

SOUTH AUSTRALIA

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

First Session of the Forty-Eighth Parliament (1994)

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 10 February 1994

The House met at 11 a.m. pursuant to proclamation issued by Her Excellency the Governor (Dame Roma Mitchell).

The Clerk (Mr G.D. Mitchell) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION

At 11.5 a.m., in compliance with summons, the House proceeded to the Legislative Council, where a Commission was read appointing the Honourable Leonard James King (Chief Justice) to be a Commissioner for the opening of Parliament.

MEMBERS, SWEARING IN

The House being again in its own Chamber, at 11.12 a.m. His Honour Mr Justice King attended and produced a Commission from Her Excellency the Governor appointing him to be a Commissioner to administer to members of the House of Assembly the Oath of Allegiance or the Affirmation in lieu thereof required by the Constitution Act. The Commission was read by the Clerk, who then produced writs for the election of 47 members for the House of Assembly.

The Oath of Allegiance required by law (or the Affirmation) was administered and subscribed to by members.

The Commissioner retired.

SPEAKER, ELECTION

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Premier): I remind the House that it is now necessary to proceed to the election of a Speaker. I move:

That Mr G.M. Gunn take the Chair of the House as Speaker.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): I second the nomination of Mr Graham Gunn as Speaker of the House.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): In compliance with the Standing Orders and in accordance with the traditions of Parliament, I humbly submit myself to the will of the House.

There being only one nomination, Mr Gunn was declared elected.

Mr Gunn was escorted to the dais by the mover and seconder of the motion.

The SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn): Standing here on the upper step, which is the traditional place for the Chair, I assure all members that it will be my aim to ensure the utmost protection of members' rights, both collectively and individually.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Premier): Mr Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election by this House of Assembly to the position of Speaker, a very important position in this Chamber. You are, in fact, the umpire of the Chamber, and all members expect a fair and reasonable judgment every time from the Speaker.

It is appropriate, Sir, that you have been elected. You now share with Mr Becker the honour of being the longest serving member of this House. In a previous Parliament you had the experience of being Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees, so you are by far the most experienced member of the House in terms of the role of the Speaker and what is required. I have a great deal of confidence in the manner in which you will carry out that role, and I take this opportunity on behalf of the House to congratulate you on your election.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): I, too, rise to join with the Premier in congratulating you upon your election to the position of Speaker of the House of Assembly. We are confident on our side that you will serve that position with distinction. We know that on the previous occasion when you were Deputy Speaker of this Parliament and on other occasions in intervening years when you sometimes sat in the Chair as Acting Speaker or Acting Chairman of Committees that you always disported yourself with distinction in that role, and by that I mean with fairness to all members of the House in the business of this place. I can assure you, Mr Speaker, that the Opposition looks

forward to working with you in this Chamber as you fulfil the noble duties of the role of Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I thank the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition for their congratulations. I can assure all members that I will do my utmost to uphold the traditions of this House and the rights of members.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Premier): I have to inform the House that Her Excellency the Governor will be pleased to have the Speaker presented to her at 12.15 p.m. today.

[Sitting suspended from 11.34 a.m. to 12.5 p.m.]

The SPEAKER: It is now my intention to proceed to Government House to present myself as Speaker to Her Excellency the Governor, and I invite members to accompany me.

At 12.5 p.m., accompanied by the deputation of members, the Speaker proceeded to Government House.

On the House reassembling at 12.22 p.m.:

The SPEAKER: Accompanied by a deputation of members, I proceeded to Government House for the purpose of presenting myself to Her Excellency the Governor, and informed Her Excellency that, in pursuance of the powers conferred on the House by section 34 of the Constitution Act, the House of Assembly had this day proceeded to the election of Speaker, and had done me the honour of election to that high office. In compliance with other provisions of the same section, I presented myself to Her Excellency as the Speaker, and in the name and on behalf of the House laid claim to our undoubted rights and privileges, and prayed that the most favourable construction might be put on all our proceedings. Her Excellency has been pleased to reply as follows:

To the honourable the Speaker and members of the House of Assembly: I congratulate the members of the House of the Assembly on their choice of Speaker, and I readily assure you, Mr Speaker, of my confirmation of all constitutional rights and privileges of the House of Assembly, the proceedings of which will always receive most favourable consideration.

[Sitting suspended from 12.24 to 2.15 p.m.]

SUMMONS TO COUNCIL CHAMBER

A summons was received from Her Excellency the Governor desiring the attendance of the House in the Legislative Council Chamber, whither the Speaker and honourable members proceeded.

The House having returned to its own Chamber, the Speaker resumed the Chair at 3.7 p.m. and read prayers.

COMMISSION OF OATHS

The SPEAKER: I have to report that I have received from the Governor a Commission under the hand of Her Excellency and the public seal of the State empowering me to administer the Oath of Allegiance or receive the Affirmation necessary to be taken by members of the House of Assembly.

MEMBERS, DEATH

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

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the deaths of the Hon. John C. Burdett and the Hon. Jessie M. Cooper,

former members of the Legislative Council; places on record its appreciation of their long and meritorious service; and, as a mark of our respect to their memory, the sittings of the House be suspended for five minutes.

I move this motion with a feeling of real loss, particularly in the case of the Hon. John Burdett, who was a member of the Upper House almost up until his death and who resigned part way through last year after a very long illness. John was a Minister of Community Welfare and a Minister of Consumer Affairs, having entered Parliament shortly after I became a member, at a by-election for the Legislative Council. Coming from the small rural community of Mannum, he was known locally as 'the member for Mannum', and he worked very hard for that district and represented it well.

I am sure the main memory all of us would have of John Burdett is as a very compassionate and understanding person. As Minister of Community Welfare he got out into the community so that he could better understand the nature of the problems people were suffering, and he spent part of one Christmas day with people in detention in order to understand their problems and to give them a better Christmas.

He was a member of the Legislative Review Committee, and he took a particular interest in the standards and performance of the Parliament. I particularly highlight the way in which John was very loyal to the Parliament, the Liberal Party and certainly to the people he represented. He was dedicated to his parliamentary career in very much the same way as he was to his own personal beliefs and his religion, and he was respected by those with whom he came into contact as a result. Of course, he was very heavily involved in the St Vincent de Paul Society at Mannum—again reflecting the great concern that he had for the community.

Jessie Cooper made history in 1959 by becoming the first woman to enter the South Australian Legislative Council. She was originally from Sydney and was an educated person with a Bachelor of Arts degree. I mention her education achievements, because she was a very articulate and academically interested person to talk to, although I think that many people may have misunderstood Jessie and what she was aiming to achieve. She originally worked in the education field in Sydney and then moved to Adelaide with her husband Jeff. She first sought preselection in 1952 and was finally successful in 1959.

As I have said, Jessie Cooper became the first woman member of the Legislative Council. She entered the Parliament at the same election as Joyce Steele, who lived in the same district and represented the electorate of Burnside (later Davenport, the electorate in which I had the honour of following Joyce Steele). Jessie, who always worked very hard, had a number of interests and, again, very much like John Burdett, she had faith and confidence in the parliamentary system. Talking to Jessie, one learnt that the first thing she would want to talk about was the importance, traditions and honour of the Westminster system.

Jessie's interests included the area of energy and the fact that South Australia had always faced an uphill battle to supply its energy needs from gas and electricity. She also took a great interest in the role of women, wanting to see greater representation by women. However, I think the best tribute to Jessie can be found in the comments of her own colleagues upon her retirement from the Parliament in 1979. I will not go through those speeches in detail, but it is obvious that her colleagues regarded her as a very hard-working member of Parliament. On her retirement she said of herself:

A woman in politics works twice as hard as any man, and when I first entered Parliament I set myself a workload that nearly killed me.

I think that highlights Jessie's dedication to both the people she represented and particularly the parliamentary system. To both Jean Burdett and Jeff Cooper and their families, on behalf of the Liberal Party, the Government of South Australia and this Parliament, I convey our sincere condolences.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition):

I rise to support the motion of condolence moved by the Premier and to convey my condolences and those of my Party to Jean Burdett and Jeff Cooper and their families. Jessie Cooper was not personally known to me—I entered Parliament as she left—but it is clear that her name is well known. Her record in South Australian politics and in the South Australian community certainly exists and will be long remembered. I share with the Premier his comments about the significant contribution that she made to the life of our community and to politics in particular. Reference has already been made to the fact that she was the first woman to be elected to the South Australian Parliament. She was elected almost simultaneously with Mrs Joyce Steele, who was officially elected to the House of Assembly one hour later. Her election represented a significant achievement that had been long awaited in South Australia. As we know, this State was the first in the world to enfranchise women to stand for Parliament and the first in Australia to enfranchise women to vote. That happened in 1894, and we celebrate its centenary this year. Yet, it was to take until 1959 before a woman would enter either House of the Legislature.

The election of Jessie Cooper was contested: there was legal argument as to whether or not a woman was eligible to stand for a seat in the Legislative Council. It is one of the ironies of history that in a State which had been so progressive in 1894 there would be such a regressive attitude in 1959. Fortunately, the wisdom of the community on that matter prevailed and the court rejected the application that Jessie not be eligible. The then Premier (Tom Playford) proceeded immediately to initiate legislation that would ensure that future contests of that nature would not be initiated in that way.

Mention has been made of the considerable hard work Jessie Cooper did in the fulfilment of her parliamentary duties. That is clear both from the parliamentary record and from those who have spoken of her work over the many years she was here. As has been mentioned, she had a particular interest in the area of energy: in that regard she achieved considerable note in the year of her retirement from politics in 1979 during the controversial Santos legislation. She brought her own opinions to that legislation and is to be commended for the courage she showed in that matter. She contributed her views on that matter on the basis of considerable study of the energy needs of South Australia.

Jessie had many other interests, and it would be correct to note her support for the role of women in our community, particularly in the political arena. She had other interests and contributed to the general workings of this Parliament by reminding us of its history. I understand that she was a prime mover behind the creation of what might be termed 'the rogues gallery' that exists in the members' lounges: the photographs and drawings of members, both present and past, a collection at which some of us look askance when we see younger versions of ourselves. However, it is interesting to note that that gallery exists to remind members of all those

who have been a member of Parliament in either House since the inception of parliamentary democracy in South Australia. Jessie will long be remembered as a significant contributor to our community, and I extend to Jeff and his family my condolences and those of my Party.

John Burdett was a member of Parliament with whom I did have the pleasure to serve. I entered Parliament as he became a Minister in the 1979 Tonkin Government. Over the years I appreciated the opportunity of knowing John Burdett, whom I held in very high regard. While born in Adelaide, John spent many of his early years living in the area that I now represent in Parliament. In fact, he came from a farming family in the area of Salisbury, their home being on the Bolivar Road, which is situated in my electorate. I know that they had fond memories of their Salisbury connections and remember what Salisbury was like before urban development encroached on much of the farmland in that area. As the local member I enjoyed hearing from him. He would come out occasionally to venues in my electorate and point out what had been here and what was over there, and it was interesting to listen to his recollections about the Salisbury area.

He moved to various parts of the State: first to the Riverland and later to the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide. Wherever he moved he became intricately involved in the community life of those areas—not just in broader community issues but quite specifically targeting issues that were for the betterment of the human condition and looking at community welfare concerns. He did that because he had a very deep-seated sense of compassion motivated by a very strong religious belief. Therefore, it was no surprise that when elected to Government he was appointed Minister of Community Welfare and Minister of Consumer Affairs.

As a member of the then Opposition, when I had dealings with him I respected enormously the talent and the compassion he brought to those areas. I also respected the way he dealt with legislation, trying to get the very best for all South Australians. I particularly remember the way in which he worked with all members of Parliament—Opposition as well as Government members—in the framing of significant community welfare legislation that was brought to the Parliament at the time. As a member of the Opposition I appreciated that, but I know that the real beneficiary was the community of South Australia then and now.

Later, when the Tonkin Government was defeated and he went into Opposition, he served on the Subordinate Legislation Committee with that same scrutiny of detail that he had as a lawyer, and he also brought compassion to the examination of legislation that came before the Parliament.

In the corridors of Parliament he was a fine person to know and talk to, and I enjoyed that opportunity over the years. It is with great sadness that he died prematurely as a result of the illness that struck him. We will miss John Burdett. His passing is a matter of regret to all of us and to the community. To Jean and the family I pass on my very best wishes and condolences and those of my Party.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I, too, would like to express my condolences to the families of John Burdett and Jessie Cooper. Jessie Cooper was to me the warhorse of the Liberal Party. I feared her more than anybody who was in the Liberal Party when I first joined it. I believe it was a mark of the respect that Jessie held that she was one of the strongest contributors amongst the Liberal ranks within the Party as well as within the Parliament. Along with Joyce Steele, she was a banner bearer for women in politics, and I

believe that South Australian politics owes a great deal to Jessie Cooper's contribution.

There has been some suggestion that today it is twice as hard for a woman to get into Parliament than it is for a man. If we reflect back to 1959, we could probably say that at that time it was almost impossible for a woman to get into Parliament, yet the breakthrough was made and Jessie Cooper and Joyce Steele were the two who changed the face of the Parliament for the better. So, we in this Parliament owe a great debt to Jessie Cooper for what she did and for the toughness, the resilience and the passion in the way she bore her Liberal politics.

John Burdett, of course, is much closer to home for me. I joined this Parliament in 1982, and John was instantly a friend to a new member. John had a lot of marvellous attributes that we can all reflect on—and they have been today by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. All the things they said about John Burdett are true. For a person coming into Parliament for the first time it was tremendously valuable to have available someone of the calibre of John Burdett. When things went a little bit haywire John Burdett would say, 'Look, I think it can be done a little differently.' If you wanted good counsel, you would talk to John Burdett, you would ask his opinion and it was always given, irrespective of what side of politics the question came from. His opinion was always given in a straightforward fashion with a great deal of honesty and with the member's best interests at heart.

I saw John Burdett as a person of great dedication, great compassion, tremendous intellect and a great contributor to the Parliament of South Australia and the Liberal Party. I endorse the comments made by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. I, too, express my condolences to Jean Burdett and her family, and to Jeff Cooper and his family.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): I, too, would like to join in this debate, I suppose, on the condolences to be expressed to the relatives and friends of the Hon. Jessie Cooper and the Hon. John Burdett. I had the privilege of serving in the Legislative Council for about four years with the Hon. Jessie Cooper and for about 10 years with the Hon. John Burdett. As regards the Hon. Jessie Cooper, following her retirement I placed on the record a few thoughts about her career and the impression she made on me during those four years. I do not intend to repeat them as they are in *Hansard* for all to see.

Some fine obituaries have been written about the Hon. Jessie Cooper, particularly the one in the *Australian* shortly after her death by a former member of this place, the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore, which I think went into great detail in respect of the career and life of the Hon. Jessie Cooper. I do not intend to go over that again, although it would be very easy to do so and to speak in the same warm and favourable tones as those obituaries.

I was something of a student of *Hansard* before I came into Parliament, although I have not read it since! Before I came into Parliament I used to have *Hansard* delivered, and I would read it avidly. I was intrigued with the speeches of the Hon. Jessie Cooper, as they were always brief and eloquent. I always said that that was something to emulate when I eventually entered Parliament. I know—as I spoke to her about this later—that the Hon. Jessie Cooper forgave me for not succeeding, but I am still trying.

She was, as was mentioned by the Premier, a very well educated person. She was delightful to speak to. I was not the

least bit frightened of her, as was the Deputy Premier, but I certainly had a great deal of respect for the quality that she brought to her work in the Legislative Council. In my speech following her retirement from this place I think I described her as the high priestess of the Liberal Party. I found out somewhat later that she was quite flattered by that. I was hoping that she would not be offended, and she was not. I concur with everything that has been said about the Hon. Jessie Cooper.

I served with the Hon. John Burdett for about 10 years. I can say that I have not served with a more decent person since I have been in this Parliament. When John was elevated to the Ministry, I recall making a very mild but unkind remark about him which turned out to be completely wrong, and that was demonstrated within a very short period, and he was very gracious in accepting my apology. So my respect for John Burdett was formed very early. What particularly impressed me about John Burdett was no less than one would expect if you knew the man.

Unfortunately, over the past couple of years in the Legislative Council there has been quite a bit of vicious personal debate, and I think that is a pity. It was easy to jump onto that bandwagon. The Hon. John Burdett never did—in fact, quite the reverse. Such was the man that the Hon. John Burdett made clear that he did not want to be associated with those vicious personal and unwarranted attacks on other members. Obviously, politically we had very little in common. As regards some social attitudes, again, we did not have a great deal in common. However, it was certainly a pleasure to know and serve in the Parliament with the Hon. John Burdett. I wish to add to the condolences that you, Mr Speaker, will forward to his widow.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I did not have the privilege of meeting the Hon. Jessie Cooper but, as a member of this Parliament, I am certainly aware of the contributions that Jessie Cooper made to the State of South Australia out of the other Chamber and of her compassion for the people of this State. So I, too, add my condolences to the family members of Jessie Cooper.

It is John Burdett, whom I did know extremely well, to whom I wish to extend further thought. Not only was John a colleague of mine for four short years but John Burdett, his wife Jean and his family have been friends of my family for 30 years or more. During that period, John became known to me by his personality, his character and his contribution not only inside this Parliament but on the ground where it mattered—amongst the people. John Burdett, whether for good or for bad, was the person who had to take responsibility, to a degree, for the member for Newland being in this place today. John Burdett was the person who approached me and asked me whether I was interested in standing prior to the 1989 election. The tenor of the man meant that not only did he approach you with a particular reason but also was prepared to be committed to support whatever it was that you or he was interested in in the community.

John Burdett walked the streets of Newland with me door knocking for over 18 months, whether rain, hail or shine. That was the commitment of the man and the loyalty that he had to support his Party and his political beliefs. John Burdett continued that support with his political beliefs not only with me but with other members of the Liberal Party. In fact, the member for Florey, I think, will attest that John Burdett's support to him assisted in his attaining the current seat of Florey.

John Burdett was still working on my behalf a matter of two days before his death. When I again needed the assistance of John, he was the mediator when I needed a third party to intervene in a matter. In the period that I was in Parliament, John gave of his time not only to me and to others but to my constituents. He was available at any time to give advice, and he had plenty of experience, legal background, and care and compassion for the people of the State to offer that advice. He never once knocked back a request for his assistance. I had great respect for John Burdett. He was a man who had an open mind and a good heart. He was compassionate. He was loyal. He was a family man first and foremost, and I believe that he gave his all to this State and to his family. It is with deep regret but with great respect that I record my condolences.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I pay tribute to the Hon. Jessie Cooper for her outstanding service to the South Australian Parliament. I did not know Jessie personally, but I extend my sympathy to her family.

I had the privilege of serving on the executive of the South Australian Parliamentary Christian Fellowship for seven years with John Burdett. He was the president for eight years and was the driving force behind the survival and, indeed, the growth of the Christian Fellowship. Over the years I had many discussions with John on various issues and, free from the political constraints that we have in this place, I always valued those discussions. I am sure that John had the respect of every member of both Houses; I have never heard anyone criticise John in any way. John was a person of great integrity and compassion and a good friend. On behalf of the members of the Christian Fellowship in this Parliament, I extend sincere sympathy to John's widow Jean and her family.

The SPEAKER: I thank members for their remarks and will ensure that the *Hansard* record is forwarded to the relatives of the deceased members. I ask members to support the motion by rising and standing in their places.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 3.37 to 3.42 p.m.]

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES, ELECTION

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:
That the Hon. Harold Allison be appointed Chairman of Committees of the Whole House during the present Parliament.
Motion carried.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The SPEAKER: I have to report that, in accordance with a summons from Her Excellency the Governor, the House attended this day in the Legislative Council Chamber, where Her Excellency was pleased to make a speech to both Houses of Parliament. I have obtained a copy, which I now lay on the table.

Ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL VACANCY

The SPEAKER laid on the table the minutes of proceedings of the assembly of members of the two Houses held today for the election of a member to fill the vacancy in the Legislative Council caused by the resignation of the Hon. Ian Gilfillan, to which vacancy Mr Michael Elliott was elected.

VICTOR HARBOR SCHOOLS

A petition signed by 402 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to retain physical education and art teacher positions at Victor Harbor R-7 schools was presented by the Hon. D.C. Brown.

Petition received.

CHITON ROCKS

A petition signed by 62 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to connect Chiton Rocks to the Victor Harbor sewerage system was presented by the Hon. D.C. Brown.

Petition received.

WATER VOLUME

A petition signed by 1 392 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to exempt bodies of water of greater than one million litres in volume from the Swimming Pools (Safety) Act and the Public and Environmental Health Act was presented by the Hon. D.S. Baker.

Petition received.

STATE BANK

A petition signed by 458 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to sell the State Bank was presented by the Hon. L.M.F. Arnold.

Petition received.

VIDEO GAMES

A petition signed by 970 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to seek a ban on the importation of X-rated video games was presented by the Hon. L.M.F. Arnold.

Petition received.

SOUTHERN DISTRICTS WAR MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

A petition signed by 199 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to retain surgical and obstetric services at the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital was presented by the Hon. M.J. Evans.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:
By the Deputy Premier (Hon. S.J. Baker)—
National Crime Authority—Report, 1992-93
Regulations under the following Acts—
Crown Proceedings—Officers Protection from Prosecution
Liquor Licensing—Dry Areas—Adelaide/Victoria
Harbor/Renmark/Port Elliott/Goolwa/Normanville
Young Offenders—Training Centre Review Board
Procedure
Rules of Court—
District Court—
Adoption of Supreme Court Rules
Mental Health Act—Various
Environment, Resources and Development Court—
General
Supreme Court—
Supreme Court Act—

- Admission of Practitioners 1993
Amendments—Various
Foreign Judicial Process/Taxation of Costs
Youth Court—Youth Court Act—General
Summary Offences Act—
Dangerous Area Declarations, 20/4/93 to 30/9/93
Road Block Establishment Authorisations—20/4/93 to 30/9/93
- By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—
Auditor-General's Department—Report on Operations, 1992-93
Freedom of Information Act—Report, 1992-93
State Services—Report, 1992-93
Freedom of Information Act—Report on Operations—Regulations—Fees and Charges
Public Corporations Act—Regulations—Formation of STA Subsidiary—*Austrics*
Remuneration Tribunal—Reports relating to Determination—
No. 2 of 1993—Judiciary
No. 3 of 1993—Member of Parliament
No. 4 of 1993—Planning Appeal Tribunal Commissioners
- By the Minister for Industrial Affairs (Hon. G.A. Ingerson)—
Mining and Quarrying Occupational Health and Safety Committee—Report, 1992-93
Occupational Health and Safety Commission—Report, 1992-93
WorkCover Corporation—Report, 1992-93
Regulations under the following Acts—
Construction Industry Long Service Leave—Abolition of Compulsory Retirement
Industrial Relations (SA)—
Non-legal Registered Agents
Registered Agents
Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation—Exempt Employers—Non Bank Financial Agents
- By the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—
Carrick Hill Trust—Report, 1992-93
South Australian Country Arts Trust—Report, 1992-93
Government Adviser on Deregulation—Report, 1992-93
Small Business Corporation of SA—Report, 1992-93
National Road Trauma Advisory Council—Report, 1992
Regulations under the following Acts—
Harbors—Dragon Boat Festival
Motor Vehicles—Demerit Points Scheme
Road Traffic Act—
Breath Analysis—Voluntary Blood Test
The Code—Traffic Control Devices
Television Receivers
- By the Minister for Health (Hon. M.H. Armitage)—
Physiotherapists Act—Regulations—Registration and Practice
- By the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)—
Enfield General Cemetery Trust—Report, 1992-93
Planning Appeal Tribunal—Report, 1992-93
Regulations under the following Acts—
Building Act—Transitional Provisions Class 1a and 10a Buildings
Development Act—Variations
Local Government Act—Freedom of Information—Fees and Charges
Planning Act—Crown Development Reports—
Public service depots at Darlington
Transportable classroom at Aldgate Primary School
Corporation By-laws—
Adelaide—No. 12—Public Restaurants and Fish Shops
Noarlunga—No. 18—STED Schemes
District Council—
Barossa—
No. 1—Permits, Penalties and Fees
No. 2—Street Hawkers and Traders
No. 3—Bees
No. 4—Animals and Birds
No. 5—Garbage Removal
No. 6—Dogs
No. 7—Repeal of By-laws
Kapunda—
No. 1—Permits, Penalties and Fees
No. 2—Street Hawkers and Traders
No. 3—Bees
No. 4—Animals and Birds
No. 5—Garbage Removal
No. 6—Dogs
No. 7—Repeal of By-laws
Mt Remarkable—No. 4—Camping
Port Elliott and Goolwa—
No. 1—Permits and Penalties
No. 2—Taxis
No. 3—Caravans and Camping
No. 4—Traffic
No. 19—Moveable Signs
Stirling—No. 42—Moveable Signs
- By the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)—
Tobacco Products Control Act—Regulations—Sale of Tobacco Penalties
- By the Minister for Mines and Energy (Hon. D.S. Baker)—
Mines and Energy South Australia—Report, 1992-93
- By the Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. D.S. Baker)—
Soil Conservation Council—Report, 1992-93
South Australian Meat Corporation—Report, 1992-93
Veterinary Surgeons Board—Report, 1992-93
Fisheries Act—Regulations—SAFIC—Prescribed Body
Regulations under the following Acts—
Branding of Pigs—Fees and Charges
Deer Keepers—Triennial Registration Fee
Dried Fruits—Registration—Producers/Packers
- By the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources (Hon. D.C. Wotton)—
Environmental Protection Council—Report, 1992-93
Murray-Darling Basin Commission—Report, 1992-93
Clean Air Act—Regulations—City of Adelaide—
Backyard Burning
Fee Exemption—Methyl Chloroform
- By the Minister for Family and Community Services (Hon. D.C. Wotton)—
Department for Family and Community Services—Report, 1992-93
- By the Minister for Emergency Services (Hon. W.A. Matthew)—
Country Fires Act—Regulations—Abolition of Compulsory Retirement
- By the Minister for Correctional Services (Hon. W.A. Matthew)—
Department of Correctional Services—Report, 1992-93
- By the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education (Hon. R.B. Such)—
Industrial and Commercial Training Commission—Report, 1992-93
Non-Government Schools Registration Board—Report, 1992-93
Education Act—Regulations—
Alberton Primary School
Teacher Registration Fees

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid on the table the tenth report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee on Southend foreshore erosion.

QUESTION TIME

MITSUBISHI MOTORS

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier confirm that the incentive package offered to the Mitsubishi Motors Corporation during his recent visit to Japan to support the 10 year development plan announced on Friday 4 February is the same package approved by the previous Labor Government on the advice of the bipartisan Industries Development Committee and signed in an agreement with Mitsubishi late last year? If there are any significant differences, will the Premier provide details of those to the House?

On Saturday 5 February, the *Advertiser* announced the very welcome decision by Mitsubishi to maintain its operations in South Australia and to support a \$500 million expansion program. The report suggested that this decision was taken as a result of the Premier's visit to Japan when in fact the major negotiations on the project took place last year at a time when the Liberal Party of Australia continued to threaten the motor vehicle manufacturing industry of this country, and of South Australia in particular, by supporting the introduction of a zero based or negligible tariff regime by the year 2000.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The answer is plainly 'No', I cannot confirm that it is the same package because it is different. It is different because of the Liberal Party's policy that was announced prior to the last State election, which I think is the most significant change in direction in terms of State taxation by encouraging internationally orientated export industries in this State that has ever been offered by any State Government. I refer to a 50 per cent rebate on payroll tax for any new exports from South Australia. No other Government in Australia has given that sort of commitment at State level to encourage export orientated industry.

So, I was able to tell Mitsubishi that not only could it get a 50 per cent rebate on new exports but that it could get a 10 per cent rebate on existing exports. I was fully aware of the package agreed upon by the Industries Development Committee, and I understand that that was put to Mitsubishi. Mitsubishi gave me two specific assurances. First, it assured me that the next Magna and Verada models would be manufactured in South Australia. That is a real tribute to the work force and management of Mitsubishi, who have proved to the people in Tokyo that they can produce a world class motor vehicle that is competitive in both quality and price.

The second commitment by Mitsubishi was that a specialist station wagon would be designed and produced in Adelaide to be exported to world markets. Mitsubishi then raised a number of other matters about which for commercial reasons I cannot speak in detail at this stage.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No. That is quite rightly so because no decision has as yet been made by Mitsubishi on these matters. Until it makes a decision, quite rightly it would want those matters to be kept confidential. However, I can indicate that Mitsubishi is considering further significant investment in addition to what I have just outlined if it finds that there is a far more competitive environment in which to manufacture and export cars within Australia. In particular, it is looking for a number of significant commitments.

The first is a reform of the environment that exists here in South Australia whereby they have a more flexible working relationship with their work force; and enterprise agreements whereby they can sit down with their work force and achieve a significant lift in productivity. They are looking for reforms in terms of WorkCover and the Australian motor vehicle plan which has been laid down by the Federal Government. They are taking up certain aspects of that plan with the Federal Government because they argue that it will be extremely difficult for an international car company to invest in Australia after 1996 under the current car plan and the projections that are forecast.

So the brief answer to the member is that the Liberal Government of South Australia was able to offer considerably more than was offered by the previous Government. First, we had a policy for reform of industrial relations; secondly, we had a policy for reform of our WorkCover system; thirdly, we had a policy for reform of Government itself and more efficient delivery of government services; and, most important of all, we offered these very special incentives—a 10 per cent payroll tax rebate on existing exports and a 50 per cent rebate on new exports.

The Mitsubishi Motors Corporation in Japan was thrilled with the commitment given by the new Government to making sure that we have world class manufacturing here in South Australia which can be focused on world markets.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling the next question, I point out that that was a very important question, and the Chair allowed the Premier considerable latitude in answering it. The Chair will not be as tolerant to Ministers from now on because many of them, when in Opposition, complained quite bitterly during the last Parliament about the length of answers provided by Ministers. The honourable member for Coles.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

Mrs HALL (Coles): Mr Speaker, before I ask my question I take the opportunity to congratulate you on your election earlier today to your high office. In view of the protracted history of the development of the MFP and the early attention the Premier has given this project, can he inform the House of the progress that has now been made as a result of his discussions in Tokyo last week?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: This was the other good news that I received in Tokyo last week. Frankly, I went to Tokyo concerned as to how the Japanese would react, because we as a Government had put down a bold new initiative for the MFP. We all know the extent to which it has floundered for the past three years, and on numerous occasions I had heard criticism directly out of Tokyo from the Japanese who had originated the concept of the MFP. I knew that they were becoming increasingly disenchanted with the MFP itself.

So I was able to see them on Thursday of last week—exactly a week ago—and tell them about the agreement that had been negotiated between the new Liberal Government of South Australia and the Government in Canberra in terms of the refocusing of the MFP. The most important features of that discussion were as follows: first, we had for the first time short-term commercial objectives (and they were expressed by way of centres of excellence) whereby we intended to set up new internationally-classed technology/industry centres. The first of those, which has already been approved by the MFP board, is the computer technology centre of excellence; the second, of course, will be the Asian business centre; the

third will be based around environment and technology; and the fourth will be based on improving wine technology and achieving improved research in land care and soil salinity.

It was interesting, because when I sat down with Mr Saito, who is the co-Chair of the International Advisory Board of the MFP, he had especially brought in the present Chairman of Nippon Steel Corporation to hear what I had to say. After I had outlined the plan in detail, particularly the agreement with the Federal Government and the refocusing of the MFP, he immediately said, 'I agree with what you have done'. For the first time the MFP has short-term commercial objectives while still retaining the long-term urban development component, but on an easier site than that originally selected at Gillman. It was interesting, because I left him and went to see the most important person at Mitsui Corporation. When I arrived there about 20 minutes later Mr Yahiro had already heard the news from Mr Saito and said to me, 'It is good news, because we now agree with what you are trying to do with the MFP.' I then went on and met other people, and the next day during a broader meeting of the MFP group the same response was received.

So I am now very heartened and encouraged by the support that we are getting from Tokyo and Japan in general for the refocusing of the MFP as laid down by the Liberal Party before the election.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Leader of the Opposition): My question is supplementary to the question just asked by the member for Coles and is addressed to the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development. Does the decision to extend the MFP core site to facilitate the early commencement of urban development, while at the same time proceeding with the environmental clean-up at Gillman, mean that the Liberal Party has reversed its decision to scrap the Gillman core site in favour of the development of high technology industries? Furthermore, does the Premier's previous statement mean that the name of the MFP will be changed and, if so, when?

On 14 September last year the current Premier moved a motion before the Estimates Committee to stop development of the Gillman site and to refocus efforts towards the development of high technology industries.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: What the South Australian Government has been able to achieve with the support of the Federal Government and with the endorsement of the Multifunction Polis Development Corporation Board is a refocusing of the MFP in South Australia. That support, as outlined by the Premier, has received significant support and recognition overseas, particularly in Tokyo and Japan. It does not mean that we have reneged on previous commitments. All I ask the Leader of the Opposition to do is read the Premier's press release as Leader of the Opposition at the start of the election campaign last year. If the Leader of the Opposition had taken the time to read the press release last year, he would have seen that the policy endorsed by the Federal Government and the board of the MFP mirrors exactly the proposal and the policy put down by the Liberal Party and the Premier when he was Leader of the Opposition last year.

We have seen a refocusing of the multifunction polis, to put in place short-term achievable goals, unlike the statement of the former Premier and now Leader of the Opposition who told this House that there would be 10 000 dwellings on the Gillman site by 1995-96. That was subsequently modified. It came down to 4 500 homes on the Gillman site by 1995-96.

They were never attainable goals. Is it any wonder the public of South Australia were confused, let alone international investors, as to what the multifunction polis could deliver for South Australia, Australia and the international investing community? The Liberal Government has been able to achieve a clear focus and direction, which all parties to the multifunction polis clearly understand, and in the short term we will be able to establish some real benchmark achievements for MFP South Australia and Australia.

GRAND PRIX

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): Can the Premier advise this House of the outcome of discussions he had in London with Bernie Ecclestone of FOCA in relation to the Australian Grand Prix?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I went to London to achieve three things: first, to make sure that we had the Grand Prix for the next three years; secondly, to make sure that, if for some reason Victoria was unable to stage the event, it would revert to Adelaide (and I was able to achieve that); and, thirdly, to find out why Mr Ecclestone gave the race to Victoria and why he did not give South Australia at least a chance to put in a bid. When I put that to Mr Ecclestone and expressed the disappointment on behalf of South Australians at the loss of the Grand Prix and in not being able to put in a bid, he said, 'I gave the former South Australian Government every opportunity last year to put in a bid—every opportunity—but it failed to do so.'

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: So I came back to Adelaide and decided to look in some detail at what documentation was available and I found some very interesting documentation. The first goes back to March 1991, a briefing given to the then Premier, the member for Ross Smith, Mr Bannon. Agenda item No. 6 refers to Melbourne initial discussions, and there were some attachments to that for the agenda. It points out that there had been an approach by Premier Kirner of Victoria to the Premier of South Australia highlighting the fact that Victoria now was very, very interested in securing the Grand Prix for Victoria and that Dr Hemmerling pointed out that he had had a meeting in Victoria with Mr Ron Walker. I highlight the significance of that—

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson: What year was that?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: March 1991. There is Victoria making a very serious bid, at a Premier to Premier level, for the South Australian Grand Prix. There is plenty of other correspondence, but the next significant item is a letter sent on 10 May 1993 to Dr Hemmerling from Mr Bernie Ecclestone of FOCA. I will not read the entire letter, but I will read one very pertinent sentence from it!

If we can't get an agreement within the next 60 days—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It states:

If we can't get an agreement within the next 60 days, it's not going to happen.

This is 10 May last year. I have had only a little experience in international negotiations. I suspect that the then Minister had had none, and I suspect he still has none as Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I point out that, if I had seen that, every alarm bell would have rung to say, 'We've got a major problem; the first thing we should do is to get across there at the highest possible level—in other words, at ministerial level—and secure that race for Adelaide', particularly

because for more than two years they had known that Victoria was after the Grand Prix race.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader has had sufficient—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: A response was sent back by—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: After Hemmerling went to London and Monaco.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has been most tolerant. I suggest to the Deputy Leader that he not continue to interject. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We realise that the Deputy Leader is now trying to protect the fact that he dropped the ball for South Australia. If ever there was anyone who should be held responsible, it was the then Minister who dropped the ball for South Australia.

Mr QUIRKE: I take a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe that the Premier is now debating the issue.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. The Chair has been concerned that some of the responses the Premier has given have been rather lengthy. Therefore, I ask him to round off his answer. He does have the opportunity to make ministerial statements.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Speaker; I will certainly be as quick as I can. There was a response sent back on 31 May 1993 from Dr Hemmerling to Mr Ecclestone. Interestingly, that response indicated quite clearly that he had raised the matter with the then Minister, Mike Rann. It also indicated that Dr Hemmerling had been to Monaco and had had a discussion with Mr Ecclestone in Monaco on the 24th. The letter still talks about the 60 days, because the now Deputy Leader of the Opposition has been running around trying to claim that the 60 days was no longer relevant at that stage because it had been dealt with. In fact, the letter sent on 31 May still dealt with the 60 day issue. In particular, this letter stated that the South Australian Government was interested in negotiating with Mr Ecclestone as soon as he was willing. Within 24—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Read the letter.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will make copies available. Within 24 hours of receiving that, Mr Ecclestone had sent back a reply saying, 'We are ready, obviously, to discuss things with you whenever it suits you.' In other words, Mr Ecclestone had said, '60 days to finalise it or you have lost it.' What had happened is that at no stage, even up until now, had the South Australian Labor Government made a firm offer back to Mr Ecclestone—not within the 60 days, not even within the next subsequent six months did it make it. We all know the extent to which the now Deputy Leader of the Opposition stood in this House—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Giles has a point of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Clearly the Premier is not addressing the Chair, Mr Speaker, but I draw your attention to an eight minute response.

The SPEAKER: Order! There have been a number of interjections, particularly from the Deputy Leader. I may be forced to read the appropriate Standing Order to him if he continues to interject. I suggest to the Premier that he now round off his answer otherwise leave will have to be withdrawn. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Quite clearly, the then Minister used to stand in this House in October last year and carry on and on about the Grand Prix. Now we understand why. He had dropped the ball. That is no more than just sheer incompetence on behalf of South Australians. All this State is suffering as a consequence of that incompetence. But judgment was passed on that on 11 December last year and we are moving on. This year's event will be the best yet.

PARLIAMENTARY DOCUMENTS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is also directed to the Premier. Will the Premier support any request by the police anti-corruption branch for access to all parliamentary records—all records—relating to the use or misuse of the country members' living away from home allowance, and is the Premier satisfied that no Minister in his Cabinet, and no member of his Government, has at any stage falsely or improperly claimed the country members' living away from home allowance, and has he questioned any of his Liberal parliamentary colleagues as to the use of this allowance? I hope, Sir, that you would remind the Premier of the need to tell the truth on this issue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader will withdraw the reflection he has made on the Premier immediately.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Sir, there is no reflection. Obviously—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Deputy Leader.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I withdraw—

The SPEAKER: Order! I will name the honourable member if he does not resume his seat. The Deputy Leader has been in this Chamber long enough to know what the Standing Orders prescribe. Unless he complies with the request of the Chair, I will have no alternative but to apply the Standing Orders. I again request him to withdraw the comment that the Premier was not telling the truth, and no other comment will be entered into.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I did not say that, but I withdraw—

The SPEAKER: Without qualification.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —the inference.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Of course, we all know the member who is referred to as the fabricator in this place, so if ever there was anyone who should stand—

The SPEAKER: Order! I would suggest to the Premier that that remark is not helpful in relation to the current climate. I would suggest that he withdraw the remark.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am happy to withdraw the remark. I was simply referring to a nickname given to one of the members of the House.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader has a point of order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Premier has just repeated the inference and I demand a withdrawal.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. I suggest to the Premier that he not repeat those comments and that he get on and answer what is an important question.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The matter is an important issue because it deals with several very fundamental princi-

ples of this Parliament, the first of which is the extent to which the Parliament itself has its own protection. All members of this House understand that and have used that parliamentary privilege. This issue is currently before the other House, and it is an issue which is being worked through, I understand, in conjunction with a particular former member around whom the allegations were made during the election campaign—

An honourable member: By the Labor Party.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: By the Labor Party—as to whether or not those documents have parliamentary privilege and, therefore, whether or not they should be released. I would have thought that any member of this House would be very concerned if we were to throw out that longstanding tradition of privilege of the Parliament, because that is what was suggested by the Deputy Leader in his question. He has suggested that the parliamentary privilege of this and the other House is no longer relevant.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I believe that the matter is, first, for the Upper House to resolve. Very significant legal implications are involved in that. Therefore, we should wait to see what the Upper House does. However, I can give an assurance that I have absolutely no evidence whatsoever that any member of the Liberal Party has abused the provision that was provided by the Remuneration Tribunal for members living in the country.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Has the Treasurer any idea how many Government vehicles in total the Government owns and whether they have been efficiently used? In answering this question, can he inform us whether his Government intends to take any action or make any inquiries and so modify Government policy with respect to the use of Government vehicles?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: This is an important question and all I can say is that I am amazed at the mess we have inherited. It is important to understand that our vehicle fleet is worth about \$160 million. To this date—and we still have not had it properly accounted—we believe there are 9 300 vehicles in the State Fleet but only 8 949 are registered with the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. We found that the internal records of the departments did not coincide with those of the Motor Vehicles Department. We found that, when State Fleet has asked departments how many vehicles they owned or occupied, the estimates varied by some 200. We found that no common accounting or financing procedures are in place and that servicing policies are *ad hoc* at best. We found that most cars in that very large Government fleet are used minimally during the day but extensively during the night. We found there were special arrangements to take a car home at night so the taxpayers' money and not the employees' money is being spent. We also found that Mobil cards quite often do not require the identification of a particular vehicle. State Fleet has been making a valiant effort to get this situation under control.

I made an announcement that the fleet has to be reduced by some 25 per cent. But the problems go far deeper, because we have found that, despite what has been requested of senior management within some departments that the vehicles be available for departmental use, those vehicles stay in car parking stations all day. The keys are put in the manager's drawer and they are never used; then more vehicles are

required to service the needs of the public sector. There is some concern amongst the agencies that, if there is a reduction in the number of cars, people will get less service. I assure those people that they will not get less service: they will get better service as the number of cars will be lower but they will be better utilised. We all know of the incidents involving Government vehicles over a period of time. We have all heard about the judges' use of cars. We have heard about children of managers using cars and doing wheelies in the car park.

An honourable member: Do you have any proof?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: In fact, there is some proof, and those matters have been pursued in this House previously. It would be my recommendation, as one of the most important, perhaps first, items of discovery by the Economic and Finance Committee, that it look at this matter.

GRAND PRIX

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): When and from whom did the Premier first become aware that Victorian interests had made a bid to stage the Formula One Grand Prix, and when and from whom was he first made aware that the bid was successful?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: As I recall, the first question was: when and from whom did I first know that Victoria was even interested in making a bid for the Grand Prix? It was from the then Minister of Tourism in this House last year in one of many of the public speeches he gave. I first knew that they had achieved that by signing a contract on 16 December, when Mr Walker flew to Adelaide and briefed me on the matter. It was exactly the same day as I had also arranged the briefing from Dr Hemmerling and Mr Cox, Mr Cox being the Chairman of the Grand Prix Board. I had no inkling whatsoever—I had not even heard a whisper—that Victoria may have even gone this far. I thought the Minister of the day was just going over the top for political reasons, as he invariably does. I just wonder why, in fact, the Minister did keep going over the top in this House back in late September.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Just think of the significance of the dates when the Minister started going over the top—late September, early October. Apparently the contract was signed between Victoria and FOCA on 16 September last year.

TRADING HOURS

Mr EVANS (Davenport): I direct my question to the Minister for Industrial Affairs. What action has been taken to fulfil the Government's election promise to inquire into shop trading hours, and can the Minister assure the House that the terms of reference for such an inquiry cover all the consequences of an extension to trading hours?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Yesterday we announced the committee to set up an inquiry into shop trading hours in South Australia. The committee is to be headed by Mr Glen Wheatman, the previous General Manager of the South Australian Brewing Company, as it was then known, and the Deputy Chairman is Mr Paul Pilkington. There are five other members of that committee, representing small business, building owners and managers, consumers and a large retailing group. The committee of inquiry will look at all issues that relate to trading hours and to the specific Act. Anyone who has looked at the Act would know that it is the

greatest hotchpotch, add-on Act that has been before this Parliament. Whenever anybody wanted to change shopping hours, instead of looking again at the Act, another clause would be added to it. So the inquiry will look totally at that condition.

It will also look at one specific reference under the Landlord and Tenant Act, that is, how the core hours will be reflected upon by any decision made. That reference is of great importance to small business. There is one other very important and specific reference: any recommendation the inquiry makes has to take cognisance of the very large number of small businesses in the retail trade in South Australia, and there is to be a specific reference as to how any change should take place, if there is to be any change, with reference to small business.

GRAND PRIX

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Does the Premier have continued confidence in the Chairman, the board and the executive director of the Australian Formula One Grand Prix? Throughout 1992 and 1993, up until the time that the Victorian deal was signed, a series of attacks were made by key Liberals on the cost and viability of the Grand Prix and associated activities and on Dr Hemmerling, in particular, regarding his salary, culminating in suggestions that he leave the position. Dr Hemmerling has been the principal adviser—

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Sir, this strikes me as being comment or an expression of opinion, rather than an explanation, on the part of the member for Playford.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order. The honourable member is explaining his question. I have been listening carefully, and I inform members that the Chair is showing slightly more tolerance today than may be shown on future occasions.

Mr QUIRKE: Dr Hemmerling has been the principal adviser to Government on the Grand Prix contract and the chief negotiator.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: They have my confidence, and at no stage has the Liberal Party or the Economic and Finance Committee suggested that Dr Hemmerling should be forced to leave his position. I have never made any such suggestion whatsoever. Questions were raised by the parliamentary committee, and quite rightly so, about the nature of the salary package that he was paid, but that does not for one moment suggest that I have no confidence in the Grand Prix chairman, the board or the executive officer.

JOBS PACKAGE

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): Will the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development say what response there has been to the launch on 6 January of the Government's comprehensive jobs package?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Given the high levels of unemployment over a consistent period in South Australia, the Government was intent, as one of its first initiatives, on putting in place its \$28 million jobs package. To the credit of members of the Economic Development Authority and other agencies of Government, who worked through the Christmas/new year period, the Premier on 6 January was able to announce details of the package so that businesses returning to work after the Christmas/new year break could plan calendar 1994 on the basis of the Government's jobs package program available to them. We simply wanted to stimulate

employment, boost productivity and improve the competitive position of South Australia's economy as a priority of this Government over the next four years. Following the release of the jobs package, up to 4 February we have had some 1 500 inquiries from businesses in South Australia, and that is not a bad effort in the first four weeks. Some 730 inquiries have been received from small business operators looking for relief from WorkCover levy subsidies for the employment of school leavers and long-term unemployed people in the community. In addition we have received some 200 applications or inquiries in relation to the export marketing employment scheme.

The young farmers incentive scheme, through the Department of Primary Industries, has received some 235 inquiries for support and subsidy in that area. All in all, some 1 500 inquiries have been received from small business operators in South Australia wanting to access the Government's job creation program to assist them with the employment of South Australians during the course of this year. Given the levels of unemployment we have had to sustain in this State over a considerable period, the Government's priority in putting the program in place within four weeks is an indication of the commitment of this Government to creating job opportunities for young and unemployed South Australians through the vital small business sector.

GRAND PRIX

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Premier. In his meeting with Bernie Ecclestone, did Mr Ecclestone repeat or confirm his view now expressed in several media interviews that the Liberals' continuing criticism of the conduct and cost of the Australian Formula One Grand Prix had convinced him that there was no future for the race in South Australia in the likely event of a Liberal victory at the last election? In a recent issue of *Auto Action*, published a week before the Premier's visit, FOCA chief Bernie Ecclestone was quoted directly as saying:

There was so much speculation that 1993 would be the last race, that after the December election the race would not go on any more, that if the Liberals got in they would cut the race because of the costs. I was in a position where it was more likely there would not be a race at all after 1996 and maybe before.

Auto Action stated:

During 1992 the Liberal Opposition, led by the now Premier, together with local newspapers honed in on the failure of the State Bank but also called into question the continuing losses incurred in staging the Formula One Grand Prix. The Liberals' attack on the Grand Prix shocked Mr Ecclestone, who interpreted it as mounting opposition to the race.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Ecclestone did not say that or repeat it in any form whatsoever, but he did say two things I think of relevance here: first, that he acknowledged the fact that on several occasions I had written to him and expressed my full support for the Grand Prix. He acknowledged that. He said that he had received the letters and, because we had passed certain messages back and forth through a mutual friend, he also acknowledged the role that friend had played in conveying those messages of my support for the Grand Prix. He knew that I wanted to have the Grand Prix for South Australia after 1996. He did acknowledge the political instability that had been created in South Australia, first, as a result of the State Bank and then with the resignation of the former Premier, Mr Bannon, in 1992. He acknowledged that and said that it had caused him some concern.

I think that people realised that Mr Ecclestone had developed a fairly close relationship with Mr Bannon. The

other pertinent point in answering the question is that he stressed to me on several occasions that he had given the Government of South Australia several opportunities last year to bid for the Grand Prix and it had failed to respond.

HOSPITAL WAITING LISTS

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): In view of the growing waiting lists for surgery, a legacy of the former Government's administration of South Australia's public hospitals, will the Minister for Health say whether the new Government will cut waiting lists and, if so, by how much?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Flinders for her question. I recognise the great concern of South Australians about our increasing waiting lists. Over the past decade, coinciding almost exactly with the introduction of the Federal Government's Medicare organised scheme, waiting lists have unfortunately dramatically escalated as costs have soared and funding constraints have been imposed. At various stages in the past decade the previous Government committed extra funds in an attempt to cut waiting lists but, unfortunately, they were untargeted funds and went into the global budgets of the hospitals, and the number of patients waiting for surgery was basically unaffected. Such injections of money is an admission, nothing more and nothing less, that the system is not working.

The latest figures available indicate that, when the now Opposition, the then Government, was proselytising the virtues of its health policy to South Australians, the number of people waiting for operations in South Australia in the month of December alone increased by 5.3 per cent to 9 195 people—an increase of 472 people in one month—while the previous Government was saying what a wonderful manager of the system it was. The Brown Government basically regards that as unacceptable, and accordingly we have devised a hospital service improvement strategy of which casemix funding is a major part. This funding mechanism will see that our public hospitals are given more money to cut waiting lists in a targeted fashion.

This form of funding will provide a new culture in hospitals. It will provide a new way of approaching hospital care which will see efficiency rewarded, and perhaps more importantly it will see inefficiency stopped. We made a commitment in the election campaign to halve waiting lists during the first term of the Brown Government. I believe that, within the first 12 months of the introduction of the hospital service improvement strategy and casemix funding, a very significant and quantifiable reduction in waiting lists will occur and our election commitment will be met much earlier.

The administrators and staff within hospitals have long been frustrated that their efforts have not been fully recognised, and this system recognises and rewards efficient care. Casemix funding though is not about formulae or numbers: casemix funding is about providing beds for sick South Australians who need them, and the Brown Government is committed to doing just that.

GRAND PRIX

Ms HURLEY (Napier): My question is directed to the Premier. Has the Government or the Australian Formula One Grand Prix office discussed with the cigarette company, Marlborough, a proposal for that company to be the naming right sponsor for the next three Australian Formula One Grand Prix? Is the Premier confident of an exemption being

given by the Federal Government under its tobacco advertising legislation, given that the naming right sponsorship would significantly upgrade the influence and impact of cigarette advertising over this sporting event?

Last year the former Minister of Tourism sought and was granted an exemption for Grand Prix cars to display cigarette advertising during the 1993 Grand Prix. I have been informed that no application for an exemption has yet been made to the Federal Minister for Health, Graham Richardson. It has also been reported to me that the cigarette company, Marlborough, has offered \$1.5 million more than Fosters' previous naming right sponsorship amount in order to secure the naming right sponsorship.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, it is inappropriate to divulge to the House the nature of negotiations—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Just listen.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is quite inappropriate to divulge ongoing negotiations for the sponsorship of the Grand Prix, but I anticipate that we will be making an application for exemption from cigarette advertising similar to that which was made last year.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Giles has had ample opportunity to speak.

PATAWALONGA

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): My question is directed to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. Has the previous Government's inaction over recent years caused the Patawalonga boat haven to become one of the most polluted waterways in Australia and, if so, what has the new Government done in its first eight weeks in office to clean up the Patawalonga?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I acknowledge the interest that the member has shown in this very important area. I acknowledge also the point that has been made by the member for Mitchell: that this is a—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Tourism and the member for Giles will not continue to have a discussion across the Chamber.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I also acknowledge the point made by the member for Mitchell: that this is an area that was ignored by the previous Administration for more than a decade. I am pleased to be able to report to the House that I have met with the 11 councils that make up the Patawalonga catchment to outline the Brown Government's very strong commitment in cleaning up the Patawalonga. We recognise and applaud the very constructive work that has already been carried out by the upstream councils in regard to the cleaning up of the Patawalonga.

I have instructed the Environmental Protection Authority in two areas: first, to provide urgent advice to the Glenelg council about all the options available to minimise the impact of flushing the Patawalonga in the short term; and, secondly, to prepare a code of practice for stormwater pollution control under the Environment Protection Act. I am also pleased to advise the honourable member that I will have administrative arrangements in place within four weeks to advise me on the best way to spend the \$4 million that has been committed by the Brown Government to clean up the Patawalonga to ensure

that a permanent solution to the problem is put into effect. I reiterate that the Brown Government recognises that the cleaning up of our waterways is an important issue of very high priority and one, I am pleased to say, in which we have been able to take positive action already.

WOOMERA ROCKET RANGE

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): My question is directed to the Premier. Will the South Australian Government match the Commonwealth Government's promised \$30 million funding package to upgrade the Woomera Rocket Range to enable the launch of low earth orbiting satellites if a private consortium can be found?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have not even explained it and the Deputy Premier says 'No.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Comments across the Chamber are out of order. I ask the honourable member to explain his question.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you for your protection, Sir. The Federal Defence Minister, Mr Robert Ray, has predicted that Nurrungar will close within six years. Whilst this may not kill Woomera, it would certainly mortally wound it. As the Commonwealth is prepared to put up \$30 million to entice some private activity in relation to that matter, would the State Government consider taking similar action?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Some work is being done on the possibility of looking at Woomera as a site for the launch of space vehicles and, in particular, rockets for satellites for communication purposes. However, those negotiations are still very much at an elementary stage. Some work was done under the former Government and a working party established. There would need to be a very detailed proposal brought forward. In discussions with some of the specialists within this whole area, I have received both some encouraging reports and also some reports from others who are actively involved in this area who believe that the site is not suitable and that we would be wasting our money. We need to work through this proposal in some detail. Certainly, once we have the detail of it we can look at whether or not it should be supported financially.

TRANSIT SQUAD

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Will the Minister for Emergency Services advise the House whether the transfer of the STA transit squad to police has proved successful?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I thank the member for Reynell for her question. I know that the honourable member has a particular interest in this topic and, both now as a member of Parliament and previously during her role as Liberal candidate for Reynell, has from time to time expressed considerable concern about the safety of her constituents on public transport.

I am pleased to report to the House that a very positive impact has been provided by the transfer of the transit squad to the South Australian Police Force. Members would be aware that over 12 months ago, back in January 1993, the Liberal Party announced that this transfer would occur under the Liberal Government at the time it released its passenger transit strategy. The transfer of police officers and STA personnel back into the Police Force commenced at the

beginning of this year, and to date we have seen 19 former transit squad officers fully sworn as police officers, the swearing-in ceremony having occurred on 1 February this year. In all there were 80 transit squad personnel. Of those 80 personnel we found that 22 were former South Australian police officers. The Police Force was able to devise a one-month refresher course to enable those 22 former police officers the opportunity, after one month's retraining, to be back in the Police Force as sworn officers.

To date, 19 of those officers have taken up that option and are now back in the Police Force. While they were undertaking that training we transferred police personnel into the STA Transit Squad to undertake policing duties. The result of that action has been quite significant. We have found a marked change in behaviour on STA vehicles in a very short period. However, we have also seen an increase in the number of arrests for disorderly behaviour on public transport. Indeed, in the past week there were five such arrests compared with just one in February 1993. Police advise me that they expect this much higher arrest rate to continue until behaviour on public transport is stabilised, when the arrest rate should drop off through an absence of unruly behaviour rather than the previous situation where police did not have the power to act.

Further, there has been a marked detection of warrant defaulters and their subsequent apprehension on public transport. Indeed, in January, 10 fine defaulters were apprehended as a result of outstanding warrants on public transport compared to two in the same period 12 months ago. Police have advised me that as a result of having officers riding public transport who can identify these defaulters they have been able to take appropriate action.

The process continues. A further 20 officers commenced a 26-week course today, and after that course they too, should they pass, will become police officers. The Liberal Party policy of providing safer public transport is now well under way and proving to have great effect.

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Can the Premier advise the House by what statutory authority the Hon. Julian Stefani styles himself 'Parliamentary Secretary for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs' and occupies a room at the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs? Has he been appointed pursuant to section 68 of the Constitution, and are any public servants required to report to the Hon. Julian Stefani?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: He has not been appointed under any statute whatsoever. I have given him the title 'Parliamentary Secretary' to assist me in ethnic affairs. He will do as any backbench member would do to assist me in my requests, and he has no more than my authority to do what I ask of him. He plays a very valuable role and is a person with enormous experience in this area. I am surprised that the honourable member should even question his involvement, because I know the extent—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: He is my Parliamentary Secretary. I can appoint someone in my office and call them my 'Parliamentary Secretary' if I so wish. In fact, I know of previous Premiers who have done that very thing. He acts entirely in response to whatever I ask him to do. Under statute no public servant is required to respond to him. However, a number of them appreciate his assistance and his valuable experience in that area.

Mr Atkinson: And the office?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have simply asked that a desk be made available so that he can sit down and carry out any work he needs to do in the office, and I think it is very reasonable to do that.

INDUSTRIAL AWARDS

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): In light of the Premier's answer to the Leader of the Opposition's question concerning Mitsubishi Motors, is the Minister for Industrial Affairs aware—and, if so, will he inform the Premier—that: first, Mitsubishi and its employees are and have always been bound by awards in the Australian Industrial Relations Commission since the company's inception in South Australia; secondly, that Mitsubishi recently concluded its second successful enterprise agreement in as many years under the auspices of the Federal Labor Government's industrial legislation covering enterprise bargaining; and, finally, that the State Government's industrial relations policy with respect to State awards and enterprise agreements is of no consequence whatsoever to Mitsubishi Motors?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I thank the member for Ross Smith for his question. I am aware that it is under a Federal award. However, as the honourable member would be aware, individuals in our community can choose to change systems. If we—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Constitution talks about choice, my dear man. If we set up an industrial relations system in this State that is attractive to both the employers and the employees and they make the decision to change, they can do that quite adequately and at any time.

The other important issue to note as far as Mitsubishi is concerned is that a large number of component suppliers work within both the Federal and State award systems. As a previous secretary of a union, the honourable member would be aware—if he is accurately advised, and I suspect that he has been—that the State and Federal systems are used on many occasions in the automotive industry. It is the Government's intention to ensure that the new industrial relations system in this State is used by whoever wishes to use it, and that may include Mitsubishi and its workers having a look at it.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:
That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.
Motion carried.

ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:
That Messrs Buckby, Foley and Lewis be appointed to the Council of the University of Adelaide as provided by the University of Adelaide Act 1971.
Motion carried.

FLINDERS UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:
That Messrs I.F. Evans, M.J. Evans and Mrs Rosenberg be appointed to the Council of the Flinders University of South Australia as provided by the Flinders University of South Australia Act 1966.
Motion carried.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA COUNCIL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:
That this House resolves that an address be forwarded to Her Excellency the Governor pursuant to section 10(3) of the University of South Australia Act 1990, recommending the appointment of the Hon. M.D. Rann and Mr Scalzi to the Council of the University of South Australia and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting its concurrence thereto.
Motion carried.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:
Standing Orders: The Speaker and Messrs Atkinson, Brindal, De Laine and Lewis.
Printing: Messrs Ashenden, Blevins, Brokenshire, Clarke and Rossi.

JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE COMMITTEE

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:
That pursuant to section 5 of the Parliament (Joint Services) Act 1985 Messrs De Laine and Lewis be appointed to act with Mr Speaker as members of the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee, and that the Hon. H. Allison be appointed the alternate member of the committee to Mr Speaker, Ms Hurley alternate member to Mr De Laine and Mr Becker alternate member to Mr Lewis; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council informing it of the foregoing resolution.
Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:
That Messrs Becker, Blevins, Brindal, Buckby, M.J. Evans, Quirke and Tiernan be appointed to the Economic and Finance Committee.
Motion carried.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:
That Ms Hurley, Mrs Kotz and Mr Venning be appointed to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution.
Motion carried.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:
That Messrs Clarke, Condous and Cummins be appointed to the Legislative Review Committee, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution.
Motion carried.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:
That Messrs Atkinson, Leggett and Scalzi be appointed to the Social Development Committee, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution.
Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I nominate the member for Flinders to move an Address in Reply to Her Excellency's opening speech, and move:

That consideration of the Address in Reply be made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): On 17 December, the day on which we learned that South Australia had lost the Grand Prix to Victoria, the Premier said that this was not a time for recrimination. Since that time he, several of his Ministers and several of his personal staff have been engaged in a smear campaign against the Executive Director of the Australian Formula One Grand Prix, the Chairman of the board, the board itself and its staff. There have also been a series of off-the-record briefings to the media by Richard Yeeles and others designed to establish a case that the former Government, advised by Dr Hemmerling, was responsible for losing the Grand Prix. That is an unfair slur on Dr Hemmerling.

Let me track back in time. From 1992, the Liberal Opposition, supported by some sections of the media, led a series of attacks on the Grand Prix, Dr Hemmerling and the cost of staging the Grand Prix. In January 1993, former Premier Arnold visited Bernie Ecclestone in London to reaffirm his Government's strong support for the Grand Prix to continue. Prior to the former Premier's departure, Dr Hemmerling wrote to him, and I quote directly from that letter as follows:

Following discussions between your economic adviser, Ray Garrand and myself, I felt it important that I advise of the current position of the contract for the Australian Formula One Grand Prix in Adelaide.

All Formula One contracts are based on an international agreement called the Concorde Agreement, which is controlled by the FIA and through FISA in Paris. This agreement is a five-year agreement which extends to the 1996 season. Based on this agreement, all Formula One contracts are negotiated between the various countries and FOCA through Bernie Ecclestone.

Dr Hemmerling continues:

Because of the commitment that we needed to give to particular physical assets, when the Formula One contract was renegotiated from 1991 to 1996, we asked Bernie Ecclestone for some comfort for the longevity of our contract. He provided this in the form of a letter which basically says that, provided that he retains the right to extend Formula One contracts, Adelaide's contract would be extended.

I continue with Dr Hemmerling's advice to the former Premier, as follows:

There is little point in my view in pursuing this issue because Ecclestone is unable to extend the Formula One contract past 1996 until the new Concorde agreement is put in place. This is unlikely to be done until the latter part of 1994 or 1995. Therefore there will be little point in trying to get an agreement from Bernie Ecclestone beyond 1996 because his answer would be that he would be unable to provide that at this stage.

Extensive notes were taken during the former Premier's January meeting with Mr Ecclestone. At that meeting, the Formula One boss was unequivocal about his strong desire to keep the race in Adelaide and to begin negotiations at the end of 1993 when he visited Adelaide to attend the Australian Formula One Grand Prix. Let me quote from notes taken during that meeting between Bernie Ecclestone and the former Premier, as follows:

... South Australia had been good to the Grand Prix. It was because of John Bannon that the Grand Prix was there in the first place.

He stated:

... now that the Grand Prix is in Adelaide they don't want to leave and everyone is delighted to be there in Adelaide for the Grand Prix.

He also pointed out:

... with regard to the renegotiation—

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The honourable member appears to be reading from a Government docket. I ask whether it is a Government docket and, if so, can it be tabled before this House?

The SPEAKER: Order! Private members are not required to table documents from which they are reading. That is a requirement only of Ministers. I suggest to the member for Unley that he is getting close to making frivolous points of order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Bernie Ecclestone also pointed out that, with regard to the renegotiation of the Adelaide Grand Prix contract, it would be discussed when he visited Adelaide later in the year, that is, later in 1993. At the conclusion of the meeting with the former Premier, Bernie Ecclestone pointed out:

... we won't lose the Adelaide Grand Prix.

He often told people:

If you want to see how things should be done then go to Adelaide to see how the Adelaide Grand Prix is staged.

However, on 10 May 1993, as we have heard today, Mr Ecclestone wrote to Dr Hemmerling, as follows:

As you know, I wrote a letter a few years back, which was a letter specifically directed to the then Premier (Mr John Bannon) to assure him of my commitment that as long as he was Premier the Grand Prix would stay if it suited him.

He goes on to say:

I am sure you would remember that the terms and conditions of the original contract were put in a way that was favourable to you in order for you to get the event established, so it will mean that we will have to start at a figure more commensurate with other events.

Although I'm sure we'll have differences on what this should be, we should put a cap on the decision as to whether or not we will go forward, and I suppose if we can't get an agreement within the next 60 days it's not going to happen. Anyway, let's do our best to make it happen because as you know we do enjoy coming to Adelaide.

Best regards, Bernie.

This appeared to be a change in attitude by Mr Ecclestone, and both the Grand Prix Office and the Government were aware of his continuing disquiet about attacks on Dr Hemmerling and the cost of staging the Grand Prix by the then Liberal Opposition and others. At my direction, Dr Hemmerling went to see Mr Ecclestone for talks in London and Monaco. Upon his return from Europe, Dr Hemmerling told me that he had conveyed to Mr Ecclestone the State Government's strong support for the Grand Prix to continue beyond 1996, and that Mr Ecclestone was satisfied with this assurance.

As had been previously arranged, Mr Ecclestone was scheduled to meet with the former Premier, officials and me when he came to Adelaide in November. However, it was important to reiterate in writing the Government's commitment to the future of the Grand Prix. Dr Hemmerling wrote to Bernie Ecclestone on 31 May, after he returned. Again, I quote from the full text of the letter, which the Premier did not have the guts to read to this House in front of the television cameras. In fact, he wants to face them and not recognise the Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The letter states:

Following our meeting in Monaco and London on 24 May 1993 concerning the extension of the Adelaide Grand Prix arrangements I am writing in response to your letter of 10 May 1993. I have had further discussions with Minister Mike Rann and confirm that the

Government of South Australia remains committed to the Formula One event in Adelaide. They are in agreement with you that the conditions of an extension to 2001 need to be negotiated when you are ready. As you will appreciate, the exchange rates to the Australian dollar as well as the escalator are a particular concern in these negotiations and will need to be addressed.

The current income sharing arrangements on naming rights and elsewhere will also need to be protected for the financial stability of the event. Whilst the Government is unsure of the significance of the 60-day time mentioned in your letter they are willing to begin their negotiations at your convenience to get a resolution on the long-term future of the event in Adelaide.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We will be talking about Ian Smith in a minute, so just hang on.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence has a point of order.

Mr ATKINSON: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Minister is interjecting out of his place.

The SPEAKER: That is debatable, but the Minister is certainly out of order when he interjects and interrupts another member. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Attacks on the Grand Prix by the Liberals continued throughout the year both in Parliament and outside and included a very personal attack by the now member for Peake on the Executive Director on Tuesday 10 August 1993. These attacks culminated in a major attack that was reported in newspapers at the beginning of September just two weeks before Mr Ecclestone signed the contract with Mr Kennett's Liberal colleagues. Therein lies another story.

Later in September, when it was too late, the Liberals in Parliament and in the media completely reversed their position and issued statements and a much touted letter by the former Leader of the Opposition to Bernie Ecclestone pledging the Opposition's support for the race if it won Government. The fact is that it was too late: the Liberals had done their damage. We have already heard the quotes from *Auto Action* wherein Bernie Ecclestone said that he had to shift the Grand Prix because of the Liberals' attacks. However, the real story about the loss of the Grand Prix remains to be told. I would support an inquiry into when the present Premier and the present Minister for Tourism were told about the Victorian bid. Such an inquiry should examine what collusion occurred between the key Liberals in both States to relocate the Grand Prix from Adelaide to Melbourne.

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member imputing improper motives to another member?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I mentioned key Liberals, Sir. Any inquiry should examine what information was given to the present Premier by the Premier of Victoria, who said during the election campaign:

... the Grand Prix is not up for grabs. Adelaide owns it.

An inquiry should also question when a senior adviser to Jeff Kennett first discussed the Victorian bid and then the signing of the contract with the present Minister of Tourism in South Australia. It is the view of many involved in motor racing, politics and the media in both Victoria and South Australia that key South Australian Liberals were told of the Kennett bid well before 15 September. They failed to notify the Grand Prix Board, and their reasons were quite straightforward. They were licking their chops at the prospect of an announcement being made before the election that the South Australian Labor Government had lost the Grand Prix to their Liberal mates in Victoria.

In other words, the Liberals in South Australia put their Party interests before the interests of South Australia. Not

only did the Liberal's attack serve to undermine the Grand Prix's credibility internationally and undermine Mr Ecclestone's confidence in the future of the race in this State but also they continued those attacks after they had been informed of the Victorian bid. It is a sham—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. I would suggest to other members that, regarding members reading as quickly as the honourable member was, some consideration be given to *Hansard*.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): Jin tian shi, Hua ren de nong li xin nian—

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that we do not have an interpretive service in this House. Members are not permitted to speak in any language other than English. The honourable member for Ridley.

Mr LEWIS: I understand there is a precedent for members speaking in this Parliament in other than English. What I have said is that today is a new year in the Chinese lunar calendar. Accordingly, as often appears on the signs around this city and anywhere else on earth at this time, may I, Sir, wish you and all other members, including those Hua ren, Yue nan ren, Han guo ren, Ri ben ren, Xin nian kuai le, Gong xi fa cai—that is, the Chinese, Vietnamese, Korean and Japanese peoples living here—Happy New Year and may you greatly prosper.

In Chinese history, whilst I would have preferred to continue the message in Mandarin, can I nonetheless point out for the benefit of members that this is the Year of the Dog. That is of particular significance, because in the lunar years there are 12, this being the first day of the Year of the Dog. Next year will be the Year of the Pig, followed by the rat, the ox or buffalo, the tiger, the cat or rabbit, the dragon, the snake, the horse—and I am a Horse, Mr Speaker. It might be of some interest to members that horses are very much their own bosses and everyone else's; they are gifted, energetic, hardworking, independent and love to get their own way. Now, I did not say that: that is the way the Chinese lunar calendar describes such people. The year after is the goat, the monkey and the rooster, and we are back to the dog 12 years later.

Exactly 12 years ago the Liberal Party was last in government in South Australia and, in keeping with what the Chinese expect of administrations, it was an Administration which produced prosperity, it produced jobs and it produced development prospects for all South Australians, because it was in that year that we effectively established the liquids pipeline and passed the Roxby Downs Indenture Bill to enable the establishment of the huge mine near Olympic Dam and the township called Roxby Downs which has brought great prosperity to South Australia and paid an enormous amount into the South Australian coffers.

That being so, it is propitious that we recognise again on this day, the first day of the sittings of a new Parliament, that it is Chinese New Year in the lunar calendar. Again the Liberal Party in office is determined to engage in a program which will rebuild jobs for people in South Australia; it will reduce Government debt (it will be prudent in that respect); and it will ensure that people are encouraged to pursue the very best they can do in whatever it is they seek to do in life, because if they succeed and achieve, then we all succeed and achieve.

It will not only do that. This Government's policies, I am sure, unlike the Government that has just left these benches and been decimated in the process, will restore community

confidence in Government, its administration and its institutions and in the process provide for Parliament to be more functional than it ever was during the unfortunate intervening 12 years.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Where I learned Mandarin, in answer to the honourable member's inquiry, was in my own home. My five foster children, or godchildren, however you wish to describe them, are of Chinese extraction. Neither themselves, nor their parents at the time they were born, were citizens of any country, and they had no prospects in life of getting anywhere. What I was able to do for those five people, out of the many millions of very able, determined people that I met during those years in the mid and late 1960s and early 1970s, was to provide them with a chance to do something with the obvious abilities they had. I took that opportunity and I recognised in the process that the money would be better spent providing scholarships in Singapore which were then made available to a far greater number of people.

However, those five people helped me not only understand the languages which they spoke—they did not all speak Mandarin; some of them spoke only Cantonese, others Hakkan—but they were all literate in more than one alphabet and more than one language, and they were outstanding scholars. It was a pleasure to have them living with me. They did themselves credit.

As it turns out now with the effluxion of time over these past 20 years, four of the five of them have become Australian citizens by one means or another coincidentally, and they occupy places in very high esteem and service in the community, some here in South Australia, some interstate and some overseas.

The purpose of my engaging in the recognition of the effect and benefit which I enjoyed as a result of my association with them was to point out just how this Government on this day, as though it were fated to be so, now turns South Australia around to provide it with those opportunities for investment, through which there will be far greater jobs in number and diversity, to ensure that in the process there are better relations between the people who provide the jobs and the people who do the work, and to provide them with greater freedom to make arrangements between themselves as to how they will do that work, where they will do that work and how they will obtain a reward for having done it and how they will be encouraged to develop their skills, apply themselves to the purpose and expand the productivity of their efforts, and everybody benefits in consequence.

Why, only during Question Time I distinctly recall the remarks the Premier made in answer to the first few questions about those matters, and there is more yet to be uncovered, I am sure, during the course of this sitting of the Parliament.

There will be new means, too, for us to provide key public services both here in the metropolitan area and in other urban settings in South Australia, and equally if not more particularly in rural areas, and standards of performance and excellence will be pursued in the course of productivity arrangements and agreements for the employment of those people. In consequence, there will also be a containment in the costs of the delivery of each unit of those services.

The work that the Premier and the Deputy Premier in particular have done in mapping out that program for the public sector and the work of other of my colleagues in what we call the Transition to Government committee has certainly provided us with the means by which we can restore confidence in South Australia.

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

The SPEAKER: A quorum is present. I point out to the honourable member that in the other place there is automatic suspension when members call for a quorum when a quorum is present. However, that rule does not apply at this stage in this House. The honourable member for Ridley.

Mr LEWIS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It distresses me that such frivolous things can be done, especially during the grievance debate, which is limited enough, goodness knows. This is the year in which we are to encourage people to look to the family and see the benefits which it brings to society. I draw attention to an article in the *Sunday Mail* of 23 January by one Hollings which refers to those matters.

It refers to a man who was accused of sexual assault; the young female who accused him received \$40 000 for victim's compensation. However, she has been convicted of a public mischief, whereas the accused man now faces bankruptcy because he cannot pay his legal bills of \$11 000. That is exactly the case regarding a family in my own constituency in Tailem Bend, and it is about time the Department for Family and Community Services took action to prevent that from continuing.

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

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): The Festival of Light is an organisation, founded by Malcolm Muggerridge, devoted to promoting Christian values. At each State election, the South Australian branch of the Festival of Light surveys members of Parliament and candidates to ask them their attitudes to certain Christian values. The 1993 State election was no exception. On 1 November, the Festival of Light posted a survey with 10 questions to all known candidates of major Parties and later followed up with candidates of minor Parties. Note the date for future reference—1 November. These questions related to prayers in Parliament, parental consent, abortion, prostitution, independent schools, euthanasia, pornography, child abuse, status of marriage and control of AIDS. If a candidate answered in a way that coincided with the position of the Festival of Light, that candidate received 10 points for that question.

Before proceeding with my remarks, I should say that I will concentrate on the law of prostitution. Our law on prostitution in South Australia is contained in several Acts of Parliament. Section 28 of the Summary Offences Act creates an offence of keeping, managing or receiving money in a brothel. Keeping a brothel is also made unlawful by section 270(1) of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. Section 29 of the former Act creates an offence of letting or subletting premises knowing they are to be used as a brothel. Section 26 makes it an offence to live knowingly off the earnings of prostitution. Another law prohibits soliciting. So that is our law of prostitution. The Festival of Light asked all candidates in the State election:

Would you vote for the retention of laws prohibiting the exploitation of women and men in prostitution?

Note the words 'the retention of laws.' The Festival of Light was referring to the laws that I have just outlined. Most Liberal Mps responded to the survey and the then member for Hayward, now the member for Unley, scored 10 points on that question. That is to say that the member for Unley told the Festival of Light, in writing, that he would vote in this Parliament for the retention of laws prohibiting the exploit-

ation of women and men in prostitution; that is, he would support the retention of the laws I outlined a moment ago.

On Sunday 7 November, the *Sunday Mail* published an article entitled 'The Great Prostitution Debate', and all then members of the Parliament were asked their attitude on the prostitution law. I note that you, Sir, were unavailable for comment. The *Sunday Mail* story stated that the *Sunday Mail* had surveyed elected parliamentarians and asked them whether they supported decriminalising prostitution, that is, doing away with the laws that I just outlined. This is how they responded. Mark Brindal, Liberal, Hayward, for decriminalisation on 7 November. 'Our extensive parliamentary files', Mr Brindal said, 'show there is nowhere in the world where a prohibitive system has ever worked.'

Mr Brindal: Quite right.

Mr ATKINSON: So, in response to a question asked of him on 1 November, the member for Unley was in favour of retaining our laws against prostitution, but by the time of the *Sunday Mail* article—and presumably he was interviewed by the *Sunday Mail* on Saturday 6 November for the next day's paper—he was in favour of doing away with those laws. I make no inferences as to what that says about the member for Unley and his veracity in dealing with his constituents. What I do say is that it is an example of how targeting in election campaigns leads to undesirable consequences. You see, the member for Unley was quite happy to tell the Festival of Light, a Christian organisation, that he was against decriminalising prostitution because that was a desirable answer from its point of view—that was worth 10 points—but when it came to telling the general public in the great prostitution debate article what his attitude was, he was in favour of decriminalising prostitution. I do not know how he thinks he could have got away with it. But the member for Unley is not the only one. The member for Bright was asked the same question by the Festival of Light:

Would you vote for the retention of laws prohibiting the exploitation of women and men in prostitution?

Mr Speaker, what score do you think the member for Bright got?

Members interjecting:

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Bright got 10 out of 10. He was totally against the decriminalisation of prostitution. But days later, when asked by the *Sunday Mail* for the consumption not of practising Christians but for general consumption what his attitude was to decriminalisation, he said, 'Should the question arise in a private Bill, I would survey my electorate before making a decision.' Yet days earlier he had told the Festival of Light that he had already made up his mind and was opposed to decriminalisation.

Mr Speaker, I am glad you are in the Chair at this moment, because I want to dwell on one of your answers. You will recall that, in the last Parliament, I was a supporter of the Brindal Bill, the Criminal Law Consolidation Bill, which sought to ban late abortions proposed to be conducted at the former Mareeba babies home at Woodville. In this House I voted for the second reading of that Bill in order to stop late terminations. Mr Speaker, you voted for that Bill but, in a subsequent meeting of the parliamentary Liberal Party, you gave strong advice that the Bill ought not to be proceeded with.

Mr Brindal: You do not know that.

Mr ATKINSON: Well, I do, as a matter of fact. Thus the Brindal Bill never came back. So the opportunity to amend the law in that way was lost. But you are a versatile person, Mr Speaker. In the Festival of Light survey, the question was asked concerning abortion:

Would you support legislation to uphold the current practice of most South Australian hospital staff of not performing abortions for social reasons after 12 weeks of pregnancy?

Well, we had already tried that. It was known as the Brindal Bill, and you, Mr Speaker, through your good offices in the parliamentary Liberal Party as we know ensured that that Bill went no further and did not become law. But, in response to the Festival of Light, Mr Speaker, you had a slightly different answer. In response to that question, you got 10 out of 10—that is to say that you would support legislation to uphold the current practice of most South Australian hospital staff of not performing abortions for social reasons after 12 weeks of pregnancy. Mr Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on your versatility. Obviously you have changed your mind and we can expect perhaps a private member's Bill on this matter.

Motion carried.

At 5.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 15 February at 2 p.m.