buy back and compensation arrangements does the Government intend to implement for recreational licence cancellations?
> 3. Will the Government purchase the now surplus nets and for how much?
> 4. Will the Minister reconsider a natural attrition policy with the appropriate licensing fee structure and compliance regime?

I thought they were positive suggestions. With respect to the commercial fishery, when we have denied South Australians the access rights that they have had to the public fishing estate, some compensation arrangement has always been made. The other suggestion of buying back the nets would remove the temptation for people to engage in black market fishing. That was rejected by the Minister. On 7 June, I issued a press release calling on Mr Baker to lift his ban on recrea-

tional net fishing, and I suggested that there ought to be a continuation of the netting review committee's recommendation that net fishing should be reduced by a natural attrition policy over time.

I was then approached by people from the South Australian Amateur Fishers Association, who made representations to the Minister (I have seen a copy of the document) about some of their concerns. They pointed out that this fishing, as distinct from commercial fishing, takes place between the low and high water mark and that the target species are mullet, salmon trout, tommy ruff and yellowfin whiting, which is a fairly rare species to be caught. They also pointed out that they do not catch King George whiting, which we all know is the main species under threat in South Australia. The Minister suggested that recreational net fishing is passive fishing. Anyone who has been involved in recreational net fishing, and I understand that you, Mr President, have engaged in that activity yourself, knows that it is backbreaking work. You suffer the cold, the heat, the wind, the weeds, and the mud. It is definitely not a pastime for the faint of heart.

They also talked about bag and boat limits, suggesting that to stop the selling of King George whiting it should be 10 per person per day and 30 per boat. They believe that ought to be implemented. They pointed out to the Minister that they were being blackened by some power haul netting that takes place, and I will not go into the merits or otherwise of that, but just report that comment. They pointed out that the perception of most recreational net fishermen was gained from the activities of professional power haulers. They pointed out also to the Minister that there were 3 000 gulf fishermen and that, if we accepted the proposition, there would be lost revenue to the Government of $50 each fisherman, which equals $150 000 and which equals the cost of three inspectors. If the Government were to let in 1 000 in the first year, it would gather another $300 000 in income. However, those very sensible submissions were rejected and, again, they pointed out to the Minister that there was no threat to mullet, tommy ruff and salmon trout. Those requests fell on deaf ears.

I was moved to issue another press release on 25 August 1995, whereby I suggested that the recreational ban on net fishing was unnecessary and I pointed out that, following the Estimates Committee of this Parliament when I asked where was the evidence that suggested that recreational net fishermen were doing damage, it was announced that the Minister intended to get interstate experts to come to South Australia and hold a workshop. A decision had been made, but there was no evidence that recreational net fishermen caused a detrimental effect, and I assert that this was a move to try to justify a decision that had already been made inappropriately. When I issued my press release on 25 August, I received by fax a letter from the Minister, which stated:

> I am writing to you concerning the prohibition of recreational fish nets in maritime waters. I have given this matter my full consideration and presented my recommendation to the Premier and Cabinet on Monday 21 August 1995 for their final decision. For the benefit of South Australians, now and future generations, the Government considers that it is imperative to endorse the responsible and necessary decision to prohibit the use of recreational gill nets in maritime waters of the State. This legislation will become effective on Friday 1 September 1995. The pertinent issues in support of the total prohibition on recreational nets relate to:
>
> 1. resource management; and
> 2. equity.
>
> Gill netting tends to be non-selective in terms of both the number of fish and species that are taken. The mortality of unwanted, undersized or fish in excess of bag limits is very high once the fish have been meshed in a gill net.
>
> Most of South Australia's inshore scalefish stocks are considered to be over-exploited. There are significant concerns over the status of tommy ruff (Australian herring), the Australian salmon and yellowfin whiting—target species of recreational gill net fishers.

My response to that is that the significant concerns were decided after a workshop had been set up by interstate experts. I remind the Council that these interstate experts, who have absolutely ruined their fisheries, come to South Australia to give advice on how to run our fisheries when, clearly, our fisheries have been managed far better than theirs. This, to me, is a curious way of going about things.

The Minister sent a letter headed 'Briefing notes on recreational netting' to all Liberal members of Parliament and stated:

> Gill netting tends to be non-selective in terms of both the number of fish and species that are taken.

Quite clearly, that is wrong because the mesh size will determine whether a small fish can swim through the net. A large fish cannot mesh himself and therefore will escape anyhow. The letter continued:

> The mortality of unwanted, undersized or fish in excess of bag limits is very high once the fish has been meshed in the gill net.

Clearly, an undersized fish cannot mesh itself in the gill net. It has to be of certain size, otherwise it will swim through it. It continued:

> Gill nets continue to fish as long as they are in the water, unlike hooks that stop fishing once the bait has gone.

This is profound stuff. It continues:

> This leads to problems with lost gill nets and nets that have been set for extended periods.
>
> The level of fishing effort and the quantity and variety of fish caught using a gill net are very difficult to manage effectively.

That submission suggests that the gill nets will be left for many hours and not cleared. The Minister has overlooked and failed to recognise the very fact that this fishing takes place between the high water mark and the low water mark and, if the net is left, the tide goes out and the net lies on the beach. Quite frankly, unless the fish have grown legs and gone up and attacked the net to try to enmesh themselves, I fail to see how that can be accurate. The letter continued:

> The current restrictive access provisions to recreational gill nets do not comply with a fundamental and internationally accepted principle of recreational fisheries management in democratic societies. If access to the use of a particular item of recreational fishing gear is to be allowed, it should be available to all South Australians. Providing an equal choice of access to recreational gill nets for all residents of South Australia, which applied prior to December 1985, presents difficulties in managing the level of effort and catch from this method of fishing and could result in a further decline in inshore scalefish stocks.

I challenged that assertion when I pointed out that in South Australia another example was that people who were licensed rock lobster potters had access, but the Minister is now attempting to cut me off at the pass and he will now restrict the access to recreational rock lobster fishers so that his argument applies. I remind the committee to go back prior to 1985. I point out that there was not 300 000 recreational nets in South Australia: there was a limited amount. Indeed, the same argument in respect of rock lobster pots is being promoted. The assertion has been put to me that under the new arrangement in the rock lobster industry there will not be any more pots. If we accept the proposition that the Recreational Amateur Fishermen's Association and I now support, namely, that those fisherman have rights, have

always had rights and ought to be able to attain those rights on a natural attrition policy, we will not have any further effort in the fishery.

In respect of the other assertion to which I referred earlier concerning the problems about fish stocks, that argument was clearly blown out of the water by a contribution in *Southern Fisheries* magazine by Dr Edyvane, who is the Minister's principal scientific researcher in SARDI South Australia. She pointed out in reviewing the Ocean 2 000 Report, which was commissioned by the Federal Government and which looked at all fisheries in South Australia, that there were five fisheries in South Australia that were under-exploited. They were: crabs, leather jackets, tommy ruffs, mullet and salmon trout. The last three of those species are the almost exclusive target of recreational net fishers in South Australia. Therefore, despite this process of trying to build-up an argument for a decision that had been made before and retrospectively create an argument, the assertion was shown to be flawed. It is quite clear that there is no pressure on those three species in South Australia. It ought to be remembered that that situation has occurred with those 6 500 to 7 000 recreational net fishermen engaging in that activity for years and enjoying it along with their families.

In the document dated 27 August, and faxed to me on 28 August, the Minister also stated:

> Recreational gill net fishing is not permitted in marine waters in New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria and Northern Territory. It has been phased out in Western Australia and further restrictions limiting their use are being introduced in Tasmania. Some cast net and bait net fishing is permitted in Queensland and the Northern Territory for the purposes of collecting bait only.

In that statement the Minister is forgetting the geography and the populations of those States. For instance, Victoria has approximately 10 times the population of South Australia. It is quite clear that their fisheries management has been such that they have ruined their fisheries. Despite the fact that we have thousands of kilometres of coastline and these recreational net fishers do not operate out of metropolitan centres such as Adelaide, Melbourne or Sydney—and I point out that recreational net fishing on the Adelaide metropolitan waters has been banned for years, and I agree with that—the Minister asserts that, because others are doing it, we necessarily have to do it.

We in South Australia are trying to lead and to be the smart State. We are supposed to be trying to create a better lifestyle. However, this particular proposal wants us to go all the way back to mediocrity and fall in line with others. Not for good reason, not for biological or scientific reasons, but because the Minister is bent on disposing of this activity and those people engaged within it. He went on in his contribution to say:

> There is the general opinion that the use of gill nets is not an appropriate recreational activity, and that there is difficulty in establishing effective management arrangements to control the quantity and type of fish caught with gill nets while maintaining equal opportunity for all recreational fishers to use a gill net.

That particular point has been answered earlier in this submission. He continues:

> The submission from the South Australian Amateur Fishermen's Association does not provide any evidence to counter the above two issues. The claim that the predominant species caught in recreational nets include tommy ruffs, Australian salmon and yellowfin whiting substantiates the need to more effectively manage the fishing effort from recreational nets, and they failed to address the question of equal access and opportunity to the use of recreational nets.

I have covered the point about equity and access. It is my submission that you cannot change the equity and access arrangements overnight without considering the history of the pastime in South Australia which has developed over the past 10 or 15 years. It is quite stupid to take away the rights of South Australians with just a stroke of the pen. I believe it is wrong and that it ought not to occur. The Minister claims:

> There is sufficient evidence, both scientific and anecdotal, to support regulations and management arrangements that will reduce the catch of fish species such as tommy ruff, yellow fin whiting and Australian salmon. The nature of gill netting is such that it is very difficult to effectively manage either the quantity or variety of fish caught, particularly if the current restrictive access arrangements are to be modified to be consistent with the principle of equal opportunity in recreational fishing.

That assumes that the Minister's thesis is right and, quite clearly, he has no qualms in taking away the rights of South Australians who are doing no harm to South Australia's fishing estate and denying them rights.

Having had discussions with the South Australian Amateur Fishermen's Association and hearing their concerns, I took the opportunity to write to recreational fishers throughout South Australia and sent out some thousands of letters, seeking their views. I have received just under 500 letters from people expressing their absolute concern and disappointment in this Minister and their absolute disgust that their rights as South Australians are being unilaterally taken away from them when there is no logical or sensible reason for that to be done.

In his notes to the Liberal backbench the Minister has said that the overwhelming majority of the public submissions to both the marine scale fish white paper and the recent net review were opposed to recreational gill netting. That is just not true. There were only 14 submissions to the review on net fishing in South Australia advocating the banning of all netting. Out of all the South Australian residents there were 14 submissions, and they referred to recreational nets and/or all netting. We are really talking about those who wanted to get rid of power hauling as well as recreational netting, so quite clearly that was wrong.

The Minister also provided the information that recreational gill nets are not selective in terms of species or numbers of fish killed. That is clearly wrong, and I have pointed that out, because that depends on the size of the mesh and the size of the fish. The Minister states that limited studies have shown that gill nets can be at least twice as effective as line fishing on species such as tommy ruff, mullet, yellow fin whiting and even King George whiting. Throwing in the King George whiting there is clearly a red herring, because it is not the target of these fishers. In fact, I think the Minister is deliberately misleading his backbench in putting that in. It is not true that these species are under-exploited, especially the whiting species, because they are not being caught here. They are being over-exploited by other forms of fishing.

The Minister also stated that access to inland waters using recreational nets will be reviewed over the next few months but that it should be noted that Lake George is unique in that only mullet are taken, and then only with difficulty by line fishing. That does not happen only in Lake George: it occurs in the open seas. And that is another point. These fish are generally recognised by fishers to be very aggressive fish and, left to their own devices with none being taken, they will force out the juvenile King George whiting which are in those

shallow waters and which congregate between the high water mark and the low water mark during high tides.

The Minister pointed out to his backbench, in an effort to justify his decision, that recreational gill netting is considered by most to be consistent with the national policy—although I do not know how he defined 'most'—on recreational fishing, where active participation is required and where only sufficient fish for immediate requirements may be taken. I have addressed the question of active participation. Quite clearly, active participation is required. It is quite clear that most people, whilst they are engaged in this activity, eat much more mutton than they catch fish. It is normally a family pastime, and people catch a few fish as part of the recreation.

The Minister provided the advice to his committee that current recreational netting rules also provide for inequity of access between recreational line fishers and those entitled to use recreational netting equipment. Allowing all recreational fishers to use gill nets would result in an unacceptable increase in fishing effort on an already over-exploited scale fishery. It is interesting to note that that is exactly what he intends to do with rock lobster pots. I addressed most of those questions earlier.

Commercial net fishing effort will be reduced by lowering the number of licences from 175 to 50. That is a decision that the Minister has taken in respect of the number of commercial fishermen, and arguments will take place in respect of that. I am conscious that the Council is keen to get on with its business, but I will not be deterred by the interjectors opposite, who think that this is a trivial matter. I can assure them that the 6 500 recreational net fishermen are quite angry at present with the people on the opposite side of the Chamber.

These regulations were brought in and were to be implemented when the Council was not sitting. I was moved to notify that I was going to move a disallowance motion in this Chamber so that this injustice would not be inflicted upon the recreational fishers in South Australia.

Clearly, what the Minister has attempted to do here is slip this regulation in respect of recreational net fishing in with a whole range of other regulations in an omnibus package in an attempt to get it through. As I have said, I have received 500 letters and numerous phone calls, and I know that the Minister's office and those of backbenchers in the Liberal Party have been flooded with letters. I should have thought that an experienced Minister would say, 'I will put this regulation up as one regulation and I will put up the rest of the regulations in another package.'

Unfortunately, that experience did not come to the fore, and he tried to do the cloak and dagger routine to slip it through. I am happy with the effect of that, although I was disappointed that he did not see fit to try to tackle this in a tradesman-like way but wanted to bludgeon it through. However, it has given all those people who wanted to make a contribution in respect of trying to save their pastime and recreation the opportunity to go to the Legislative Review Committee and give evidence.

I understand that people from northern Spencer Gulf have given evidence to the committee in the company of the Hon. Graham Gunn in respect of the size of King George whiting in that Upper Spencer Gulf area. Quite clearly, they have had an opportunity that would not otherwise have been available to them.

I understand that people from Coffin Bay gave evidence today, and more people are wanting to give evidence. There has been a very detailed submission by the Amateur Fishermen's Association with Mr Barry Treloar, who is one of the executive members. I also point out that Barry Treloar was the IMC Chairman and Chairman of the Net Review Committee and was vehement in his opposition to the rejection of his committee's recommendations to the Minister. Quite clearly and properly, in my view, representing those people, he put strong points of view to the Minister.

I would assert that it is because of that strong opposition to that unfair recommendation that he was virtually told that he would not now be the Chairman of the scale fish IMC in South Australia and that there would be an independent Chairman. I pointed out to this Chamber on another occasion that that position has now gone to Mr Ted Chapman, a former Liberal Minister and in my view a disgraced Chairman of the Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery Management Committee, because clearly that has been an absolute shambles. My understanding is that the only history that Mr Chapman has had in fisheries is in that area. If that is the criterion the Government is using to appoint independent chairmen in South Australia, we will have more, rather than less, trouble in fisheries.

When I announced my intention to move this disallowance motion and present this press release, I engaged in a radio interview, putting my point of view, expressing my disappointment and pointing out quite clearly my opinion about the assertion that the recreational net fishers were having an undue effect on fishery stocks in South Australia. I pointed out in that submission that Dr Edyvane's evidence clearly shows that the Minister's assertions are absolutely and totally wrong and that yellow eyed mullets, tommy ruffs and Australian salmon are underfished in South Australia. We must bear in mind that that is with 6 500 recreational fishermen operating in this State. I therefore had no alternative but to move this motion.

One other aspect of this matter needs to be put on the record. All those marine recreational net fishermen other than those who fish now in the Coorong and Lake George are to be denied their access to the fishery, but all those net permit holders are being advised that they can go and fish in the Coorong or Lake George. That is quite clearly an absurd situation because, if half those fishermen were to go down to the Coorong for recreational net fishing, it would be fished out within six months and there would still be no recreational net fishing in South Australia.

During that discourse with the Minister on the *Country Hour*, described by the Hon. Mr Elliott, the Minister extended the invitation to recreational amateur fishermen in South Australia to take the opportunity to phone or write to me and tell me what they thought of me for interfering with their recreational pursuits. That is a curious situation, because that is exactly what he is doing: interfering with the recreational pursuits of net fishermen. I am happy to report that I received seven phone calls within one hour. I did not receive one phone call from the amateur recreational line fishermen, but I received seven phone calls in that hour from recreational net fishers, praising the Opposition and me for standing up to what they believed was tyrannical action by this Minister.

Obviously, again the Minister has not recognised that clearly I received no phone calls or contributions from amateur recreational line fishermen because they target King George whiting and snapper; they do not target mullet, tommy ruffs, or salmon trout. I was confident that I would not receive any contributions, and in fact I did not. It is quite clear that this decision made by this Minister and this

Government has been made on a political philosophy. It has not been made on fact: it has been made against the recommendations of his own hand-picked committee. I believe it is unjust to recreational net fishermen in South Australia.

In conclusion, I point out what would happen if we were to accept what the Minister proposed when challenged about this: those people who now go recreational and net fishing should buy a boat and go amateur line fishing. It sounds a reasonable proposition on the surface, but if we tried to implement that policy, it would become absurd. If half—3 000—of them were to take up that challenge and go fishing on Saturdays and Sundays, clearly they would not be going out there to catch salmon, tommy ruffs or mullet: they would attack the very species that are under threat in South Australia, that is, King George whiting and snapper.

That last point clearly demonstrates that this decision is being made by people who do not know what recreational net fishing is all about. They have mixed everything up. They are mixing up the operations of power hauling with recreational netting. They introduce arguments about species which are the targets of recreational anglers and have quite clearly demonstrated to anyone with a smidgin of knowledge with respect to this operation that the decision has been inappropriately and hastily made. Since the decision has been made and been challenged, they have been trying for the past three or four months to find reasons to justify this inappropriate decision.

I understand that further contributions will be made to the Legislative Review Committee, and I look forward to those, because I do believe that what the Opposition has provided for all fishers in South Australia who are subjected to these new regulations is the opportunity to have themselves heard, put their case and try to get some reasonable judgment made, in contrast to this automatically dismissive attitude that has been displayed by the Minister with respect to these matters. I call on and urge the Council to support this disallowance motion and leave the recreational activities, which are enjoyed by thousands of South Australians, which do not affect the fishing estate and which provide great enjoyment and recreation for all those people and their families. I ask the Council to support my motion.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

AQUACULTURE

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I move:

That the Legislative Council requests that the Environment, Resources and Development Committee examine and make recommendations on the economic, environmental and planning aspects of South Australia's present aquaculture operations and any potential aquaculture operations.

The purpose of calling for an inquiry into South Australia's aquaculture industry is to provide certainty to one of the most exciting and valuable activities being fostered in this State. We must ensure that it becomes a truly sustainable industry. At the same time, we must avoid conflict between the proponents of aquaculture and those who have legitimate concerns and who raise legitimate issues. There is no doubt that the aquaculture industry has remarkable potential. Considerable effort has gone into developing and nurturing this enterprise, especially in recent years.

However, I believe the State Government's current approach to the industry fails to address several important issues which, if ignored, will severely restrict the viability of the industry and the State's reputation in this field. While the economics of the industry have been studied in depth, the environmental and planning issues have been overlooked to a large extent. But these concerns have the potential to force themselves into the economic equation if not addressed now.

South Australia has been endowed with natural resources which provide us with the opportunity to become a world leader in aquaculture. A review by the South Australian Development Council into the aquaculture industry released in July 1995 identifies the quality of our environment as a 'sustainable competitive advantage'. It states in part:

A clean environment is an outstanding competitive advantage worldwide in marketing food. South Australia has a global reputation as having a relatively clean, unpolluted environment. This is especially true in regard to aquaculture undertaken in coastal waters, because South Australia has extensive areas of coastline with little or no urban development.

I might add as an aside that I feel far safer eating an oyster from Coffin Bay than I do an oyster from Sydney any day of the week. The paradox of this situation is that, while South Australia's clean environment has been identified as a market advantage, there has been no attempt in the report to discuss the need for safeguards to ensure that this environmental quality is maintained. In fact, the maintenance of this 'competitive advantage' is not mentioned in the report at all.

The only reference to the environment relates to the restoration of aquaculture sites at the end of their proposed 40 year leases. The obvious potential problems with enforcing this need to be explored. While there has been a profusion of studies focusing on aquaculture, to date the emphasis has been almost entirely on administrative or logistical impediments to the growth of the industry. Problems identified have been inordinately long and difficult approval processes, or lease terms that do not provide enough security to encourage investment within the industry. Logistical problems such as limited access to broodstock or lack of State infrastructure to support the growth of the industry have also been noted. No doubt these and other issues need to be given adequate attention, but I am concerned that, so far, environmental and planning aspects of the industry have received little, if any, concerted investigation.

Aquaculture is classified as an intensive industry and, as such, has the potential to pollute the very environment upon which it depends. While our coastal waters may generally now be considered unpolluted, there is no guarantee that, with the continued growth of this industry, they will remain so. In general, while some specific research has been conducted on the damage various aquaculture farming techniques can inflict upon the environment, these studies are largely incomplete. When recommendations have been made, they are often ignored. Many environmental issues have already been identified by local communities, environmental groups and the industry itself, but in many cases have been inadequately addressed by Government.

What I will now do is take just a couple of the aquaculture industries in South Australia, and give examples of some of the problems there and some of the conflicts that might arise. If we fail to address them, they will do damage to the industry in the longer term. I will first refer to the tuna industry. I am a supporter of the growing up of tuna in pens. It has certainly been a way of taking pressure off the native stocks which were at major threat. There was a major risk that the tuna could have been wiped out. Perhaps we reacted to the

problems there just in time. However, we still need to be cautious in our approach to tuna farming.

Recent studies on the influence of tuna cages on the sea bed (benthic) communities have only recently developed methodologies to determine whether damage is occurring. It is these benthic communities that filter the water, and these have been made vulnerable by the cages. Not only is pollution created by the tuna farms but it is also wiping out the organisms that filter the seawater naturally. In many cases, the prior condition of areas now supporting aquaculture is unknown. This leaves substantial holes in our knowledge of the environmental *status quo*. One must expect impact because there is a much greater density of fish, in particular the feed, going into a very small area than you would ever see in the natural environment. It should come as no surprise that the benthic and nearby communities should be affected by it. The question is to what extent.

Tuna farms, such as those existing at Port Lincoln on South Australia's west coast, have also encountered problems in providing adequate feed, manufactured or otherwise, to caged fish. Wild pilchards are now one source of feed, but the continuation of this practice on its present scale may not be viable. It has been suggested to me that the wild stock may already be over-fished, and that this could lead to a collapse of the pilchard population. A collapse of this kind is not unheard of in South Australia and we only need to think of the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery, which was showing record catches and then went into dramatic and virtual overnight decline. Some people had warned of a potential collapse, but those warnings were not heeded.

Currently there is a push to increase the permitted catch of pilchards. There is evidence that significant illegal catching may already be occurring. It is difficult to police catches, when boats catch 20 tonnes, call in at their tuna pens, drop off 10 tonnes and then proceed to shore and declare a 10 tonne catch. I have received information from several sources that these sorts of practices are occurring and indeed the pilchard catch is significantly larger than the official legal catch, and yet there is pressure for an increase in the catch and that will almost certainly mean an increase in both the legal and illegal catch at the same time.

There is a need for caution. I have already mentioned the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery which was supposed to be the world's most managed fishery. We were told it was one of the few fisheries actually being managed from when it first started, and yet it collapsed. In recent times there have been reports of the collapse of the Grand Banks cod fishery in Canada, a fishery that was also being closely monitored and yet it collapsed. In the Canadian scenario, the data that scientists were collecting from their random sweeps of the ocean were indicating considerably smaller fish stocks than the catches of the commercial fishing fleet. The fishermen were saying, 'It is fine,' but the scientists were expressing some concern. However, the scientists became unsure of the validity of their data when the figures were based on research with a much smaller sample size than the figures they were receiving from the industry. As it eventuated, the catch sizes were unrepresentative of the health of the fishery, as fish were congregating in the areas of warmer water and warmer currents. These were the areas to which the boats were going, and this resulted in further overfishing and the eventual collapse of the entire fishery. The warning here is that this occurred in a fishery like the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery that was closely monitored and assessed.

An article in the *New Scientist* of 16 September 1995 points out that certain assumptions must be made to determine the existing fish population from the population samples caught. If these assumptions are wrong, this can produce extremely inaccurate data. A critical point that needs to be made is to ensure that, even if our calculations are wrong, there needs to be a leeway in our models to reduce the chance of inadvertent depletion to the absolute minimum. It is what many people call the precautionary principle. You do not try to work yourself right to the very margins. If you do, you take the risks that were taken with the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery and which were taken with the Grand Banks cod fishery.

Apart from threatening the industry, continued heavy fishing of pilchards will affect the higher order species that also feed on pilchards—we must not forget that they are an important part of the food chain, including the tuna wild stock, other fish species, dolphins, penguins, etc. It is worth noting that in Victoria recently a penguin colony collapsed and several others have been in decline. A major cause of that has been the depletion of the fish on which they have been feeding. An alternative which has been utilised is the importation of pilchards, instead of using the locally caught variety. Unfortunately there is an associated risk of importing disease with them. As shown in a recent *Four Corners* report on the ABC, this may have already occurred in the recent pilchard kill across southern Australian waters. Disasters on this enormous scale can and inevitably will occur unless some adequately resourced safeguards are put into place.

The present levels of quarantine resourcing are not high enough to prevent entry of foreign diseases or to prevent a repeat of scenes similar to the pilchard kill. Apart from any financial damage to the industry, it is the reputation of the aquaculture industry in South Australia as a clean producer that is also at stake. Manufactured feed for tuna has the potential for resolving many problems. A feed has been developed in the form of 'sausages'. Currently newly caged tuna undergo a weaning process from their natural food to that supplied in the cages, which results in an initial weight loss. This is due to the tuna refusing to accept the substitute feed immediately. A further problem is the fact that there is no commercial production of this feed occurring, nor is it imminent.

While these problems will undoubtedly be overcome in the future, they are impediments to the growth of the tuna industry. The SADC Aquaculture Committee report fails to mention practicalities such as this time lag between projected industry growth and a suitable feed. This issue was not considered in the committee's report, which predicts that the tuna industry will more than double in the next five years. On paper this dramatic growth may be possible, but the committee appears to have neglected the potential feed shortage when assessing the potential growth of the industry.

What also has not been addressed adequately is the type of nets currently being used to cage tuna. That issue has been raised in this place previously. Quite a large number of dolphins are still being caught and are dying in these nets. There are reports of dolphins accidentally getting caught while hunting for the smaller fish that congregate around the tuna pens. As I understand it, this problem is avoidable by two quite simple changes to net design. First, it is a matter of keeping the nets tied tight and keeping them tight all the time.

As I understand it, with a change in the tides the net becomes loose, and that is when the dolphins are likely to get in under the net and, as they come up, get themselves

entangled in the net. There is also a need to change the mesh size and the material being used to make the nets. I am assured that, with changes of that sort, most of the problems for the dolphins will be overcome. I am also told that the cost of replacing current nets with a safer variety would be equivalent to the sale price of three or four tuna.

I will now move on to issues of planning. A consultative process should be put in place to address any planning concerns in the industry. An excellent example of this is what has been happening at Venus Bay on the State's West Coast where there is overwhelming public opposition to the siting of the proposed aquaculture development. In this case, one of the options would place the development on a prominent headland, which is Crown land which is zoned 'rural coastal' and which has been designated by the Elliston council as 'coastal conservation and recreation'. This year a public meeting near, I think, Venus Bay, was attended by about 150 residents (noting that Venus Bay has only 120 dwellings) and passed almost unanimously a motion, which stated:

> . . . the two proposed abalone aquaculture sites of the south head and jetty are not acceptable to this meeting.

The Venus Bay Action Group, which was formed after this meeting, has continued to emphasise that the opposition to the development is not directed at aquaculture *per se* but at the siting of this development.

For the development to proceed before the DAC, the developer needs tenure of the land in question. The Elliston council, after taking into consideration the local community's opposition to the proposed siting of the development, refused the application for the tenure of the land. Furthermore, a Coast Protection Board report to the DAC with regard to this development identifies 18 occasions where this development conflicts with either the council's development objectives or the Minister's supplementary development plan (SDP).

It was my intention to read into *Hansard* the objectives and principles within the plan, but recognising the lateness of the hour I will not do that at this time. However, I advise members that the proposed development of Venus Bay conflicts with 18 separate points within the development plan.

The report concludes by recommending that the development be refused but that it 'would have no objections to the proposal on land which does not have such landscape characteristics or environmental issues'. Despite reports of this nature, the local Liberal member, Liz Penfold, in October this year, described the south head site as 'a favoured site for [aquaculture] development'. Furthermore, the application is yet to be processed by the DAC despite its having been lodged nearly a year ago, and the developer still has not been granted tenure of the land.

I raised some of these issues during Question Time yesterday and again, owing to the lateness of the hour, I will not go through this further. However, I express very strong concern that the Department of Environment and Natural Resources would seek to resume the land from the Elliston council, take it outside the council's control and then allow the proposed developer to take it over. It would be a clear breach of the wishes of a local community which has not been negative about the general proposal for aquaculture. The community has been saying that it welcomes that form of aquaculture in its area and it has suggested alternative sites quite close by. So, it is not being negative, it is not being 'not in our backyard'; it is simply being responsible. It recognises that there will be conflict between what is good for the abalone breeder and other legitimate interests, which include tourism. It is on a prominent and important site and is an area which, for a range of environmental reasons, has been protected by the development plan.

The last area which I will give by way of example is Coffin Bay. I have been watching the development at Coffin Bay for a considerable period of time and have been liaising with members of the local community. It is a popular tourist destination and the location of aquaculture developments. As I said, I prefer to eat its oysters than New South Wales oysters; that is not parochialism, but a recognition that it has an excellent product. The question is just how far can it go, how far should it go, how far should it expand and where should it expand within Coffin Bay?

Some significant difficulties are yet to be overcome to ensure the sustainability of oyster farming in South Australia. The Shellfish Environmental Monitoring Program (SEMP) began in November 1991 at Coffin Bay. Its objectives were to monitor the effects of oyster farming on the environment; police compliance with planning, licence and lease regulations and conditions; supply the data needed to determine future management plan reviews; investigate environmental concerns raised by the public; supply the data required to ensure appropriate fisheries management; and address EPA statutory requirements.

They were very noble objectives, but the effectiveness of SEMP has been severely restricted because of funding delays. There also have been prolonged delays in the introduction of licences. Therefore, SEMP cannot fulfil its obligations, such as monitoring licence compliance, as there have been no licence regulations to monitor for quite some time. Funding delays also have reduced the potential contribution of SEMP to the industry. These delays have resulted in the initial data collection, which was to have been done prior to any actual farming, to remain incomplete. Therefore, we have been left in difficulty when measuring the impact of what has been there already and being able to assess how much more farming can go into the area, because that initial funding and work has not been forthcoming. This data can now never be completed. Incomplete studies such as these can lead to incorrect assumptions regarding the health of our aquaculture industry; assumptions such as these increase the risk of gross mismanagement, and that is a risk to the industry itself. I am not just talking about the environment or about the impact that it might have on tourism if it spreads too far through the bay and gets too close to shore and so on; I am saying that the very health of the industry itself cannot be assured if we do not have that adequate baseline data.

If a Government is prepared to ignore quite legitimate concerns in order to pursue its own agenda, most of us would expect some sort of public reaction. The catch here is that a Government's bad handling of this reaction can cause long-term damage to an industry's reputation. Bad feelings created between industry and community groups take a long time to heal.

On a brighter note, there are many possibilities for the industry to develop beyond simply growing seafood. In a report to the Minister for Primary Industries titled 'Seizing the challenge', the Centre for International Economics states that the potential for South Australian fisheries (including aquaculture) 'lies in better marketing and management'. Opportunities exist to develop and market our growing expertise both interstate and internationally, and this aspect should not be underestimated. Developments such as manufactured feed should not be seen as merely a solution to local problems but as a business opportunity in its own right.

Here in South Australia we have a remarkable opportunity to become a world leader in the aquaculture industry owing to our natural advantages. These advantages must not be squandered by settling for an old-fashioned confrontational style industry when the opportunity exists to create a progressive industry that is both consultative and innovative, providing a real win-win situation for local residents, environmental groups, the aquaculture industry, the Government and the State as a whole.

While the economics of the industry have been studied in depth, there is no doubt that if environmental and planning aspects are not considered at a formative stage of this industry, these concerns will force themselves into the economic equation at a later stage with what is likely to be disastrous results. A naive approach, such as is being shown by the Government, in ignoring the unavoidable realities of the environmental limitations or the strength of reaction by people affected by poor planning within the industry, is a recipe for confrontation that can only harm the aquaculture industry.

South Australia is uniquely placed to develop aquaculture as a major industry in this State. Our mix of advanced technological potential and a clean environment puts us in a prime position to take advantage of this extraordinary opportunity. Therefore, it is of utmost importance to ensure that we do not allow the Government's blinkered approach to spoil this chance. By taking a balanced and widely consultative approach we will be able to maximise the benefits to the State while minimising the detractions.

This motion seeks to refer the issue to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee. This committee can handle this issue, provide a lead and provide great assistance to the future development of the aquaculture industry in South Australia. Whilst I have raised a number of issues—and they are real issues—they are capable of being addressed and are all capable of being resolved, but they will not be resolved by being avoided or by putting our heads in the sand. I urge all members in this place to support the motion.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I rise to support the motion of referring the economic, environmental and planning aspects of South Australia's aquaculture operations to the ERD Committee and do so for a number of reasons. I congratulate previous State Governments that have invested a great deal of time, effort, energy and taxpayers' money into the marine research laboratory at West Beach. It certainly has put South Australia into the forefront of providing the scientific support base that is required to provide the information and knowledge base for the investment that is sorely needed to maintain the industry.

The industry has set itself up on land-based aquaculture programs and has also set itself up in sea and harbourside ventures using the natural flow of seawater through the aquacultural programs. Victoria also has a marine research laboratory and is moving towards aquaculture programs, while Tasmania probably has running the oldest aquaculture program in Australia in the area south of Hobart using the red salmon—a species it started off many years ago. It has been a boon for import replacement and a boon for jobs and growth in that region of Tasmania.

Certainly a lot of information around indicates to me and to many other people that the industry is not a fly-by-night industry but that it is one which will be around for a long time and will grow. It is not an industry where the investment strategies of potential investors will be placed at risk because of the pressures on the existing wild stocks of fish around the world.

In the past 25 years there has been a number of incursions into sovereign fishing grounds around the world. Most notably the first ones to occur were the Icelandic complaints against the British in relation to the cod in the North Sea. It got to the ludicrous position of the cod stocks being protected by destroyer escorts going out to make sure that the Icelandic ships and fishing boats and the British fish haulers and their catches were protected by Navy vessels. We then had recent incursions into the Canadian fish territorial grounds by Spanish trawlers and those problems are now being sorted out. There have been incursions into the Portuguese sardine traditional fishing areas by other fishing vessels and there are pressures on international fish stocks to ensure that the maximisation of that stock is spread through the marketplace internationally.

Australia has had incursions from Indonesian vessels from the north into our northern waters and, to take off the pressure from our wild fish stocks, we need aquaculture programs. South Australia is well placed to be at the forefront of such and to take economic and financial advantage with the scientific research and educational advantage that we have to put it all together. The only thing that is starting to threaten that advantage that we now have through our scientific advance and research that has put us into the forefront, along with our clean waterways and managed resource on aquaculture programs on the land, is the potential for poor planning programs, through either trying to rush projects or trying to overcome what would be regarded as fair and reasonable opposition by local people to the extension of aquaculture programs where they are not designed nor applicable.

We have had problems in managing competitive use in the Coffin Bay area and now have an emerging problem in Venus Bay and the headland there. These problems can be overcome by good management and an integration of all those people with a vested interest in maintaining a clean environment, good planning programs and process and by being able to maximise the economic returns by placing the aquaculture programs in an area that provides the best benefit and the best returns.

I can remember the Public Works Committee which you, Mr President, and I were on that looked at the placement of the marine research laboratory. We were leaning towards the placement of that marine research laboratory on the West Coast or in the South-East to take advantage of some of the aquacultural programs that were starting to emerge then. We were convinced on the evidence put before us that perhaps it should be sited in the metropolitan area near to the tertiary institutions and organisations that may be supplying the scientific back-up and research programs through the university programs. It needed to be placed closer to the tertiary institutions than in the isolated areas that I mentioned. I still lean towards having it placed in one of those regional areas or having smaller institutions associated with aquaculture ventures in either Port Lincoln and/or the South-East as adjuncts to the marine research facilities that we have here to expand the knowledge and make it more localised so that the varieties of fish and/or crayfish or shellfish can be studied in depth in the local environment.

Rock lobster currently sells for about $40 per kilogram when the season opens, although lower this season for seasonal reasons, and the price of a lot of our fish and fish products are starting to get out of the reach of most people. Rock lobster are being landed off the boat, go straight to the

agent's arms, are shipped out live and exported into the lucrative Singapore, Hong Kong and Asian markets away from the tables of locals.

Unless aquacultural programs are built up in this State and around Australia generally, the pricing mechanisms that the market will produce in relation to those fish stocks will become depleted and highly sought after on international tables, and Australians will not be able to afford many of those products that we harvest. We need to build up the stocks using the best scientific knowledge that is available, in the cleanest environment and with the best planning process to enable an integration of development in regional and isolated areas that will produce income and jobs. In addition, as the Hon. Mr Elliott says, there is an industry associated with feed stock growth.

It is vital that we get all aspects of the aquaculture development programs right and it is time to take a snapshot of what we have in this State to investigate the point that we have reached. The Environment, Resources and Development Committee is a good committee to be able to achieve that. Members on this side of the Chamber have shown considerable interest in this issue by asking questions on problems associated with aquaculture and about protecting the marine environment. I have asked questions about protecting the marine environment in which aquaculture programs are being carried out from point source and onshore pollution, and it is quite clear that planning recommendations need to be brought in to ensure that land and marine use can exist alongside each other without competition and without the acrimony that is starting to develop.

The local residents of Coffin Bay, Venus Bay and Port Lincoln, and all the other people who live alongside aquaculture programs, are supportive of those programs. They have their detractors but, in the main, there is general support for the continuation of such programs, but we have to make sure that the legislative processes remove the potential for any conflict that may develop and/or emerge. As I have said, some countries are prepared to confront each other using their navies to protect their resources. It would be good if Australia could relieve a lot of pressure from fish stocks internationally to ensure that fish as a staple diet can be afforded by both developed and developing countries. As I said before, it is only people in the developed countries who can afford to have a lot of the fish stocks on their table.

Many South Pacific nations are not able to fish their own stocks because they have sold the rights to the harvesting of those stocks to Japanese, Taiwanese and Chinese interests and, in the case of Samoa, to American interests. These people are reduced to the point of buying tinned salmon and other tinned fish, which supplements what used to be part of their traditional harvest of fresh fish and, in the case of their supplemented diet, their vegetables.

It is clear that there is a long-term market. We can attract investment into these projects but we need to give assurance to those investors who come into the marketplace that these projects will be welcomed, that they have the support and confidence of local communities, that they can be expanded and that they can be moved about. I also mention a recent project in the northern Spencer Gulf where snapper stocks are being developed.

The Hon. Caroline Schaefer: It is an excellent project.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Hon. Caroline Schaefer informs me that it is a excellent project. We must mention the new and developing projects that are making their way around the coast. As I said, it is time to take a snapshot of industry, to find out what is required in terms of planning and development, and to make sure that the projects fit harmoniously into local communities so that they can be nurtured and fostered and so that they can develop through investment packages. In that way we can look forward to a history of growth and stability in this industry.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER secured the adjournment of the debate.

BENLATE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. M.J. Elliott:

That the Legislative Council draws to the attention of the South Australian Government the emerging scientific and other information in relation to the fungicide Benlate.

(Continued from 25 October. Page 342.)

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I rise to support the motion moved by the Hon. Mr Elliott. The motion is a fair and reasonable one, given that, through the contribution made by the honourable member on the subject matter, members were well informed, but I will not say swamped. It was a well researched contribution and certainly indicates to the Opposition that this motion does need to be supported so that the weight of the scientific evidence provided in the contribution by the Hon. Mr Elliott, plus the reply by Du Pont—and I have to be fair to the manufacturer of Benlate—are put on the record. The balance needs to be drawn. The evidence provided to this Chamber certainly convinces me that the conservative position of again taking a snapshot of the evidence that is now available in relation to the controversial fungicide Benlate should be now looked at.

It is not a radical motion in any way. It draws the Government's attention to an update of the evidence that is now available, in part, through the legal action taken by the Department of Agriculture in 1995, when it registered a legal action against Du Pont on which a court has made a settlement. It still does not clear up the matter in relation to some of the controversy that brought about the matter resting in the court. The contribution made by the Hon. Mr Elliott indicates to me that the scientific evidence still needs further scrutiny, or at least South Australia needs to take stock of the differences in the scientific evidence that has been provided.

The history of the development of fungicides, weedicides, pesticides and the chemical industry generally has been pockmarked with controversy in relation to the application of inappropriate chemicals for agricultural and horticultural purposes. In some cases it is not the chemical which is at fault. In some cases it is the application that is at fault. In some cases it involves poor and wrong advice that has been given in relation to the purpose for which the chemical is to be used. In yet other cases it is clear that the applications of the chemicals and the purposes for which they were being used were appropriate and they have been appropriately applied, but damage has been done either to human health, fauna, flora or the ecology because of some of the previously unknown attributes of the chemicals.

Through the evolutionary process, more than any weighted scientific evidence, we have learnt to our cost that dangerous side effects are associated with the application of some of these chemicals. I first heard of problems being associated with Benlate when a number of growers approached me and the Hon. Mr Elliott and complained of the losses that they had suffered in relation to their glasshouses and the programs

that they were running in the northern suburbs. They were also highlighting health problems that had been brought about, possibly through overexposure to chemicals. I was not in a position to judge, but certainly it appeared as though people in those northern regions were exposing themselves to problems, either through poor application, poor use or poor protection; it may have been that the risks of using the chemical to which they were being exposed were not explained to them; or, if the risk management programs had been explained, they were not being put into effect.

The history of the dangers associated with human exposure to chemicals, in many cases, arises out of ignorance. In other cases, it is the inappropriate application of those chemicals in the programs that they have been advised to carry out. In the late 1970s or early 1980s, as an identified industrial and ecology activist, I put together a community team of people who were concerned about aspects of a number of chemicals that had been sprayed from aircraft onto crops that were planted quite close to rural towns in the South-East. The education program that I went through in trying to identify the ingredients of a number of those chemicals was certainly an eye-opener. I understand the difficulties that the users of those various chemicals in the northern suburbs had in relation to identifying the ingredients of some of the chemicals that they were using in their greenhouses and horticultural programs.

Another problem is also emerging, that is, the changing genetic make-up of a lot of agricultural-horticultural lines. In some cases the original gene pool of a plant or program has changed to a point where they have been adversely affected by chemicals that have been inappropriately applied or the labelling has not indicated that those chemicals should be used either in different volumes or be applied in different ways.

So, there is a lot of speculation about the chemical Benlate. Numerous complaints have been made in relation to those batches that were put together in 1991 and 1992. A number of lawsuits have been taken out against Du Pont in relation to the use of Benlate internationally. It appears that the common denominator in relation to the application is the climatic conditions in which they are applied. That is another ingredient that comes into play when chemicals are being applied within the agricultural and horticultural industry.

There is also the problem of drift and the cocktails that emerge from the dual application of chemicals within close proximity to each other that, again, users do not take into account. I have had cases reported to me when planes have been crop spraying a chemical in a particular area on a particular day with wind direction and speed impacting on other farmers who have been applying chemicals through boom sprays behind trucks. Although they have experienced no problems with the boom spray applications and the way in which that chemical has impacted on their crop, when the cocktail mix emerges from inappropriate aerial spraying it has caused damage to crops. It ends up with farmers living in close proximity to each other who have been using sprays on different and varying crops getting into halters about the way in which their neighbours have applied those sprays and the impact that it has had on their crops.

There are a lot of unknowns in relation to numerous chemicals, and a number of chemicals have been targeted—in some cases unnecessarily and in other cases necessarily. Probably the best illustration of a chemical that developed a reputation, and quite rightly so, was DDT. Although I will not go into it, DDT certainly changed its name, and the chemical companies tried to disguise it by mixing it with a lot of other chemicals. It was given a number rather than a name in some cases. One of the problems we have in this State is that the national standard for chemical laws is not consistent. Each State has its own legislation and its own standards.

The committee of which I was a member in the South-East, comprising people with agricultural and horticultural backgrounds, identified that DDT was being brought in via Queensland, through the Northern Territory into South Australia and was, in part, responsible for residues within beef cattle. In some cases, even after we had alerted farmers in the South-East as to what they were using, at least two farms were quarantined because of the residues that were starting to build up in those cows.

So, there is a history of stand-offs and defensiveness in relation to any investigations that occur when chemicals are identified as potentially or allegedly causing problems within a particular industry. The potential for litigation can be quite costly, particularly when it comes to human health and long-term residues, effects and build-ups. In the case of the flower farmers in the northern regions, coupled with the litigants in Florida, Du Pont was put in a position of having to provide the best scientific evidence to defend its case in relation to its product.

We are now saying that we should look at the differing views of scientists around the world who have been exposed to the arguments, and our advice to the South Australian Government and indirectly to the Federal Government is that they should try to collate all the best scientific evidence, give it due weight and consideration and come away with fresh recommendations about this chemical so that people in this State can have confidence that what they are using is either safe or not safe.

If the recommendations for the applications have to change, so be it; if the labelling has to change, so be it; if there have to be changes to the directions for the applications, that is something that the Government should consider. We support the motion.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I rise to make a brief contribution to this debate. As shadow Minister for Primary Industries, I have had numerous submissions in respect of this matter. I would like to congratulate the Hon. Mr Elliott on the effort he has put into accumulating this information. As a member of this place I take note of the evidence that he has gathered. I am certain that it will be welcomed by those people in South Australia who have alleged that their properties and their products have been contaminated in some way by Benlate over the time that this dispute has been going on. This is another chapter in a long-running situation.

I make no comment as to whether Du Pont is guilty or not guilty. It is fair to note that the Government has been involved in this issue over a few years and the Department of Primary Industries has endeavoured to provide assistance to growers in respect of its responsibilities under numerous Acts. Indeed, I was pleased to note that, after submissions by me and my colleague (Ms Annette Hurley) in another place, the department was able to provide some assistance for one grower, in allowing him some relief from debt to the tune of $17 000. This is a welcome sign, and I congratulate the Government on providing that assistance to at least one affected grower.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: How long ago was that?

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: A month ago; within the last month. I am sure that relief is welcome, although I note after

discussions with that constituent, who was a cucumber grower, that he still has some concerns that he wants to take up with the department. That is beyond my control, but I am certain that this information will form the basis of any litigation that takes place against Du Pont for alleged malpractice or contamination, whatever it may be, and I think that the Hon. Mr Elliott ought to be congratulated. I hope that the Government will take note of the evidence that has been presented and provide any assistance within its power to assist growers in their legal attempts to get justice for the damage that they feel very strongly they have suffered because of the use of Benlate. The Opposition supports the motion.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.58 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 16 November at 2.15 p.m.