

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 9 February 1995

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

STATE FLEET

Mr BECKER (Peake): I move:

That the interim report of the Economic and Finance Committee on the management of the Government motor vehicle fleet be noted.

The committee decided that it would inquire into the Government motor vehicle fleet, its usage, and the Government's proposed 25 per cent reduction into the fleet. From time to time the committee, and some of the members of the committee, had received serious allegations of mismanagement being levelled at the public sector in relation to its use of Government cars. The Deputy Premier had described the state of fleet management as a mess, and requested the committee also to consider various aspects particularly relating to use. As I said, the Government has a commitment to reduce the Government fleet by 25 per cent.

After being briefed by officers of central agencies, the committee determined terms of reference but these were later reviewed when it was learned that other reviews and projects were in progress. Having obtained an overview of how the Government fleet was managed and the current role of State Fleet, the committee concentrated its attention on assessment of a proposed alternative to the State Fleet centralised model of fleet management and on examination of some of the utilisation issues raised both by the Deputy Premier and by complaints received from the public. These comments are included in the executive summary of the report.

It is important to mention at this stage that the committee has suffered considerably since the outset of the change of Government by not having a stable staff situation. It is unfair to ask a committee of the Parliament to undertake complex inquiries without permanency of staff. It is disappointing that in the first 12 months, the Economic and Finance Committee has had no less than five secretaries, not because of anything the committee has done but because of the simple situation in place here in Parliament, with the changing of the staff. Movements and promotions, whatever, within the House structure, are destabilising my committee. I hope from here on in this will no longer occur, because it puts a tremendous amount of frustration in the way of members of the committee who are endeavouring to get jobs done quickly, bring down brief reports and be quite precise in what we are doing. We want to change the style of reporting to the Parliament and to inform the Parliament of what is occurring. It cannot do this without proper resources.

The committee concluded that the benefits claimed for centralised ownership and fleet management are not proven, and there may well be circumstances in which local fleet ownership and management are more appropriate. That could happen. We have looked previously at the Department of Agriculture and, when we consider the activities of the Mines and Energy Department, particularly at the outback operations of that department, we appreciate that it can be difficult operating through a central fleet management. However, that is something that now has to be decided by the Government. The committee also found that, although State Fleet and the

Department for Treasury and Finance both stressed the importance of realistic charging for fleet vehicle hire, the long-term hire rates levied by State Fleet in 1993-94 were not realistic, being well in excess of the actual cost of vehicle operation, and therefore the claimed benefits for managers of knowing the real costs of the fleet have not been achieved.

The committee noted the reduction in rates from 1 July 1994 by an average of 17 per cent and, while welcoming this more competitive and accurate figure, was concerned that large fluctuations in fleet management rates may occur again, making the planning of transport budgets and budgetary control in general difficult to manage. The pressure is on the managers, particularly the chief executive officers of each Government department. They are the ones who allocate to the various persons the Government motor vehicles that are needed. Some vehicles, of course, are included in salary packages. But it must be a terrible worry to try to come up with a satisfactory budgetary system when the rates are so high and you know that you could get a better deal outside.

Evidence was given to the committee by a person employed by TAFE, who believed that there was a terrible assessment of the operation of the management of motor vehicles, and who believed that the costing of the hire could be reduced by several thousand dollars. The committee went to great lengths to take evidence from this person, and then, of course, took evidence from fleet management people within the Government to ascertain whether the information provided was sound and workable. We have come to no great conclusion on it, because there is a difficulty in the way that you start with the cost price of the vehicle and work your way through the various charges. Various types of leases are offered to Government departments.

There is a wet lease, which of course includes petrol and everything, and there is the straight out hire of the vehicle only. But in some instances, it appeared to me, anyway, that perhaps they were quite attractive leases when it comes down to the work leased. As we were proceeding in this inquiry, I must admit that the committee itself occasionally would just sit down and discuss generally; there was great interaction between the members. We have not had this for some time on this committee, and it was refreshing that members were prepared to get together and discuss the pros and cons, the benefits and the possibilities. So, there was a lot of in-depth discussion in assessing where we were heading and what we were doing.

The committee found that State Fleet's status as a profit making business unit is in conflict with a role aimed at reducing the number of cars each client hires, or even at reducing the number of clients. It noted the establishment of the new position of Director of Fleet Management Task Force and seeks to establish regular liaison with the Director, particularly in relation to comparative studies of various fleet management options and strategies aimed at reducing vehicle utilisation and maximising the efficiency of the systems of transport of personnel. The committee recommends that State Fleet's role and charter be independently reviewed and that the role of the Fleet Management Tasks Force be clarified and publicised.

The committee was already considering the draft report when the Director of the Fleet Management Task Force was appointed. He commenced duties in October 1994, and it was decided to postpone the tabling of the report in order to take the opportunity to call the Director to give evidence on his early assessment of State Fleet management and the proposed strategies and timetable of the task force. Only a brief

summary of the information provided is included in this interim report in view of the committee's intention to maintain regular liaison with the Director.

We hope that, probably in late March or early April, the Director will be in a position to advise the committee of what progress he has made in bringing all the vehicles of the various Government agencies and departments within the whole central structure of State Fleet. I believe it is proceeding quite well and, as the Deputy Premier mentioned in the House on Tuesday, there has already been a considerable reduction in the number of Government motor vehicles of about 700. However, when you are considering a reduction of 25 per cent, you are looking at 2 600 or 2 700 motor cars, and that will have quite an economic impact in this State on motor vehicle manufacturers, such as Holden and Mitsubishi, as well as on the Public Service.

When you get down to finetuning the fleet management, the operation and the use of the cars, you also have to look at the impact that it will have. It is all very well to say, 'We will reduce this, and we will cut spending by such and such', but you cannot do it consistently every year. Occasionally, you can do it when there has been lax management and poor use of resources. Some of these targets may well be achievable but the committee wants to know how this will be done and what progress is being made.

The committee concluded that there was no evidence of widespread misuse of Government vehicles and that the incidence of complaints from the public was not a reliable guide to levels of misuse, with only a small percentage of complaints being sustained and a very small number of serious offences being proven. However, I must say that over the years, when my Party was in opposition, I was used as the whipping post and the central collector of information on complaints—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I have not got down to pushbikes yet, but watch out. The idea was that all information relating to complaints about the use of motor vehicles would be given to me. I have met dozens of members of the public; I have had long discussions with them in my office and have had telephone calls and letters about the misuse of Government motor vehicles. Some of those people have even been harassed by the drivers of those vehicles. In fact, I have seen first-hand the bad habits and practices of some people driving Government motor vehicles. Nothing annoyed me more than the fact that, after I put the questions on notice and received the answers—and I can say this from my personal observation—I found that 50 per cent of the answers I received as a backbencher were not true.

There has always been and probably always will be a method within the Public Service to cover up at all costs. As I said, it is a reflection on probably 1 per cent or 2 per cent only—a very small number—who are abusing the system, but they are reflecting on everyone else and they are damaging the credibility of 98 per cent of public servants. When I have placed questions on the Notice Paper I have received answers that completely contradicted the allegations made.

It is high time that we weeded out these types of people who are put in charge of motor vehicles and who abuse the system. There should be no separation package as far as I am concerned; they should be shown the door. I never tolerated it in banking and I do not see why we should tolerate it in Government when the Government is responsible for the management of taxpayers' funds. It proves that periodically people do abuse the system. The article on the front page of

today's *Advertiser* entitled 'Probe on outback trip in Government car', written by Nick Papps, the police reporter, is a classic example of what occurs from time to time. Had that been raised as a question on notice there is no doubt that there would have been a very simple answer: that the use was authorised and within the guidelines.

I congratulate the *Advertiser* and Nick Papps for their responsible reporting. God only knows what the answer will be to justify the allocation of the car and its use. You can bet your socks that a lot more work will go into trying to dampen down that allegation than any other effective work as far as the State is concerned. Certainly, I do become annoyed when someone is caught out abusing the system. If someone makes a genuine mistake, that should be acknowledged and then we can rectify it. However, if someone is abusing the system, we should pull them up and, if necessary, withdraw the privilege. Certainly, we do need stronger management.

I was annoyed when, after we started the inquiry and were encouraged by the Deputy Premier to go on with it, we discovered that there were other inquiries within the Government and that the fleet manager was appointed to conduct an inquiry as well. There was lack of communication with my committee. We could have saved time and achieved the same result. The size, cost and management of State Fleet are issues that have been raised by the Auditor-General for years, and it is time that we resolved the situation.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I rise to comment on this report as a member of the Economic and Finance Committee. As somebody who has read many Notice Papers over many years I have watched the member for Peake in his almost lone crusade against any public servant caught using a car for anything other than the appropriate service. Clearly, the honourable member is in his element as Chairman of the Economic and Finance Committee to finally have the opportunity to go after those public servants who he has long felt have misused the system.

This reference to our committee came amongst much publicity by the Government. The so-called 300 odd cars that were lost in the system, allegations that appeared in the morning media and comments to the effect that there was massive roting and massive wastage within the system simply were found not to be true. I suspect that that was what the committee had to go through in terms of the new Government wanting to be seen to be making what was not there to be made. Despite comments by the Deputy Premier and the Chairman that there was massive roting within the system, the committee clearly found no evidence to suggest wide scale and massive roting.

As I said during the committee's deliberations, I accept that it is important that the Parliament scrutinise the use of public assets such as cars. However, the amount of time, effort and energy that was expended on that work relative to the savings and the size of the State budget were quite out of balance. I recall one meeting with the Chief Executive Officer of the Department for Education and Children's Services, an extremely highly paid public servant who was accompanied by two or three officers. We grilled him for quite a few hours one morning, and he would have put quite a few hours of preparation into that meeting.

We scrutinised him in respect of an area of his budget that totalled not quite \$2 million, and I point out that his department's budget amounts to some \$1 billion. At that meeting I thought about why were we applying this level of scrutiny to \$2 million out of a \$1 billion budget allocation.

This parliamentary committee has a charter to probe into the State's finances, so I believe our energies are far better spent looking at the big picture and at the big areas of Government expenditure and not wasting our time and the time of Government officials on what are pet projects.

The issue of Government cars has been a pet project of the member for Peake for many years. We are now through that period. As the honourable member said, the amusing point was that not just our committee was probing into the issue of Government cars but a task force and other Government officers were doing the same work. So, it is perhaps a bit ironic that a committee that likes to pride itself on finding efficiencies in Government was adding to some triplication, or at least duplication, of effort.

I concur with the Chairman's comments about staffing levels and the resourcing of the Economic and Finance Committee. I share the honourable member's concern that we have a revolving door when it comes to secretaries. We have very limited finances and even less flexibility in terms of being able to chart our own course and do our own thing.

Mr Evans interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I am glad the member for Davenport agrees.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I apologise for taking up the very important time of the member for Unley, whose 15 minutes of glory is just about to come upon him. I want to reiterate the comments of the honourable member. The Economic and Finance Committee should have more resources—as, of course, should all committees—but it should have the ability to be the controller of its own budget lines and positions, and it must have some consistency. So, I appeal to you, Sir, as Speaker of the House, to take seriously the comments of the Chairman. It is an important issue, and the Opposition concurs on that point.

In conclusion, we have tabled this report. I do not think that at the end of the day it adds a great amount to the wealth of knowledge about how we have controlled our State Fleet. I just want to make the point that the comments of the Deputy Premier and the Chairman himself about massive rorts, wide scale abuse and a corrupt system were found to be quite wrong. No such evidence was produced to the committee and, like most things, particularly in the early days of this Government, those comments were totally exaggerated and totally blown out of proportion, and that was proven to be the case.

Mr BASS (Florey): I rise also as a member of the Economic and Finance Committee. I agree with the Chairperson of that committee and also with some of the comments of the member for Hart.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BASS: Only some of his comments, yes. The committee looked at all aspects of State Fleet and the use of vehicles. It found that the majority of the agencies appeared to manage their motor vehicle use responsibly and make sensible choices between the options available. It is probable that some home-to-office use has been excessive and that executive vehicles are under utilised as pool cars during the day. I have only to look back at my career in the Police Force to recall how frustrating it was for detectives on a Monday when three teams were working and they did not have a vehicle available to enable them to go out on tasks and inquiries. Very often the senior police officer who had a vehicle to take home was not using it; it was sitting in the car

park getting hot or wet, yet active police officers could not go out on inquiries.

The committee found little hard evidence in relation to pool cars being under utilised during the day but it received considerable anecdotal information. It is clear that the level of public complaints is influenced by the visibility of blue plated Government cars. In relation to changes in service delivery, the committee found that, with the increasing likelihood that Government activities will take place outside standard working hours and away from the traditional office base, complaints regarding cars allocated to executives frequently reflected a lack of understanding of the nature of executive remuneration, which includes the right of private use for all executives above the first level.

In the past month I have had people in my electorate office who have complained about the use of Government cars. On one occasion a member of a Government agency used a car on the weekend for a legitimate purpose. During the journey, that person detoured for a purpose that was not part of her employment and, being a Sunday afternoon, I was asked why that vehicle was being used in that way. After making inquiries, I found that the vehicle was being used legally but that the person who was using it had disobeyed the instructions to users of Government cars and, consequently, that is why it was identified in an area it should not have been.

The second recent case concerned a vehicle that was parked in a space reserved for disabled people in the shopping centre where my electorate office is situated. The driver raced to a Rediteller, withdrew some money and went back. Of course, an irate constituent came and saw me. First, he believed that the use of the vehicle to access the Rediteller, no matter what Government agency it was, was not within the guidelines. The fact that the user actually parked in a car park for the disabled (and on my information not straight in it; she straddled the car park) and then left the vehicle there while she withdrew some money increased the concern of my constituent. Both these incidents, although minor, were contrary to the regulations and strict guidelines set down by chief executive officers in departments. It is in that area, more than anything, where chief executive officers need to impress upon employees in Government departments that they must stick very rigidly to the guidelines.

The committee concluded that, at the agency level, the scope of potential savings is limited, as most agencies have already identified travel costs as an area for review. In relation to cost reduction within their global budgets, it was also found that in many circumstances the use of a Government car is the most economical form of travel. Therefore, even a significant reduction in the use of Government cars will not necessarily lead to a reduction in overall transport costs. The area of fleet financing, acquisition and overall fleet management may be more critical to long-term savings. It is a must that the State fleet be reduced. People who are allocated vehicles which end up standing all day and night outside offices must ensure that other people in the office who need the vehicle can maximise its use. I support the committee's conclusions and recommendations. It is a good report into what was a difficult problem to solve.

Motion carried.

PROSTITUTION (DECRIMINALISATION) BILL

Mr BRINDAL (Unley) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to abolish offences related to prostitution and

to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 and the Summary Offences Act 1953. Read a first time.

Mr BRINDAL: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I introduce this Bill conscious of the great responsibility that it brings to the House. It is not done lightly. Before dealing with the Bill, I apologise to members for the personal pain it will cause them and their families. I want to pay a particular and personal tribute to those people who have advanced the debate thus far, namely, the Hon. Robin Millhouse, the Hon. Carolyn Pickles and the Hon. Ian Gilfillan, because the position from which we start today is not the first step but the third step.

Also, I want to pay a particular tribute to the people whom I love because this has not been an easy time for them. Members new to the House will realise—and if they do not do so now they will realise it by the end of the debate on this matter—that people consider members of Parliament fair game for absolutely any level of abuse and any type of obscene comment, not necessarily directed only towards them but also to the people whom they care about.

It is one of the downsides of our profession and, in so far as members of this House may suffer that fate because of this debate, I apologise to them. Nevertheless, this issue is more important than our personal sensibilities on this matter. We are all conscious of the fact that there is no Party position on prostitution, that it is a conscience issue so, in asking members carefully to consider their vote, I hope they will ask, 'What is my conscience related to my duty in this House?' We may have been raised in different faiths and with different points of view and, when we come to exercise our conscience here, do we just follow the dogma or creed in which we were raised or do we have a duty to interpret that creed in the light of our experience as members of Parliament? Is it our higher duty to exercise that conscience honestly and conscientiously in the best interests of all South Australians?

I would say that it is not good enough to come in here as an ordained minister in this or that church and say, 'This is my belief.' That is not good enough. The only acceptable point of view in this House is to come in here and say, 'I will exercise my conscience absolutely and completely on behalf of the best interests of South Australia.'

The member for Coles told me last night that I was becoming very unpopular with Italians in her electorate. So be it, but loudly and clearly I ask the State's Italian community to remember who stood up and sought justice for the person who was formerly in charge of the Lotteries Commission. I ask Bishop Joseph and the Greek community in South Australia about who stood up and helped them acquire Thebarton Primary School. I ask the Catholic community of Adelaide to look at my record on abortion, gambling and many other moral issues. Then—

Mr Lewis: For a few thousand dollars, and it was worth \$3 million.

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Ridley apparently wants to suggest some impropriety on the part of the previous Government. I suggest that he do it by way of substantive motion. I ask the Greek, Catholic and Italian communities to look at my record. I say to them simply this: if they would have me stand in this place and defend them on important issues, can they then say, 'You are right; you defended us on this issue, but when you support a principle that we do not like, you are wrong, so we will run away from you in droves'? If that is the sort of loyalty that one earns in this Parliament by seeking honestly and conscientiously to do

one's job, I wonder what any of us are doing in this Parliament. It is a matter of exercising our conscience.

I wish to quote from a number of sources in the course of this debate. I wish first to take us briefly through the legislative history on this matter. In 1980 a select committee of this Parliament reported that there was a need to decriminalise prostitution. As members know, that evidence has been sealed away. Immediately it was sealed away, we had people saying that the conclusions did not accord with the evidence. They could not see the evidence, and neither could we, so they automatically made this whole series of accusations: the conclusions do not accord with the evidence; people have overlaid their own opinion on the evidence; and basically it is a flawed report. We will be discussing this by way of another motion.

I have asked to see that evidence not because I particularly want to see it but because I want to assure myself that my predecessors in this House had the integrity for which I give them credit; that they acted honestly, openly and without prejudice and came down with a set of conclusions that agreed with the evidence. That is the only reason I am interested in looking at that evidence. If this Parliament makes a decision that it would be wrong to do so—and that is fine—we should not enter into this debate by saying that that committee was flawed and that its conclusions are wrong because, if we are not prepared to look at the evidence and examine it, we must accept that previous members of Parliament behaved with integrity and that the conclusions they reached are therefore valid. The conclusions were quite clear: the conclusions were that there was a need to decriminalise prostitution.

Mr Atkinson: For that time.

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Spence says, 'For that time.' I will show the member for Spence that we have moved on, so that it is more important today than it has ever been in the past. Following that, we have had a number of parliamentary committees, select committees, commissions and all sorts of things around Australia. One of the most notable figures in that was Marcia Neave. Another very authoritative and well researched document was produced in Canberra. Virtually every committee that has met in the past decade and a half has suggested reform of prostitution law. When the NCA was operative in this area, Operation Hydra reported:

In the course of the investigation it became clear that in spite of often rigorous efforts by police to enforce the law there is no real possibility that prostitution could or would ever be eradicated.

It went on to state:

The National Crime Authority therefore recommends that the operation of the criminal law in South Australia, as it applies to prostitution, be reviewed with reference to the law and practice in other States.

In other words the NCA recommended reform and recommended it strongly. Matthew Goode, a senior lecturer in criminal law at the University of Adelaide and well respected by the previous Government, was commissioned by the previous Government to prepare an information issues paper on the law as it relates to prostitution. Matthew Goode was quite clear. While he sought not to make recommendations and conclusions, he admitted that he could not discuss the matter without some relevance to what the future direction should be. His paper is a clear indication of the need for reform in South Australia. Need a Government look any further than its chief law officer in South Australia? Commissioner Hunt is on the record—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The chief law enforcement officer—I stand corrected by the members for Spence and Norwood. He is clearly on record as saying that the law in this area needs reform. He has been saying it not in the past few months, not since this debate came up, but for a number of years. I quote from a minute of enclosure to the Minister for Emergency Services entitled ‘Prostitution legislation review’:

The proposal is that the legislation entailed within the Summary Offences Act relating to prostitution be amended to ensure effective control measures.

The background says:

Over a period of several years numerous reports have been forwarded to the Office of the Minister for Emergency Services advising that the laws relating to prostitution offences and brothels as contained in the Summary Offences Act were virtually ineffective in controlling what I believe may well become one of this State’s areas of organised crime.

He goes on in the overview to say:

Whilst accepting policing techniques will never eradicate prostitution, the Government’s position should be stated and in so doing address prostitution as it impacts on the following community issues: morality; health; nuisance; taxation; organised crime; exploitation of women; and children’s protection.

It is signed by David Hunt and dated 26 February 1990. He has repeated his calls for reform as latterly as 6 April 1993 in the *Police Post*. I will make available any documents from which I quote, should any member of this House wish to access them. It is most important that we establish this: that the select committee of this Parliament, the NCA, the Police Commissioner and every authoritative report in the past 15 years in this country has recommended the need for reform.

I am indebted to the fact that the member for Coles pointed out that the Women in Power and Politics Conference unanimously passed a resolution for the decriminalisation of prostitution. Members on this side would also know that the State Council of the Liberal Party unanimously passed—

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: One member, who shall remain nameless, said that they are all lefties. I do not know that the Liberal Council would like to be described as ‘all lefties’. They unanimously passed a resolution for the decriminalisation of prostitution. This proposal, if members have done their homework, is supported by the Women’s Electoral Lobby, the AIDS Council, the STD clinics and some of the main-stream churches.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The proposal for change. The member for Hanson asks me to name them. There will be a time when those churches will, I believe—

Mr Leggett interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: If a bishop in this jurisdiction seeks to lead his flock, it is his prerogative rather than to be dragged screaming at the behest of the member for Hanson, however well meaning. Let the bishops speak for themselves. I made the statement and said that they will speak for themselves. They are quite capable of that and will in time. If some of them speak against me, so be it. Some will come out in support.

Mr Leggett interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, I am clearly saying that.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I am claiming wide support from the churches and I hope that the record will clearly show that.

Mr Lewis: And you are claiming support from David Hunt.

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Ridley is right: I am claiming support from David Hunt for the proposal to reform the law.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is an important debate. The Committee stage allows members to raise matters with the mover of the proposition and that is where questions in relation to this matter should rest.

Mr BRINDAL: Let us be quite clear: in my opinion, the Police Commissioner has not sought and will never improperly seek to interfere with the processes of this House. He is a most honourable man and I claim his support by way of the recent reference which I have quoted in this House—

The Hon. W.A. Matthew: Has he seen the Bill?

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I seek leave to extend my remarks.

Leave granted.

Mr BRINDAL: The Minister for Emergency Services asks whether he has seen this Bill. The answer is that he will see this Bill directly after this House has received it, which is now.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Members will be aware that I—

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: No. I quoted the Police Commissioner—and I gave the member for Gordon more credit than to be obtuse on this point—as saying that there was a need for reform. All I am claiming is the Commissioner’s support for the need for reform.

Mr Atkinson: Change.

Mr BRINDAL: All right, change: the need for change. I wonder how those in this place who profess to be students of the language will argue that reform and change are not very similar. Reform is change, change is reform, and *vice versa*; but that is another argument.

Legislative history is clear that there is a need for reform. The next thing is how we do it. Some person, who I do not believe deserves the name of member of Parliament, some spineless pond creature, was quoted anonymously on the *7.30 Report* as saying that they were inclined to support this Bill, but that I was moving the Bill for political motive or gain. I say that that person is some type of spineless neanderthal, and I am sure that is unparliamentary.

Mr Atkinson: Neanderthals had spines.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: That is true, but this particular—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Speaker is not aware of what the term means, so I cannot rule on it.

Mr BRINDAL: It is a very primitive cave dweller. The member for Spence is quite right: they had spines, but this one did not. Mr Speaker, I am sure you would rule that was very unparliamentary if the person who made that remark for television would like to get up and ask me to withdraw what I have said about him. If they wish to identify themselves, let them do so. If not, I say to them that our job is not to judge the motives of others—were any of us to do that, at times very few measures would be passed—or, indeed, to pass judgment on others. There are those here—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that members should not continue to interject or attempt to engage in discussion. The Committee stage is for that. I ask the member for Ridley not to interrupt the member for Unley again.

Mr BRINDAL: Thank you, Sir. There is a need for reform. The Police Commissioner, the chief law enforcement officer in this State, four years ago wrote to Executive Government and pointed that out. He has repeatedly pointed that out and both Governments—the year of this Government and three years of the Labor Government—have done nothing. There has been no attempt to implement the wise counsel of the Police Commissioner, and no Minister has come in here with any proposal for change.

Like or dislike what I am proposing, this Parliament is elected to act on behalf of the people. Members can totally refute all of my arguments; they can take some high flown moral ground or they can have whatever argument they want and it is totally as valid as mine. My argument is no better or no worse than anyone else's. However, one thing I ask all members in this House to do is at least acknowledge a need for change. That change cannot occur unless we are prepared to debate this matter honestly and openly and to open this Bill. To say some of the rubbish that has been said—that this legislation is adequate—is palpably and totally nonsense. The current legislation is inadequate and it serves no-one.

Mr Lewis: Are you sure?

Mr BRINDAL: Let me assure the honourable member that I came to this place by a circuitous route, and I think I should share it with this House because it concerns someone whom many of us held in very high esteem—the late Hon. John Burdett. John Burdett had a conversation with me in his office about this issue. He was passionately convinced of the incorrect nature of this body of law and he deeply believed—and he is on the public record as saying so—that the Act should be self-criminal and equally criminal for both parties.

At that stage I agreed with the Hon. John Burdett. I started my research on this matter some 18 months to two years ago, and all of this can be checked from that point of view. I received some advice from police officers, who said that it was unable to be policed and that that was not the direction to go. I therefore looked at alternatives and the alternative is reform. That is what I am proposing. This Bill is quite simple.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I apologise to the honourable member opposite that I am upsetting him. All I am trying to explain, as the honourable member should understand—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Behind this Bill. If the honourable member has a copy of the Bill he will see that it is simply a Bill for repeal. Today I will seek the leave of the House to introduce a further Bill, which will deal with a regulated industry that results from the decriminalisation of this industry. I will do that today, and I will do it on the advice of many of my colleagues who have said, 'You cannot do half a job: you either do the whole job or no job at all.' That is the counsel of my peers in this place. I have been talking to them—members on both sides of the House—over the past couple of days. I accept that counsel, and I will seek leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to regulate the prostitution industry. So, the whole matter is before us, and that is what we will be debating.

That is what the honourable member opposite is talking about: that the Bill I am introducing into this House today is a Bill to repeal existing legislation. While the member for Gordon and members opposite may fulminate, I am simply explaining this Bill, which is to repeal the prostitution laws as they exist in South Australia, and I am explaining why.

The Festival of Light, which is very vocal in this matter, says, on the one hand, that it abhors the practice of prostitu-

tion: first, it is destructive of the client; secondly, it is destructive of the prostitute; it is therefore destructive of families and, in being destructive of families, it is destructive in itself of society. That is a very valid point of view. Blake summed it up fairly well by saying:

The whore and gambler, by the state
Licensed, build a nation's fate.
The harlots cry from street to street
Shall weave old England's winding sheet.

That is a valid argument, and one which I expect will be put by the members for Hanson and Spence, and a number of others. I accept the validity of that argument and have some personal attraction to it, but we are here to consider what is good for South Australia. I find no good at all in the current legislation, which has never made the very act they deplore illegal. This is the point: in South Australia today, prostitution is not an illegal act.

Mr Atkinson: And it never has been.

Mr BRINDAL: And it never has been. As the member for Spence would also know, I could travel 500 miles with \$1 000 in my pocket, seek out a brothel, enter it and pay that money, and I have committed no offence, but the woman who has received the money thereby commits a number of offences.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, that is exactly right. The member for Spence says, 'Only if it is a brothel.' South Australia has a law pertaining to the regulation of brothels and virtually no law at all relating to escort agencies.

Mr Atkinson: That's right.

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Spence says, 'That's right.' Therefore, it is all right to be a hooker in an escort agency but totally unacceptable to be a hooker in a brothel. I look forward to the contribution from the member for Spence to understand how we have first and second class prostitutes. I would have thought that all sex workers are equal. I know the law ignores that, and one of the provisions of this law we want repealed is this: it is illegal in this State—and quite rightly so—to obtain sexual favours by way of false pretences or fraudulent means—by cheating. In other words, you cannot get somebody into bed by cheating.

There is a little proviso there: unless that person be a common prostitute or a person of low moral character. If that does not show the bias that has been inherent in this Parliament, and if that does not show that prostitutes are regarded as somewhat second class citizens, I really do not know what does. That shows the inherent bias of the law, and the inherent bias of this law is to degrade women and to somehow elevate men to a plain at which they cannot be held responsible. I do not accept that as a just or proper principle. I grew up with a very simple belief: all people are created equal before God, and I came into this place holding that belief.

I believed that in this place it would be absolutely axiomatic that all people were equal before the law. This is not a law in which all people are equal. I challenge the members for Hanson and Spence, or anyone, to stand up and promulgate the continuance of an unjust law that victimises people who are arguably already victims.

The Festival of Light on the one hand says, 'Prostitution is abhorrent; it is destructive. Therefore, the State should keep in the area; therefore, the State should work hard to eradicate it.' But what does that organisation say about the health issue? What is the scaremongering about the health issue?

The Festival of Light says it believes that an HIV infected prostitute will infect 20 men, and of those men, by their admission and the admission of the industry, probably 80 per cent are married, so they will almost certainly infect another 16 innocent partners of this victimless crime. They will infect 16 partners and .8 unborn babies, and by this law that exists we do nothing about the health issue. Let me tell you something that Father John Fleming will tell you, if you do not know yourselves: prostitutes are cleaner than the general society. If there is an argument in this debate it should be that prostitutes have the right to protection from their clients and not *vice versa*.

So, prostitutes are the cleans ones, yet we get that garbage disguised as Christianity, which is so compassionate that it says, 'They will spread disease,' etc. That is not my brand of Christianity. This is not a Chamber that should much concern itself with Christian ethics, but it is a Chamber based on the Judeo-Christian tradition. So there is a sense in which the ethics of this debate, from a Christian standpoint as they relate to the law, cannot be ignored. I am sure the member for Spence will point that out. So that is valid in this debate.

It is equally valid in this debate to say that what we seek is the best good for all people, and prostitutes are people. Whatever else they are, they are citizens of South Australia, and they deserve our help and support. I have written to some heads of churches, and I have yet to receive an answer from some of them. I said simply this: there is a story about a person a lot of members in here profess to follow. He said, when a woman was brought to him in adultery, 'Let her without taint of sin cast the first stone,' and they all went away. When only he and she were left, he asked, 'Where are they who condemn you; have they left?' She said, 'Yes,' and he answered, 'As they will not condemn you, neither will I. Go away and lead your life of sin.'

I say to this House and to those who follow that faith that, if the leader of the faith that they follow would not pick up the stone and cast it, they should not tell me to pick up that stone and throw it. I will not, and I will not vote for a law that is unjust, a body of law that is repressive and a body of law that should be repealed.

Mr ATKINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

FAMILY LEAVE

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): I move:

That the fifth report of the Social Development Committee on family leave provisions for the emergency care of dependants be noted.

The report was handed to this House on 7 February. My colleague and the Presiding Member of the Social Development Committee, the Hon. Bernice Pfitzner, similarly tabled this report in the other place yesterday. This report explores the issue of care of sick family members by people in the paid work force and investigates the options available to workers to care for family members when they are ill. Taking evidence for this report, which was referred to the committee by its own motion, began on 1 September 1993, and members resolved to continue the inquiry following the December 1993 election. A broad cross-section of evidence was heard from 28 witnesses, and written submissions were received from 30 organisations. The evidence upon which the committee has based its findings was representative of a wide variety of organisations, including employer organisations, unions, women's groups, community groups, Government

agencies and child care centres. The committee agreed that for its purposes 'family' would be interpreted as including dependent children and aged or disabled relatives.

Evidence which was presented to the committee clearly showed that the difficulties between work and the need to care for sick dependants has increased significantly and will continue to increase in the future. The reasons for the increased conflict are due both to demographic and labour force changes. One significant factor in more workers' experiencing difficulties is the increased participation by women in the work force. Evidence shows that not only are more women participating in the work force but that they are choosing to have fewer children, having them perhaps later in life after establishing a career and then returning to work earlier, quite soon, in fact, after the birth of their children.

Other significant factors were the increased number of single-parent families, Australia's rapidly ageing population and the trend toward maintaining the aged and disabled in their own homes. When these factors are considered together, the inescapable conclusion is that most Australian workers will need to care for sick family members at some stage, and indeed for many workers the need will continue over a number of years, moving from the need to provide care for children to the need to provide care for aged parents.

Results from two surveys, one based in South Australia and the other an Australian wide survey, were submitted to the committee as evidence of the difficulties facing workers with family responsibilities. Interestingly, one of the findings was that workers caring for sick parents took more days off than those caring for sick children. Whether it be sick children or parents, though, the surveys found that most workers used their own sick leave when they required time off to care for sick dependants. This placed enormous pressure on them not to get sick themselves or they would go to work perhaps sick so they could save their sick leave to care for dependants when they became ill. Some workers took leave without pay to care for sick dependants but, as this reduced the worker's income, this practice placed additional pressure on families.

The studies also found that parents had sent sick children to school or child care and some other school age children had been left home alone. Two alternative care options were described to the committee, and we believe they have some merit. In our report, we recommend that sources of funding for emergency care options be investigated and alternative care programs be evaluated. In deliberating on other recommendations, it would have been easy for the committee to recommend that workers be provided with as much leave as necessary to care for sick dependants in emergency situations. However, obviously we took our task very seriously and understood our responsibility not only to the workers of this State but also to the employers. There are examples in the report of enterprise agreements effectively worked out between workers and employers to the benefit of both parties.

The committee was told that a number of companies, for example, provided workers with unlimited leave for family emergencies. These included ICI, Australian Defence Industries, Mission Energy at Loy Yang B power station in Victoria and Optus. Many of these agreements have come about as a result of enterprise bargaining. Other employers had provided a specific number of days leave to allow workers time off work for emergency family care, and these mainly included General Motors-Holden's, Biotech and AMP. In South Australia an agreement has been reached between Myer/Grace Brothers and the Shop Distributive and

Allied Employees Association that provides all South Australian employees of Myer/Grace Brothers with an annual entitlement of three days paid leave for the emergency care of family members.

The United Trades and Labor Council in its submission argued that an additional five days per year should be legislated to allow workers to provide care to sick family members. On the other hand, the South Australian Employers Chamber argued that legislation was too prescriptive and inhibited workers and employers in finding flexible approaches to leave taking suitable to both parties. The chamber also made the valid point that employers should not be solely responsible for the cost of social change. While the committee members were very sympathetic to the UTLC's request, we could not support it. We recommended that flexible use of leave, annual and sick leave, and flexible work practices, be negotiated through enterprise agreements as provided for under the new Industrial and Employee Relations Act of 1994. We further recommended that agreements made under this Act be examined and reported on to assess their effectiveness in dealing sensitively with the emergency care issue.

Furthermore, the committee recommended that all parties—the South Australian Employers Chamber, the UTLC and the South Australian Government—actively work together to promote the introduction of flexible work practices. A number of innovative flexible work practices were described to the committee, and if all parties exhibit a willingness to negotiate, the potential to resolve satisfactorily the work/family conflict exists at minimal cost to either the employer or the employees.

In conclusion, in tabling this report today I would like to thank those organisations and individuals who provided submissions and oral evidence to the committee. The issue of emergency care of sick dependants will not go away. If anything, the conflicts will increase as we head towards the twenty-first century. The committee and I believe that the ability to be flexible enough to change the way we currently work is essential to the resolution of this very significant issue. Ongoing work and discussion will be required to encourage this change, and the committee believes that this report assists in giving direction and support for such a change. I commend the report to the House.

Motion carried.

SEAFORD DEVELOPMENT

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): It is with pleasure that I move:

That the Public Works Committee report on the Seaford 6-12 school project be noted.

The Seaford development project is a joint Government/private enterprise housing venture. As part of the development proposal, the Government of South Australia has agreed to provide appropriate infrastructure, including schools. Extensive consultation between the Department for Education and Children's Services and the Noarlunga council has concluded in an agreement to construct joint school/community facilities within the development of a new school. On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I note that the clock is not operating.

The SPEAKER: I can assure the honourable member that he will not be cut short.

Mr ASHENDEN: The Seaford 6-12 school project is an initiative of the Department for Education and Children's Services, forming an integral part of the Seaford develop-

ment, and it is a strategic response to the projected population growth of the area. The Seaford master plan was approved by Cabinet in November 1989. It detailed objectives for the Seaford development area through a joint venture agreement between the landowners (the South Australian Housing Trust and the South Australian Urban Land Trust) and private sector joint venture partners (the Jennings group, Kinsmen Seaford Pty Limited and the State Bank).

The joint venture documentation sets out commitments by the joint venture partners to a range of social planning and human services objectives, to develop the land progressively and to provide human services to the area of a quality commensurate with good urban development. Because of the projected population size of the Seaford development area, Noarlunga council had planned to establish a branch library and recreational facilities within the district. By combining resources, both Noarlunga council and the Department for Education and Children's Services are now able to provide a facility which is of maximum use to all members of the community, which avoids duplication and which provides access to a greater range of materials than would otherwise have been available if the conventional path of a separate school and community library had been followed.

The committee's report deals with the proposal to construct a 6-12 school at Seaford, including a joint school/community facility. The estimated cost of constructing this project is \$16 375 000. After examination of the proposal, after taking evidence from witnesses and undertaking an inspection of the site, the committee finds that the proposal is soundly based and satisfies the terms of reference for investigation by the Public Works Committee pursuant to the Parliamentary Committees Act. Through its evidence, the Department for Education and Children's Services has demonstrated the necessity and desirability of the proposed new school, which will form an integral part of the Seaford development.

The committee recommends the construction of the proposed school subject to the resolution of concerns which the committee has raised and has expressed on a number of occasions in relation to the following matters. First, the committee notes the absence of any provision for the parking of student vehicles. Given the forecast numbers of enrolments, the increasing use of motor vehicles by students and the uncertain timetable for the construction of the public transport corridor to the rear of the school, the committee requests the department to renegotiate this matter with Noarlunga council, the joint venture partners or the school management to ensure the provision of adequate numbers of safe and proximate student parking as the need arises.

Secondly, the committee expressed its concern at the present pick-up and set-down arrangements. The committee believes that the provision of areas, either in the street or on the school site, for the delivering and collecting of students is quite inadequate and insufficient for the number of students that is expected to enrol at the school. The committee requests that the department secure firm agreement from the Noarlunga council and/or the joint venture partners for the use of street parking bays and the parking areas proposed as part of the town square development as pick-up and set-down areas. I cannot urge enough the strength of the committee's recommendations in that area because I have seen first-hand the shocking problems that have occurred in the Golden Grove development because of inadequate car parking spaces for the schools, well planned as they are, and the subsequent problems that have developed. This is an area that must be

attended to, and the mistakes of Golden Grove must not be repeated.

During its second hearing of evidence, the committee received assurances from the department that these concerns would be addressed in cooperation with Noarlunga council. The committee will monitor these matters very closely indeed, as they are major concerns and, unless addressed, will cause substantial problems that must not be allowed to occur at such a magnificent facility. As I have said, similar problems at a number of new schools at Golden Grove, including Golden Grove High School, must never be allowed to occur again.

The Public Works Committee travelled to the site of the proposed school at Seaford where committee members met with senior officers of the Department for Education and Children's Services, and we conducted a tour of the proposed development site. The site inspection gave the committee a greater appreciation of the physical impact of the project; its layout; its potential relationship with nearby housing and with other neighbouring buildings, such as the supermarket and the Catholic school; proposed pick-up and set-down areas; car parking; and public transport routes and main roads. The committee supports the development of the Seaford community and recognises that the school will provide an appropriate venue for the education of children in this growing region as well as provide a focus for community activity.

In July 1994, the Department for Education and Children's Services released its action plan for the implementation of middle schooling. The recommendations of the action plan have been incorporated into the structure and design of the Seaford 6-12 school; that is, the school has been designed as a middle school, incorporating years 6 to 9 and a senior school for years 10 to 12. Consequently, while there are joint use areas in the school, such as the gymnasium, library and student services areas, there are also two distinct sub-schools, which share a single administration.

There has been extensive consultation with educational practitioners in the design of the school to accommodate student needs and contemporary curriculum initiatives. Development of this project has involved extensive consultation with the Noarlunga City Council, the Seaford Human Services Planning Team and the Children's Service Division within the Department for Education and Children's Services. Also, public meetings have been held where concepts and plans have been presented and discussed. Other consultation was conducted with principals; curriculum advisers and consultants; school support officers; practising junior primary, primary and secondary teachers; and overseas specialists, Professor Larry Amey of Nova Scotia and Dr Trevor Davis, an adviser on the UK's technology and education program.

The 14 hectare site for the school was allocated by the joint venture partners as part of the district centre for the Seaford development. Having a school located in the district centre is seen to provide advantages of accessibility, transport, community interaction and the sharing of facilities. The construction of the school is planned in three main stages. Stage 1 will provide general and specialist teaching facilities for years 6 to 9. The stage 2 component will provide general and specialist teaching facilities for the senior school, that is, years 10 to 12, and stage 3 will involve the provision of relocatable accommodation to address enrolment growth in accordance with the core-plus policy of the Department for Education and Children's Services.

An extensive consultation process has ensured that the design reflects current teaching and learning practices, yet is also flexible to allow adaptation to any future curriculum or methodological shifts in emphasis. At the same time it meets the parameters for accommodation and space allocation set out in the policies of the Department for Education and Children's Services. In particular, the new facility will provide: modern purpose built teaching and learning facilities; safe areas for students, with facilities which are secure and well-organised and designed to cater appropriately for the full range of middle and senior school functions at the Seaford site; the ability for advanced information technology to be incorporated into the design of a purpose built education facility; the provision of a unit for 16 adolescent students with severe and multiple disabilities—I think it is important to emphasise that at the moment those services and facilities are just not available in the region; a joint use school community library and resource centre, which, again, is not available at present in the region; and the building will cater for low energy consumption levels, ease of management and low ongoing costs.

The Department for Education and Children's Services will make a capital contribution to the Noarlunga city council equal to the cost of building a standard secondary school gymnasium. The council will contribute a similar sum towards the construction of a shared Seaford recreation centre. The Seaford school will have exclusive use of a portion of the proposed centre during school hours.

Written and oral evidence presented to the committee demonstrated that the best practice project initiation processes, as espoused by the Construction Industry Development Agency, have been incorporated into the proposal and the project has been undertaken with the cooperation of the Department for Building Management. The project has been conceived with low maintenance and operating costs in mind. Savings will result from careful building orientation to minimise solar penetration and maximise sun protection, and by the use of high quality, durable and readily cleansed materials and finishes.

To provide security—and that was a point which the committee raised and to which, I think the witnesses would acknowledge, was something that perhaps they had not given due attention to—the Seaford 6-12 school will be equipped with smoke and intruder alarm systems, remotely monitored by a private security company, to detect intruders and provide for the early detection of fires. The committee considers that the construction of the Seaford 6-12 school will make a significant and positive contribution to families in the district.

The organisation of this school into a middle and senior school will, according to the Junior Secondary Review, provide opportunities to ensure that the physical, emotional, intellectual and social needs of young adolescents and of students of post-compulsory age can be best met. The formation of learning communities, enhanced by the built design, will mean that the needs of all students can be better catered for. Students with severe and multiple disabilities will also be accommodated in a unit at the Seaford school. As I have already indicated, no such facility presently exists there for these adolescents, nor anywhere on Fleurieu Peninsula. So, I am sure all members would agree that this will be meeting a need.

The provision of human services in the Seaford development area has been carefully considered and an extensive process of consultation has been undertaken to ensure that a sense of community and neighbourhood is created. The

Seaford district centre will involve a large number of community facilities and agencies to enhance opportunities for access to services and recreational facilities for all family members.

The committee finds the Seaford 6-12 school will provide an appropriate educational facility for members of the Seaford, Moana, Noarlunga and Seaford Rise communities. Growth within these districts is expected to be rapid, and the school is anticipated to meet the educational needs of a peak enrolment of 1 400 to 1 500 students. The sharing of library and recreation facilities with the Noarlunga council allows for more efficient use of available resources by the Seaford development area community.

In summary, the committee finds there is significant social value for all members of the Seaford community in the construction of the Seaford 6-12 school. The Public Works Committee is satisfied that a genuine need exists for the proposed school, that an appropriate concept design and building solution has been developed to meet this identified need and that the Department for Education and Children's Services has given due consideration to the appropriate planning and consultative processes including best practice processes equivalent to those espoused by the Construction Industry Development Agency.

Pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to Parliament that it recommends the proposed public work subject, very importantly, to satisfactory resolution of the issues raised by the committee and an appropriate response from the Minister.

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): I rise with great pleasure to support the report of the Public Works Committee on the Seaford 6-12 school. The Seaford 6-12 school will be part of the Seaford joint venture development. This development has been highly acclaimed by other developers, community members and also our Government. Already as part of the Seaford development we have a new primary school with a collocated Children's Services Office, kindergarten and child-care centre, a private Catholic school, a shopping centre and a service station. Other very important planned services are the combined ecumenical centre with a health centre at the same location.

This school shows clearly the way that local government—in this case, the Noarlunga council—the State Government and private developers can work cooperatively to achieve a positive outcome for the whole community. The foresight of the Noarlunga council must be recognised in this process. This program has been very well planned. The only disappointment that has been associated with the whole program is the misleading information given out to my electorate by the Labor Party during the election campaign. It purposely continued to mislead the community that the Seaford 6-12 school would be built and ready for enrolment in February 1995, even though as late as November 1993 it had not even purchased the land, the building structures had not been architecturally drawn and there were no tenders let actually to build the school.

This act of purposely misleading the community was unforgivable because of the effect that the disappointment had on the children who expected to be in that school this year. Unfortunately this was, once again, a cruel example of caring more about a few votes than being honest with my community. Luckily we now have a member of Parliament for Kaurna who has total integrity and who believes that the community should be a part of the decision making for that

school. The Seaford 6-12 school will take enrolments from Seaford Primary, Seaford Rise Primary School, the Seaford catholic school, Moana Primary School and Noarlunga Primary School. The school will begin next year with approximately 400 students.

At this point, I would like to pay tribute to some of the key people who have been involved in the planning process for this school. In particular, I want to recognise Alan Young, the District Superintendent of Education, and Jocelyn Bailey, the Executive Officer and Project Officer for the Seaford school. I single them out as departmental officers who I believe have put into this project effort and enthusiasm way beyond that expected of employees. Indeed, both of them have shown obvious enthusiasm at all the public meetings we have called, and on any opportunity that has arisen to display material publicly they have been very enthusiastic about the building itself and also the middle-senior school method.

The three principals involved from the local area, namely, Ken Cock (Principal of Christies Beach High School); Peter Scott (Principal of Willunga High School, who has now transferred to Blackwood); and John Trueman (Principal of Aldinga Primary School, now retired—and I must say that is a great loss) gave the committee their invaluable experience in schooling in general but, most particularly, in schooling in the southern area. John Trueman, who has since retired as Principal of Aldinga Primary School, spent many years in that position and had a unique understanding of the southern area. The involvement of Peter Scott from Willunga High School was also invaluable because Willunga High is this year acting as the host school for the year 8 students who will be back into the Seaford 6-12 school next year to do year 9. His preparedness to be actively involved in this arrangement has helped overcome the disappointment felt by some parents because of the misleading program run by the Labor Party.

The committee worked to design this school specifically to pick up the junior secondary review. Stage 1 of the development will set up a classroom area for years 6 to 9 in a semicircular configuration allowing for each year level to be completely separated if that is the choice of the children. The middle school will be physically separated from the senior school quite purposely.

During the public meetings held recently at each of the feeder schools some of the parents showed some resistance to the middle school concept. Therefore, the importance of this school in our community for Kaurna means that there will be a total choice; that is, parents can continue to have their children continue at the traditional primary school or they may choose to have their children attend the middle school program. There will be a canteen between the middle and senior schools, a stand alone administration centre and a joint community-school library facing out onto the town square. There will also be a joint community-school indoor recreation centre with an attached child-care centre.

Another very important facet for this school in our community is the collocation of a unit for 16 students with severe and multiple disabilities. This facility, as was mentioned by the Presiding Member, is not currently available in our community and, apart from the special school at Christies Downs in the Reynell electorate, there is very little available for adolescent students with disabilities. They outgrow Christies Downs very quickly and have nowhere else to go. I am pleased that our Government is addressing this deficiency in my electorate. There have been many community information meetings since the State election, and the recent public meeting to elect the interim school council was

attended by 53 residents. An interim council with representatives from all feeder areas was set up, and this council had its inaugural meeting this week. This is an enthusiastic group who will have a very large job ahead of them, not least of all to select the principal for the beginning of term 2.

This is a particularly important process because the principal will work with the school council and the students at Willunga High School to start the foundation of the ethos for this school and to start the curriculum decisions for Seaford. It has already been decided that the Seaford 6-12 school will have a heavy concentration on technology with a computer link up between all classrooms and the library. The planning for Seaford 6-12 has taken into account life in the twenty-first century and their needs into the future. It has been visionary and futuristic. It recognises that students will have to be multi-skilled as workers and is preparing to train students for that role. There will be closer links between the kindergartens, the schools and the TAFE college, and this is notably because we have such an excellent TAFE facility also within the electorate at Noarlunga.

The member for Wright has, as part of the report of the Public Works Committee on the Seaford 6-12 school, raised the issue of car parking and pick-up/put down areas. These are very important issues, and I join with him in asking quite sincerely that the Noarlunga council and the joint developer think very carefully about this. It is an issue I have raised with them as the member for the area, and it cannot be overlooked. The narrowness of the streets and the concentration of the school on the town square will lead to considerable traffic problems within the area. Traffic lights will become extremely necessary on the corner of Tiller Drive, Commercial Road and the Main Street intersection at the time that this school begins, and are particularly important because of the large majority of students who will come from the western side of Commercial Road and attend the school on the eastern side of a very busy road. Almost every school that I have had contact with has had problems with the pick-up and put down area. As the school grows this will become an extremely big problem for this school. It is imperative that forward planning be put in place for the growth of this school.

I congratulate the Minister for Education and Children's Services for his foresight to continue with the pushing ahead of this school. I also congratulate the Public Works Committee for supporting the Government's plans. I am confident that the Seaford 6-12 school will be a positive boost for my community, and I look forward to the bulldozers beginning work on the first major secondary school in South Australia in a decade.

Motion carried.

HAEMOLYTIC URAEMIC SYNDROME

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I move:

That this House condemns the way in which the Minister for Health has managed the haemolytic uraemic syndrome epidemic and calls on the Government to establish an independent inquiry to investigate and report on:

(a) whether all appropriate action was taken by the Minister for Health and the South Australian Health Commission:

(i) to ensure the public was adequately informed of the symptoms caused by the syndrome and the dangers associated with consuming the contaminated product;

(ii) to warn retailers, prohibit the sale of contaminated goods and supervise the recall of contaminated product; and

(iii) to protect the State's smallgoods industry;

(b) the need for better management and policing of food health laws including product labelling;

(c) the need for legislative change; and

(d) the need for national standards and improved coordination between Federal, State and local government authorities.

Over the past two days in this House the Government and the Minister for Health have subjected members and the community to blustering, to lack of detail, to evasion and to buck passing. It has blamed everyone from Garibaldi's to the Victorians, the media and yesterday even the former Labor Government in a ridiculous analogy with a meat scare in 1991, although it took place four years ago in a completely different set of circumstances with a much less serious bug and involved no deaths.

Never once has the Minister pointed the finger at himself and his role as the Minister for Health, with the prime responsibility to protect the health of our community—so supremely confident, so supremely arrogant and perhaps so supremely nervous that he will not countenance a review of what happened in its entirety. He will not even release the documents, but then again as we found out yesterday, there were not a lot of them. Does he not keep a journal? Has he not heard of minutes? Perhaps he uses a white board, too. He has even been callous enough to suggest that only 18 people were affected, and compared this with other epidemics when no-one died and the organism was not in the same ball park as this deadly strain of E. coli.

Best practice is to institute independent reviews. I thought this Minister, who is a doctor and who knows so much about health and business, would have been glad to prove how competent he had been and would be wanting to make any amount of improvement, no matter how small, to ensure that things got better. My motion has four main sections. Paragraphs (1) (2) and (3) concern those aspects of this scenario that occurred after 23 January. They have nothing to do with the outstanding work done by scientists, doctors and health workers in the identification of the bug and its source.

I will refer briefly to the Food Act, because members need to be really sure about what the Minister's powers are in circumstances like this. First (and I suggest that members may like to look this up), there are powers of entry and inspection. The commission has the power to prohibit sale, to restrict movement or disposal and to require the destruction of food that may not be fit for human consumption. There is also power to destroy food in certain circumstances. There is also a section in the Act related to publication of warnings to the public where food that is unfit for human consumption has been sold. Section 27(1)(a) provides that the commission may require any manufacturer, importer or wholesale or retail vendor of the food to publish advertisements in a manner and form determined or approved by the commission, warning against the risk that the food is unfit for human consumption. Even more, subparagraph (b) provides that the commission may itself publish advertisements warning against the risk that the food is unfit for human consumption.

Just how good was the Minister in performing his duty in relation to an epidemic which has been described by himself and others as one of the most serious in our country? He has spoken about a saturation media campaign, and we have been over that issue a number of times this and last week. Just because the media are all at a press conference does not mean you have a saturation campaign. How is it that children suffering from this disease were still being admitted to hospital, when they must have eaten that mettwurst while this supposed media saturation campaign was well under way? What about the retailers? Why was the mettwurst still being sold? Why was it that people phoned in to us and gave us

information that there was still mettwurst on the shelf? Why was it still on the shelf a week or more after 23 January?

Members interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: If you want the evidence, haven't you been watching the television, haven't you been taking notice of what people have been reporting? The Minister made much about criticisms, saying that we had unjustly and unfairly criticised officers in the Health Commission. I am certain that they did their work to the best of their ability. We might ask how many of these officials there are. How many had taken targeted separation packages before this episode? How much has that department been depleted by this Government's policies? I was speaking to a council official yesterday who said that he got his notice on 30 January—a week after 23 January. He contacted the Health Commission for clarification and he had to keep phoning back. Obviously it seemed that a hotline was not established. If there was, there were not enough personnel there to handle the calls. I wonder how many staff are left in the department. They were flat out; they could not establish that hotline even if they had wanted to.

Let us move on to the smallgoods industry itself. Let us be very clear that the first blow to this industry was when the product of one manufacturer was found to be the cause of this tragedy. In this situation there are a number of factors we need to consider, but the highest priority has to be the health and safety of the population. The Government in these situations needs to limit the damage to the rest of the industry as much as it can, but the first priority is the health of the community. In these situations, simple, clear, consistent, coordinated messages and actions need to occur and they did not.

I will give an example from my own experience. Last Saturday I went shopping at my usual butcher in Elizabeth. We are regular buyers of mettwurst from a Barossa Valley supplier. When I went there on Saturday, he showed me his notice from the local council, which he had received late the day before—3 February. All the mettwurst was off the shelf, although he was not a seller of Garibaldi products. He had voluntarily taken it all off because he wanted to be sure of doing the right thing. All suppliers other than Garibaldi were put at risk by the lack of simple, clear messages going out to all retailers so that they knew what to say and so that they could show a notice from the Health Commission to customers. There would be damage, but you try to limit it to the one company and not implicate all the rest. Retailers needed to know clearly as soon as possible what the facts were so that they could feel confident at least in not taking everything off the shelves.

The other sections of my motion relate to better managing and policing of food health laws, including labelling. There was an issue in relation to that. A need may exist for legislative change as well as for national standards and coordination. It is clear that we need to investigate all of these things and need to involve all the stakeholders in so doing. This, above all, is what the smallgoods industry will need in order to re-establish itself and get back on its feet. Guidelines and criteria related to the fermentation processes need to be established. We need mechanisms to regulate and ensure that the product is top quality. National, State and local governments need to be involved and, above all, the smallgoods industry itself needs to be part of that process. In all of this the Government has continued to say that the Opposition has been irresponsible, has been spreading half truths. Our questions are legitimate.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: Thank goodness that we did and that the media also joined us in raising these legitimate questions, because those opposite did not want to know about it. They wanted to get it under the blanket and get on with something else. We know that the Premier controls the *Advertiser*, but other responsible news outlets did the right thing and worked in the public interest to get this up and refused to be intimidated and to lie down. We are continuing because we do not want a repeat; we want to learn from what happened and use it to improve our practices so that this does not happen again and we do not fall back on what was done four years ago. We want to get better and to learn from what happened. We want to take the information that we get and improve matters for the benefit of our community and the industry. That is why we need an inquiry that covers all the dimensions of what occurred.

This Government, from the Premier down, can continue to berate us, to tell us to shut up, to call us names and to use their bully boy tactics to intimidate and deflect the issues.

Members interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: And bully girls, too. However, we and other responsible people in our community will continue to fight to ensure that the facts are known so that tragedies like the one that has just happened do not occur again.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Health): I wish to respond to two things: first, a number of matters in the honourable member's speech, and, secondly, a number of matters in relation to the motion. First, I draw the attention of the House to the fact that, if there is any attempt to shift the blame in this matter, it is clearly not from the Government but from at least the member for Elizabeth, if not the whole Opposition, and certainly the Leader of the Opposition, who was a Minister in the Labor Government in 1991.

The parallels between 1991 and 1995 are exact. We have the use of section 25 of the Food Act in exactly the same circumstances. For the benefit of the House I will reiterate what I said yesterday. On 16 February 1991 there was a food poisoning epidemic confined to the guests at a wedding rather than isolated outbreaks of an unusual disease appearing from all sorts of areas within the metropolitan area as occurred in 1995. The Labor Government was confronted with a confined outbreak from a wedding on 16 February. On 8 March 1991, faced with exactly the same circumstances—but there was a period between 16 February and 8 March which had elapsed—what happened? The then Government invoked section 25. The actual order states:

The movement or disposal of the food as described in schedule A is prohibited to the conditions in schedule B below—

which was 'until advised otherwise by the South Australian Health Commission'—

but the food described in schedule A was all casalingo salami products manufactured by Garibaldi Smallgoods Pty Limited and stored at their premises at noon on 8 March 1991.

That was issued on the manufacturer. It was the same process as occurred in this instance. The manufacturer was then required, as is standard practice, via the National Food Authority recall, to get the product back from the market. However, further, one then asks: what did this present Opposition, then Government, do? What was the next thing that Government did—this present Opposition that is now saying we have not done enough? What did it do in relation to the Food Act? I merely ask: was there a prosecution,

despite the fact that it knew everything about this episode? Did it use the Food Act to prosecute the company? What did it do? The answer is, 'Absolutely nothing.' There was not a single prosecution.

So, here we have quite clearly an Opposition that is attempting to make political capital out of human tragedy when four years ago, in complete possession of the facts, it swept the matter under the carpet. Shame on you! It is absolutely appalling that we see this sort of occurrence now, as I say, attempting to make political capital when quite clearly in 1991 the then Government was not prepared, with the courage of its convictions, to take appropriate action. I assure the House that I have already instructed the legal department of the South Australian Health Commission to prepare the way for every prosecution possible under the Food Act as soon as the evidence is ready. That will occur. What happened in 1991? Absolutely nothing.

The member for Elizabeth talks about my not releasing the documents. I am more than happy to stand here day after day and to be quizzed. Indeed, the honourable member has said that the work done by the staff of the Public and Environmental Health Service is excellent. So, its documents and its work are not in question. The Leader of the Opposition—

Mr Ashenden: 'Mr 10 per cent'!

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: 'Mr Less than 10 per cent'. The Leader of the Opposition asked me—prefacing his question by saying words to the effect of 'recognising the excellent work that has been done by everyone behind the scenes'—why I performed certain actions. So, the work done behind the scenes is not being questioned by the Opposition. It is questioning my action. I happen to believe that my action is perfectly valid and reasonable in the circumstances, and I stand by that. I stand here day after day ready for questioning. I make myself available to the media and I have done so on a routine basis. I have had question after question. That is what public accountability is about, and that is completely reasonable.

Perhaps the member for Elizabeth, who has not been in politics for very long, does not understand the Coroner's Act. Perhaps she would like to look at it at some stage, because, in calling for an independent review, the honourable member and the Leader of the Opposition are quite clearly impugning the Coroner. Clearly, in any case such as this, where unfortunately there has been a death, the Coroner becomes involved. As I indicated to the House yesterday, that is where the police involvement arises. They are preparing a coronial report. Clearly, the Coroner will conduct an inquest into the death of this girl and, in doing so, will investigate circumstances surrounding that death.

Is the Leader of the Opposition impugning the Coroner? Is he saying that the Coroner is not independent of the Government? I am sure that the Coroner would love to hear that. Is the member for Elizabeth saying that the Coroner is not independent of the Government? I look forward to hearing what the Coroner has to say about that. The Coroner is already inquiring into this matter. Clearly there is enormous public import in this. As I indicated, the Coroner has already been involved.

I believe it is important that this matter be clarified for the good of the families involved, for the good of the people working in the industry, and for the good of South Australia. I have spoken with the Attorney-General about the timing of that inquiry, because I would not want any suggestion that this inquiry will drag on and on in an attempt to avoid public scrutiny. I have spoken with the Attorney-General about the

timing of that Coroner's inquiry; I understand that he will be making a statement very shortly. I believe that statement will indicate that this Coroner's inquiry—this completely independent inquiry—will be fast-tracked.

It is quite fascinating that the member for Elizabeth says, 'A media campaign to inform people was not enough.' When the honourable member made the vague claim that children must have eaten the mettwurst after the campaign was under way there was an interjection of, 'Give us some proof.' I would like to see the proof. Given that the honourable member is allegedly concerned about the smallgoods industry, let us see the proof. Proof obviously will not be forthcoming because the Opposition has a scatter gun approach to this issue. In answer to the interjection, 'Prove it', the member for Elizabeth said, 'Well, you must have seen it on the media.' That is the way people get information in this society. I happen to believe that the fact that people do not read books and do not analyse and discuss things a lot more is a tragedy. But, let us be realistic: people get their information from the media, which the honourable member's response to the interjection quite clearly identifies. The other thing I would say about this allegation that there must still have been mettwurst on the shelves is that there has not been one shred of evidence given to prove that.

However, because of these sorts of scare campaigns, for which the Opposition is well known and which it absolutely delights in, members of the public, unjustifiably, are concerned. Every public statement has identified that there is not a shred of evidence to indicate that cooked products are in any way under suspicion. Yet, despite having said that time and again, people mistake cooked products for uncooked products. That is the sort of evidence we are getting, that these products must still have been on the shelves. Give us the proof. Stop slandering everybody; stop saying that things are inadequate; stop blaming everybody; give us the proof.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The member for Elizabeth says, 'Have an inquiry.' I have already said that we are having a coronial inquiry. The Coroner is completely appropriate in this circumstance and completely independent of the Government. It would be absolutely ridiculous to suggest that that was not the case. When we talk about prohibition of sale of contaminated goods and supervision of the recall of the contaminated product—which is one part of the honourable member's motion—clearly, we have followed all the procedures exactly as occurred in 1991. The only difference is that we have prepared the way already for a prosecution; the then Government did not bother. It washed its hands of it all. It said, 'It's a bit of a problem. We don't want to prosecute anyone. We will let it go away.' Where was the prosecution? It simply was not there. We, however, have taken that action already.

With respect to the need for legislative change, we have already identified that the then Government, the now Opposition, did not even have a Meat Hygiene Act in place—did not have one. It was one of the first Acts that this Government brought into place and, together with the industry, we have advanced the regulatory expectation so that the public can be better informed and better protected. The honourable member goes on and talks about the need for national standards and improved coordination. What a second guesser. That has already been done. I had already identified to the House and to the public, days before this motion was put, that we had written to the Federal Minister for Health, through the Parliamentary Secretary. I have identified that

this is a matter for discussion, at my behest, at the next National Food Standards Council.

I have identified that we have said to the National Food Authority that it is important. Given the national implication of this, because food is distributed throughout Australia, it is important that the National Food Authority has a look at matters and decides whether it is appropriate that there be uncooked fermented products on the market. So the need for national standards and improved coordination has already been addressed. The need for legislative change has already been addressed. I have identified time and again in the House and to the public the need for better management and policing of food health laws, including product labelling. We are preparing a way for a prosecution the minute we have evidence that this company's product labelling was in any way suspect. I inform the House that we are carrying out investigations to ensure that that is the case throughout the industry.

So, it is quite clear what the Opposition is attempting to do. It has absolutely no reason for concern about a coroner's inquiry but it badly needs publicity, and it is choosing human tragedy to get that. Quite frankly, that is appalling, and people from around South Australia have been telling me that. The Government rejects this call not because we do not want an inquiry but because a completely appropriate inquiry is already taking place.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Again this has been an extraordinary performance by the Minister for Health. Yesterday in this Parliament, we saw the Premier, having refused an inquiry and having had his Minister refuse to release the documents, tell this House that there were no documents, which nobody in the community or the media believed. He said there were no documents. When the Minister for Health himself describes it as the worst public health epidemic that this State has seen, does anyone believe that there are no documents? If there is not a cover up going on, why will he not have an inquiry and why will he not release the documents? I will put on notice today—and the Minister for Health will listen—that, if that FOI request is interfered with, if there is any attempt to break the clear laws of this State in terms of FOI access to documents, including advice to the Minister about his powers in relation to section 25, and therein—

The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You've had your say, and you'll listen. I will not get into the gutter like the Premier did: the Premier yesterday was more concerned with being upstaged by his Minister for Industry than he was about this important public health issue. I am not going to degrade or diminish this Parliament the way the Premier did yesterday. It is very interesting. Yesterday, the Premier asked:

Why didn't we have a motion foreshadowed? Why weren't we debating an urgency motion today? Why wasn't there a motion?

Where is the Premier today? Let him have the guts to come in here. Where is the Premier during this debate today? Yesterday, he said, 'There should be a substantive motion on this issue to be debated, because it is a serious issue.' Here is the motion calling for an inquiry. It is a legitimate request for an inquiry, an inquiry that goes far beyond a coronial inquiry, because a coronial inquiry deals with the one issue. What we need is an inquiry to go into what happened, what went wrong, why there is not more effective communication and why there is not more effective coordination between

State and local governments; and it also needs to deal with clear responsibilities.

After the 1983 bushfire there was an inquiry to lay things down for the future, to make sure that we did things better in the future. Why is this Minister frightened to release his documents? Why is this Minister frightened to have an inquiry? Why does he have to get the Premier to hurl abuse in a gutter-type way without any dignity? Why does the Premier do that? To divert attention from the central issue.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Unless there is an inquiry, the public legitimately can say that there is a cover up because you have something to hide. You know you have something to hide because you failed to use your powers under section 25 of the Act which could have prohibited the sale of these goods through the retailers. That is where this went wrong. You concentrated on a voluntary agreement with Garibaldi—

Mr BASS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition has continued to use the word 'you'. In the past he has taken a similar point of order and I ask him to obey Standing Orders.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair has repeatedly said that the use of the word 'you' is commonly known to members as not being parliamentary protocol. However, the Chair regards the point of order as relatively frivolous at a time when the debate is heated. I ask the Leader to observe protocol. In view of the serious nature of the debate, I also ask the House to allow members to put their points of view in relative silence.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That is an important point. The member for Elizabeth and I are legitimately calling for an inquiry, and the Premier regards that as tacky; yet the lawyer acting for victims has called for an independent inquiry, and so have the parents of the child who was so tragically killed. This is an appalling situation where you are rejecting not only the Opposition's call for an inquiry but also the parents' call for an inquiry.

The Minister for Health did not do his duty. He did not apply section 25 of the Act which could have immediately prohibited the sale of these affected goods. Instead, you and your Premier have acted as apologists for the Garibaldi company, and you have tried to pass the buck. On day one you said that it was all under control, and then a few days later you decided to put the blame on Garibaldi; then you tried to blame Victoria; then you tried to blame the Opposition; then you tried to blame the former Government. The Minister for Health has shown complete contempt for this major public health problem. If you are legitimate—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If the Leader of the Opposition were to avoid the use of the term 'you' consistently—he has reached the stage of abusing the Minister on a personal basis—and were to address the Chair, I am sure the conduct of the House would be much more appropriate.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I think it is very disappointing that the Premier does not have the courage, integrity or decency to front in here and explain why the parents' request for an independent inquiry will not be adhered to. It is also very important that the Premier should accede to the request of people in the community for the documents to be released. The very fact that this Government will not have an inquiry to lay down a blueprint for the future to do things better, the very fact that this Government will not allow the documents to be released, shows it has something to hide, because some very important questions need to be asked.

Why did the Minister fail to prohibit the retail sale of the contaminated mettwurst? Did it take four days from the time Garibaldi's product was identified as the problem to send health officers into the company's plant to carry out a full inspection and, if so, why? Why did the Minister fail to issue—paid for and arranged by the Health Commission—public health notices and advertisements in languages other than English? Why was it that people in my electorate, in the northern suburbs, say they did not get their notice, a pamphlet from the Health Commission, until last week? Basically, this was botched. You know it was botched. It needs to be done better. You did not apply your powers. You were more worried about the industry implications than your clear constitutional, legislative and moral responsibilities for the public health of this State, and the Premier is not even in here today to defend your backside.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): There is no doubt that in this exercise a number of things were done correctly. I hope that no-one in this House would dispute the role that was played by the health professionals in the Women's and Children's Hospital and, as I understand it, the IMVS scientists, who quickly identified the problem and indicated where the source of the infection lay. I do not think anyone here would say that that was not the highest standard of health care that could be expected in our community. The one very clear issue to emerge is that those health services did their job and did it very well. The Minister may seek to correct me on this, but I understand that that job was done in a four or five day period from about 18 January until 23 January.

The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: I do not hang my hat and coat on those dates, but my understanding is that it was a quick and accurate analysis. In many respects, it probably should have belled the cat at that point. The Minister said by way of interjection that I was wrong; in fact, it was on 16 January. We want to be quite precise about that for the next part of the argument I will advance. While I say that the diagnostic services of the health system in South Australia obviously passed the test very well, there are a couple of curious puzzles. The key date seems to be 16 January. We in the Opposition know—and, by the stance of many of the Government members here today and the way they have gone on, they also know—that this product was still available in many stores in South Australia, certainly in some of our northern suburbs electorates, some time after 16 January.

The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: Whenever that date was, we know that this product was available last week in some of these stores. There may be some dispute about the precise date on which this identification was made, but there is no doubt that, some considerable time after that, the product was still in the stores. We questioned Government members on this issue and what they said was very interesting. They said, 'There are two ways of dealing with this: we can go in with a sledgehammer or we can have the cooperation of Garibaldi, who will identify the potential points of sale and reduce the amount of this product slowly over the ensuing days.' The puzzle to me is that, once the determination was made, there was a curiously slow period during which the product was removed from shelves in South Australia, and I would have thought that the Minister and most of the members opposite would have wished to greatly speed up that process.

The puzzle for us, and the reason why we are raising this in the House this week, is simply this: in all those ensuing

days throughout this period, why was the process not greatly speeded up? Government members have been haranguing members on this side today about the smallgoods industry in South Australia. I suggest to them that their lack of application during that critical time of which I spoke a minute ago is the principal factor that has done the damage to the smallgoods industry in this State.

Had it been identified, had the Health Commission officials removed this product much more quickly—and members know this—and had there been more determined action by health authorities in this State after diagnosis, the smallgoods industry would not be on its knees today. As a great fan of mettwurst, I went to the local supermarket two days ago and then to a series of other supermarkets and none of that product is available, whether it be from the Tanunda company, the Barossa style or from any one of a number of other companies. Indeed, all the delicatessens and supermarkets in my electorate are now totally devoid of all product. One of the female staff members in the supermarket said, 'No jokes about mettwurst, please Sir.' I pointed out that there was no mettwurst in the shop, and she said, 'If you crack another joke about mettwurst, we will go out the back where we still have some of the Garibaldi mettwurst left; it has not been collected.' This occurred last Monday and, at that point, it still had not been collected and taken to a place of destruction. The damage to the smallgoods industry has occurred because we have had a part-time response to a serious and major problem.

Also, there is another puzzle, and I speak with a bit of a heavy heart. I used to sit in 'cobweb corner' in this Chamber; for all sorts of reasons I was put in 'cobweb corner'. I notice that the member for Mawson is sitting there these days, but I make no comment on that. I remember quite clearly sitting there on 12 February 1991 and for the many sitting days thereafter through to the election and listening to comments about the role of the Government in regard to the State Bank, SGIC and all those other things in South Australia. The great dilemma of Government members is whether they should support the Government in those circumstances or whether they should call the Cabinet to account. That is a great puzzle and a great dilemma for members who are elected via a political Party.

I suggest to Government members that it can be seen by their reaction this morning that they know the wrong thing was done in this matter, that there was not quick enough or decisive enough action, and they need to sit back and ask themselves: do we really want to have this exercise all over again? Given the experience of those of us who went through the State Bank disaster and all the issues that have dominated South Australian politics for at least the past four or five years, I would suggest to Government members in this Chamber that they ought to be much more independent on this issue; they ought to be demanding from their Minister some proper explanations about what happened in this matter and the slowness to react.

Members opposite ought to be saying to the health authorities in this State, 'Your diagnosis was correct; your initial work was absolutely excellent and beyond any criticism, but what happened? When did the train leave the rails? When was all that wonderful diagnostic work thrown out the window, and who was responsible? Was it a Minister or an acting Minister? Or was it the department, a lack of staff or a lack of application?' They should ask for answers to all these very important questions, because in hospital right now are a number of very ill people, and one child has died.

The answers to those questions can come forth only with a proper inquiry. The third puzzle is: why is there no inquiry? Why are we waiting for the Coroner in this issue? Why is the Government so keen on taking such a low profile on this whole matter? It is a big puzzle to me.

The House divided on the motion:

AYES (11)

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

NOES (32)

Allison, H.	Andrew, K. A.
Armitage, M. H. (teller)	Ashenden, E. S.
Baker, D. S.	Baker, S. J.
Bass, R. P.	Becker, H.
Brindal, M. K.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Brown, D. C.	Buckby, M. R.
Caudell, C. J.	Condous, S. G.
Evans, I. F.	Greig, J. M.
Ingerson, G. A.	Kerin, R. G.
Kotz, D. C.	Leggett, S. R.
Lewis, I. P.	Matthew, W. A.
Meier, E. J.	Olsen, J. W.
Oswald, J. K. G.	Penfold, E. M.
Rosenberg, L. F.	Rossi, J. P.
Scalzi, G.	Such, R. B.
Wade, D. E.	Wotton, D. C.

Majority of 21 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

CORONIAL INQUIRY

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Health): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Mr Speaker, I indicate that I am informing the House of a ministerial statement to be delivered in another place by the Attorney-General. Following the tragic death of Nikki Robinson, the Government recognised that there always was to be a coronial inquiry. The Coroner is an independent statutory officer who is supported by a Coroner's Squad comprising seconded police officers. In respect of the current inquiry, it is supported by two police officers of the Major Crime Squad. I met with those officers two days ago and provided them with further information to assist them in their inquiries. The Government recognises that the Coroner may require additional assistance because of the desire to expedite the inquiry.

I have consulted with the Coroner and have informed him that such resources as he requires to enable him to proceed with the inquiry expeditiously will be made available. The Coroner will inform me of his requirements when he has assessed them. Such resources may include counsel to assist the Coroner. Public statements have been made which suggest that a coronial inquiry may take at least 18 months, and that the investigation by the Coroner may not be independent. The Coroner has informed me that the public statements are quite incorrect. He informs me that, if a case requires a sufficiently urgent hearing, arrangements could be made to conduct it virtually as soon as the investigation is

complete, if he is provided with the resources of an extra judicial officer to continue with the general work of the court. This occurred during the extensive Ash Wednesday bushfire inquests conducted by the former Coroner, Mr Ahern. I repeat that the Government has agreed to provide those additional resources. The Coroner also informs me that, even if this matter was not treated as such an urgent case, a hearing date can usually be found within three months or so from the completion of the police investigation and the setting down. The Coroner has also said:

I am disturbed by the implication that the investigation which has occurred to date is not independent. It is being carried out by officers of the Major Crime Squad of the Police Department but I have given instructions through the Assistant Commissioner (Crime) that the investigation is to be thorough.

The Coroner will supervise the investigation as it proceeds and any matters which have not been addressed he will draw to the attention of the investigators. I can assure the family of Nikki Robinson and members of the public that they should have every confidence in the independence of the Coroner and his capacity to conduct a full and expeditious inquiry.

QUESTION TIME

MEAT CONTAMINATION

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Will the Government consider providing assistance to victims of the Garibaldi mettwurst poisoning in making legal claims and providing them with all the necessary documents to make those claims? Given reports that the lawyer and the parents of the child who died after eating Garibaldi mettwurst have now themselves called for an immediate independent inquiry, will the Premier reconsider his refusal to allow such an inquiry that would go considerably beyond the scope of an independent coronial inquest?

The SPEAKER: Order! I wish to point out to the Leader of the Opposition—and I have sought advice on this matter—that earlier today the House made a decision in respect of calling for an inquiry on this subject. Therefore, all questions in relation to the inquiry are out of order. The Opposition should have considered these matters when it called for a vote—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Was it voted on, Mr Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Yes, it was voted on.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House made a decision on that matter. Therefore, questions relating to an inquiry are out of order. The first part of the Leader's question is in order.

Mr CLARKE: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The point I wish to raise with you about the Leader's question is that the House may have voted on the motion, but I would not have thought that that precluded the Leader asking whether the Government will reconsider its position.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the Deputy Leader and others members—and all members should be aware of this—that, if a motion is framed in a broad fashion designed to cover all aspects of a matter and is then moved and voted on, the House makes a decision and members then restrict their ability to raise such a matter in Question Time during the rest of the session. That is not my decision. Standing Orders provide for that course of action. Members should be aware of the down side of their actions.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We have just had a statement from the Minister for Health who talked about a coronial inquiry. My question to the Premier referred to the powers of that coronial inquiry.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Surely the House has now disposed of the motion. It has voted on it and so the order is no longer before the House and, provided no member reflects on the decision of the House in voting on the motion, questions can be asked about it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair sought advice about this matter, and having considered that advice—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: When members have finished, I will complete my ruling. The matter has been voted on: the House has made a decision. That was a conscious decision of the House and, therefore, it has restricted the ability of members to ask questions about certain aspects of this unfortunate set of circumstances.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, the lawyer representing the Robinson family has already approached the State Government concerning legal costs. In fact, we understand that that same lawyer may be taking a class action and covering other victims of the meat contamination as well. Through the Attorney-General we have asked that lawyer to document his request formally, and the Government will consider it once it is passed to us. It would be inappropriate to give an absolute commitment until that case has been presented to us and documented. We understand the most unfortunate circumstance in which those families now find themselves, which is why we have asked the lawyer to put that request for financial assistance in writing so that we can be quite clear about what is being requested. In terms of documents and so on, of course the police have access to Government documents.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will come to that point in a moment. The police have access to Government documents and are carrying out the investigation for the coroner. We understand that the coroner intends to look at any aspect that might have related to the death of Nikki Robinson. Of course, that is therefore a very wide inquiry into that matter. If there is a need for specific Government documents as far as the lawyer is concerned, he should simply pass that request onto the coroner, who is entirely independent and who has the power of the police if he feels it is necessary to obtain whatever documents are necessary to ensure that the coroner carries out that independent and very complete inquiry.

I am very surprised that the Leader of the Opposition, who was a Minister for at least four years, apparently does not understand and has not understood for several days the fact that there would be a coronial inquiry. The Government has clearly understood that there would be a coronial inquiry. The Minister for Health met with police officers on Tuesday afternoon and briefed me immediately afterward as to those discussions with the police officers. In fact, the Minister for Health notified me well in advance of the visit by the police officers that they were coming specifically to talk about this matter as part of the coronial inquiry. I am amazed that the Leader of the Opposition has been carrying on in the way he has carried on for the past few days and has deliberately overlooked the fact that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections coming from my left.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Leader of the Opposition should have known—and there is no doubt that he did—that there would be an independent coronial inquiry, supported by the police, because, as soon as a death was involved in the meat contamination issue, it was absolutely pre-empted that a coronial inquiry was needed. Therefore, one can say only that the Leader of the Opposition has deliberately raised questions about the meat contamination, knowing full well that there was no substance whatsoever in the points that he raised and knowing full well that the due processes of the police and the coroner were about to investigate these matters.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elder now has the call.

EMPLOYMENT

Mr WADE (Elder): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education provide this House with details of the latest employment figures that were released today?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: It is a good news day for South Australia when we can focus on a very important issue, namely, employment. It is not surprising that the Opposition did not ask the lead question on employment, because it is very uncomfortable about the figures. For the first time since 1991, unemployment has gone below 10 per cent. The other significant point is that youth unemployment has now dropped to 27.9 per cent, compared with 42.7 per cent a year ago.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: That is despite what Mr Keating has been doing with his interest rate hikes, which have seriously harmed our building industry, because in that industry alone they have lost several thousand jobs here in South Australia, as well as penalised mortgage payers. So, despite that negative impact from Canberra, 22 500 new jobs were created in certain industries in South Australia in 1994, particularly manufacturing, finance, retail, transport, hospitality and tourism. So, we can understand why the Opposition was not willing to ask a question on this very important matter.

We know that we still have a long way to go. We have still to see the benefits flow from the Motorola project, EDS and so on, but the message is that in South Australia, particularly in the private sector, there has been an enormous and significant growth in the number of new jobs. That is something that we should all celebrate, but we must realise that we still have a big task ahead of us. Whilst these figures can vary from month to month, the longer term figures are very encouraging, and the ones in relation to those industries are the annual figures on an industry by industry basis which have been released today by the ABS. This is a day of celebration for South Australia. We are heading in the right direction, despite Labor in Canberra and here.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Does the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education accept that the ABS data show that since the December 1993 election in South Australia only 2 100 new jobs have been created in seasonally adjusted terms and that since September

1994 the number of people employed has actually fallen by 5 900? The ABS figures show that the fall in official unemployment in today's data is due solely to a falling participation rate and that, had the participation rate stayed at its July 1994 level, current unemployment would be 11.4 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. There is too much conversation across the Chamber. It is difficult for the Chair to hear, and obviously it is difficult for other members.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I respond to the question from the Deputy Leader by pointing out that he and the Leader should be worried about their jobs above all others. Let us go through these figures. Some 22 500 new jobs have been created in the private sector in those industries which I mentioned during the period November 1993 to November 1994. They are ABS figures, not our figures.

The other factor that has to be taken into account, about which we all know, is that through a voluntary separation process in the public sector, counting not only State Government but Commonwealth instrumentalities, such as Telecom, there has been a decline in that sector of about 9 000 jobs. If we add the impact on the building industry of high interest rates, which was confirmed again today, that accounts for the differential. In reality, we have delivered the jobs. Those new jobs are in the private sector, but they have been offset by the necessary voluntary separation package process in the public sector and by Keating's king hit on interest rates. When those are taken into account, they affect what would have been the obvious net result. We are quite open about it. The voluntary separation process is well known—it has been applauded by the public—to make the Public Service more efficient and effective. If we take into account the growth in the private sector in those industries that I mentioned, the voluntary separation process and the king hit—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.B. SUCH:—from Keating on interest rates, which has really harmed the building industry, overall we have more than delivered.

MEAT CONTAMINATION

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Is the Premier aware of claims by a union official that the epidemic caused by the contamination of smallgoods could have been avoided if meat industry inspections had not been deregulated? Will the Premier explain the facts to the House?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes. In fact, I can confirm that on the *Today* program on Channel 9 this morning nationally, Felicity Rafferty, Assistant Secretary to the Community and Public Sector Union, was making some outrageous and quite false claims in terms of meat inspection in South Australia and Victoria. Asked whether the current meat contamination epidemic could have been avoided, she replied:

It couldn't have been avoided while we have a deregulated meat industry in Victoria and South Australia for domestic production and that is the sad thing about it.

That statement is quite untrue. There has been no deregulation whatsoever of domestic meat inspections. This person, who comes from a union that specifically covers AQIS meat

inspectors for the export market, is obviously attempting to increase membership for her union. I think it is absolutely disgusting for a union official to be making false claims, simply in an attempt to increase her union's membership.

Let me give the facts to the House in terms of meat inspection in connection with the services provided by the new legislation introduced by this Liberal Government (one of the first pieces of legislation introduced on our coming to Government). I will read to the House details of the actual increase in surveillance measures now occurring with respect to meat inspection: companies must employ meat inspectors on site; independent regular audit of company inspection programs to take place; formal instruction of quality assurance programs in meat slaughtering plants to take place; employing quality assurance managers with formal meat inspection qualifications, as well as quality management and QA audit certificates, as a mandatory qualification; and, finally, inspection for the first time of company-based quality assurance programs.

The Government has implemented those measures immediately. We have speeded up, from three years to six months, the introduction of and training for that program and the approval of the quality assurance programs. After the meat contamination scare of 1991, the former Labor Government did absolutely nothing. It did not prosecute anyone. But, even worse, it took absolutely no action whatsoever to improve meat inspection within the smallgoods manufacturing industry in South Australia. That Government was negligent by its very lack of action.

This Liberal Government introduced that legislation, which has now very substantially increased the inspection that takes place within smallgoods plants and other meat plants for the domestic market. I highlight again the extent to which that union official, in this crude attempt to get increased union membership, has quite falsely misrepresented the circumstances that applied. In fact, meat inspection and meat quality in South Australia have lifted quite considerably under the legislation introduced by this Government.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE MEALS

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to you, Mr Speaker. Is it appropriate under joint House rules for members to advertise meals at Parliament House, and have any members sought your approval to do so? The member for Kaurna has placed advertisements in the newsletter and the *Southern Times* extending a most attractive offer to residents to pay \$10 to join her for lunch or dinner at Parliament House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will consider the matter raised by the honourable member and give a considered response.

WORKCOVER

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): Can the Minister for Industrial Affairs inform the House whether independent market research has been conducted among employees, employers and the medical profession in relation to the WorkCover system and, in particular, has the research provided any information about abuses of the WorkCover scheme?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: There has been a lot of comment about some reporting and difficulties within the

WorkCover scheme. I thought we ought to put on public record a recent survey carried out by McGregor Marketing. It was an independent survey carried out of workers involved in the scheme who are actually being paid benefits—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:—and of employers who—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is not assisting Question Time by continuing to interject.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The survey included employers involved in the scheme and doctors who are treating patients. The incredible result was that 33 per cent of workers believe that the scheme was being rorted by other workers in the scheme. One-third of the workers receiving benefits believe that the scheme was being rorted. Some 21 per cent of the doctors involved believe that workers were rorting the scheme, as did 28 per cent of employers, and I was surprised that that was so high.

The other incredible issue in this survey was that 12 per cent of the doctors actually believe that the doctors were issuing too many work certificates to keep people at home. So, here we have independent evidence from an independent survey group saying that we have massive rorting of this scheme—evidence backed up by a third of the people who actually are getting benefits from the scheme and are saying that they believe the scheme is being rorted. Massive change has to occur.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the member for Wright that he should not continue to make those sorts of comments across the Chamber. They are unnecessary and do not add to the dignity of Parliament. I suggest to any other members that, if they think they can continue with this chatter across the Chamber, they will find out that there will be a quick exit from it. The Chair does not have to give warnings.

APEC MEETING

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): Can the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development explain why Adelaide was chosen as the venue for the 1995 meeting of APEC Ministers for Small Business and say what benefits this will bring to South Australia?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: This success again highlights the Government's absolute commitment and determination to put South Australia on the international map for business, to market this State overseas, and to make up for a decade of neglect in positioning South Australia in the Asia Pacific marketplace. Growing exports in goods and trade and services—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Well, the Deputy Leader should have been at the 'Return to Business' dinner at the Hyatt last night where Robert Gottlieb, who was one of the guest speakers, referred to the last Commonwealth Development Bank survey results on exports of small and medium enterprises, and who happened to highlight the outstanding performance out of South Australia in small and medium enterprises beating the national average in getting to export markets. Clearly, someone such as Gottlieb in *BRW* is endorsing the policy thrust and approach that this Government has in place to position us into that international marketplace. The APEC—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Well, your Leader was there. I bet he did not tell you the glowing report that the South Australian Government got last night. He would have been rather silent about that in his report back from the dinner last night. The APEC small and medium enterprise ministerial meeting is a great opportunity for all Australia, and particularly South Australia, to showcase its capabilities. Australia was unanimously selected by the 18 APEC countries to host this ministerial meeting on 15 September this year. We are working with the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry on a program for the three days preceding the meeting.

More than 350 high level participants will be coming to Adelaide for the four to five days, and they will be offered travel packages whilst here to see a little of South Australia. In addition, we will be putting together a comprehensive program developed by the Economic Development Authority, including workshops, visits to key projects and ventures, an international trade fair, two network forums on women in business, and the Asia Pacific business network.

Adelaide's outstanding reputation as an international events and conference centre is reinforced by this, and I understand that, of some 80 bids for national and international conferences submitted last year, 75 per cent of Adelaide's applications were successful in attracting international exhibitions and conferences to our city. In summary, it is an important success for Australia and, in particular, South Australia, and it highlights the successful strategy of opening up our economy to the international market place.

MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Mr Speaker, do you support the practice of members publishing details of accounts paid by the Parliament and by the Department for Industrial Affairs as being charges they have paid personally? The February 1995 *Kaurna Review*, which was published by the member for Kaurna, details that the expenditure from her electoral allowance includes accounts for telephone, postage, photocopying, stationery, computing and a mobile phone. I point out that those expenses usually are paid by the Parliament and by the department.

The SPEAKER: Order! Members are entitled to spend their allowance as they see fit.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If members decide to publish those details, I cannot influence that decision in any way. Therefore, it is not for the Chair to give direction to any member on how they spend their allowance, except to say that I sincerely hope that it is spent in the interests of their electorate.

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Can the Premier clarify his position on the South Australian Cricket Association's proposal to upgrade Adelaide Oval to cater for AFL football matches? In recent weeks, there have been statements by the SACA and the SANFL that contradict a perceived level of support being given by the Premier for the proposal to stage AFL football matches under lights at Adelaide Oval.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am delighted to answer this question for the member for Hart because, in fact, it goes back to November last year, prior to the announcement of a second AFL team from South Australia—and obviously the

honourable member is representing the interests of Port Adelaide in this Chamber today. About two or three weeks before that announcement, I specifically asked whether I could have a discussion with Max Basheer and Leigh Whicker about what I thought the broad outcomes should be for the South Australian community. I pointed out to them that I had no authority and no right to have a direct say in the matter, but I thought that, on behalf of the broad South Australian community, some matters of public interest at least should be considered, and I wished to do no more than draw those matters to their attention.

One of the issues I raised was the fact that it was in the interests of Adelaide, of developing tourism and of developing a broader interest in football, that there should be a number of AFL football matches at Adelaide Oval on Friday nights. In particular, I suggested that four matches a year would be an ideal way of achieving this, while still having the majority of the matches at Football Park under the control of the South Australian National Football League. Also, I pointed out that, very importantly, it would provide a new area of entertainment in Adelaide for people who either work in or come to the city; and it would encourage people to stay in Adelaide after work, to have a quick meal, and head off to the oval for some good national entertainment.

So I put that case to them in November. When the matter was again raised with me in January, I said I was willing to publicly state what I had already put to both Max Basheer and Leigh Whicker in November. So I wrote a letter that simply highlighted once again my request that there should be at least four AFL matches, preferably on Friday evenings, at Adelaide Oval under the new lights in 1996, and I said that that would be good for South Australia. I am delighted to see from a poll in the *Advertiser* that something like 75 per cent of all South Australians agree with my opinion. My query is: where does the member for Hart sit in this? Does he have the courage to come out and support the development of AFL matches at Adelaide Oval, or is he so blindly committed to Port Adelaide that he thinks all the matches should be played at Port Adelaide?

ROTOVIRUS PROJECT

Mr BUCKBY (Light): Can the Minister for Primary Industries explain what plans he has for the future of the Rotovirus project and, in particular, the role to be played by the Dutch company, Nutricia?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I believe that the member for Hart was quite opposed to the Rotovirus project when his Party was in Government, and the previous Labor Government did not seem to do much about it. When we came to Government we had a really good look at it because the Government and I have always held the view that research and development really is up to the private sector. So, we had a review and, although it is a very good project, it was thought that it would be much better processed and progressed through the private sector.

I am happy to say that later today and early tomorrow morning the final signing will take place for the Rotovirus project, and it will be sold to a Dutch company called Nutricia. That company will go on processing in Adelaide and, in fact, a company of that size continuing to carry out the research and development of this product is a very good acquisition for South Australia.

It is a plus plus for South Australia to have an international company coming here. The Government no

longer has the liability to conduct ongoing testing and processing, and we believe that this is in the interests of South Australians. The product treats a form of gastroenteritis, particularly in young children, and it can make use of colostrum from dairy cows. The Government hopes that this project will have worldwide application.

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Given the Premier's endorsement of SACA's proposal to upgrade Adelaide Oval, why has the Government rejected requests by SACA for the provision of SACA borrowings or a Government guarantee to build the necessary lighting towers? The Opposition understands that the Treasurer has advised SACA that he has no intention of providing SAFA borrowings or a Government guarantee to enable the construction of the lighting towers. SACA cannot borrow against its Adelaide Oval assets as they are built on Crown land, so it requires Government assistance, as was provided by the former Government for the construction of the recently completed Sir Donald Bradman Stand.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: There are two comments I will make about the honourable member's question. The honourable member's observation about the Premier supporting SACA was incorrect, and if the member had listened to the Premier's response he would know that.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Well, I think the honourable member should read the statements very carefully instead of opening his mouth like he normally does.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The member's mouth should stay closed on occasions. The second issue concerned financing, and I have had some discussions with SACA. For obvious reasons it was interested in putting up lights at the oval. I said that our Government's program is to reduce the role of SAFA. I said quite clearly that the financing authority is not to be used for a variety of projects which are not core Government projects and, having said that, there was acceptance. If members look at the Government's statements and releases, they will note that we have been taking non-core assets out of SAFA. We took the Housing Trust program out of SAFA. We are now down to the reserve level, which is above what was recommended by the Audit Commission.

The Government is not into financing special deals. That is where the last Government got itself into an awful amount of strife. If we lay down the guidelines now, when people approach the Government I can say, 'We cannot do it.' However, there have been further discussions on alternative financing arrangements. The SACA has not come back to me since we talked about this proposition initially. It has been mentioned that it has the capacity to finance its own lights—that has been mentioned to me. Whether or not that is the truth I am not too sure. Members should remember that this Government endorsed the 50 year lease, and that gives SACA a capacity to obtain finance from outside sources which would not have been possible previously.

The situation is still fluid and discussions are still taking place, but SAFA will not provide the finance. I make it quite clear that the ground rules have been set. We are not using the Government or SAFA as the milch cow that I mentioned yesterday; we will not do that. Unlike the previous Government we will not play around and get into strife. So, the ground rules have been set. I do not know what progress

has been made in relation to talks on other forms of financial accommodation for SACA, either through related Government areas or private sources.

WATER SUPPLY

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources report on the progress of any strategic initiative taking place to ensure community involvement in the more efficient and effective management of water resources in South Australia?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I express my thanks to the member for Hartley for his continuing interest in matters relating to water resources in this State, recognising that water is critical to the future of South Australia. The efficient and effective use of water resources in this State requires a comprehensive strategic water plan which has the broad support of the community. This was a policy commitment of the Liberal Party prior to the election, and it is one that we are following through.

Last year I asked the South Australian Water Resources Council to prepare recommendations on water planning in South Australia. The council prepared two discussion papers last year which I released for public comment during Water Week late in 1994. Five key areas for action were identified in those papers as follows: using our water resources more effectively; improving the quality of our water; working together, which includes community education and empowerment; improving our expertise and understanding of water issues; and providing cost effective water services that distribute costs equitably. I am pleased to say that 145 responses from local government, community and industry groups, private companies and individuals have been received. I am very pleased with those responses.

The South Australian Water Resources Council is currently preparing another series of discussion papers which are specifically targeted to various stakeholder groups such as the environment, irrigation, local government, manufacturing, mining, residential water services, dry land farming and recreation—to name just a few. These stakeholder papers are to be released this month and will be used to provide further background material for more detailed discussion. I am hopeful that that will happen. Representatives of these stakeholder groups will be invited to attend a series of workshops and meetings, and a list of preferred strategies, associated action plans and implications should also be an outcome of those meetings.

The South Australian Water Resources Council will draw heavily on the outcomes of these meetings for the preparation of recommendations to Government on water planning in South Australia. Through this process it is envisaged that community leaders will support the recommendations. The benefit of this initiative is that there will be a clearer understanding between the State Government, community leaders and interest groups of the need for change and broad agreement on the strategic directions for improved water resources management in this State. Finally, the Government has recognised that community agreement and involvement in the State water plan is paramount to ensure the economical and ecologically sustainable use of South Australia's water resources. I am sure that all South Australians would want to achieve that.

STILLBIRTH AND NEONATAL DEATH SUPPORT GROUP

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Will the Minister for Family and Community Services inform the House on the method employed in determining the allocation of grants to community groups and indicate what was the determining factor in rejecting continued funding for the Stillbirth and Neonatal Death Support Group (SANDS)?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am pleased to advise the House and the member for Torrens that it is not a whiteboard. As was the case with the previous Government, I have a totally independent advisory committee chaired by the Reverend George Martin, who is held in very high regard in community service activity throughout this State and throughout Australia. He is well recognised, particularly for the work he has carried out in the Port Adelaide Mission over a long period. That advisory committee in the first instance makes recommendations to me. As to the situation with SANDS and as I have explained to the House before, while I recognise the excellent work that people associated with SANDS carry out, it is not seen to be the type of priority that would require Government funding at this time.

I have had discussions with the people from SANDS and have offered them other assistance in various ways. Unfortunately, we have advised SANDS that it will not receive the funding it has requested. Certainly, it is of concern to me that there are so many organisations in the community which carry out worthwhile community services in this State but which we are not able to fund. If we had not had the situation where, through the previous Government's poor management of the economy the availability of \$3.5 billion has been lost, we would not be in the position we are in now, being unable to assist organisations such as SANDS and many others.

SANDS is an excellent organisation and there are many others like it that should be receiving more funding, but unfortunately that is not available. In regard to SANDS, I can assure the member for Torrens that we will continue to work with SANDS and offer it any other assistance that we possibly can.

NETTING

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Can the Minister for Primary Industries explain the Government's intentions regarding the inquiry into the use of nets in the fishing industry, particularly on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I thank the member for Flinders for her question and her interest in this matter. It was because of representations by the honourable member that the initial closing of Coffin Bay to netting instigated the netting review. Quite rightly, the honourable member has had an ongoing interest in the matter. In March 1994, after representations from the local member and local government and the closing of Coffin Bay to netting, we instituted a netting review of all netting in South Australia.

We formed a committee on which there were commercial and recreational line fishers plus net fishermen and representatives from Primary Industries and SARDI. The committee went to the West Coast and interviewed people involved in local government, because it is not only fishermen who have an interest in this area: the whiting fishery has a big impact on the tourism industry. In fact, that industry is important to the economy on Eyre Peninsula and it is something that has to be taken into consideration.

The report was given to me in December and has been put out for public consultation until the end of February. We will then review what the public say about it and, before any decision is made, I will go back to local government to discuss the findings and then some decisions will be made. It is most important that we realise that all sections of the community have to share a very diminishing resource, which must be protected for future generations and be protected so that all South Australians and people who visit South Australia are able to share in and get some pleasure from fishing in these areas.

STILLBIRTH AND NEONATAL DEATH SUPPORT GROUP

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Will the Minister for Health make provision in the health budget to give financial assistance to SANDS (Stillbirth and Neonatal Death Support Group)? If funds are not to be granted to SANDS, can the Minister advise the House what program will be put in place to assist people who require the types of services that SANDS provides and indicate what the cost of such a program would or could be?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I preface my reply by indicating that I do understand only too well the excellent work that SANDS does. Indeed, I have been spoken to by a number of people who are involved in fundraising efforts independently of Government on behalf of SANDS and, as personal friends of those people, I have supported their efforts to increase the availability of SANDS services to people who unfortunately might need them.

In regard to budgetary discussions, obviously in the grander context of the health budget being framed for 1995-96 I shall be pleased to receive representations from people, as applies to all these matters, and a decision will be taken in the context of the overall budgetary situation in discussion with my colleague to whom the member for Torrens addressed her recent question.

PATAWALONGA

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): My question is directed to the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. Has the Government failed to communicate with the Henley and Grange council over the Patawalonga progress, as claimed by Mayor Anderson in the February/March edition of the *Henley and Grange Community News*? The article states:

... he was appalled at the total lack of communication with those who will be affected by these changes. Neither the general public nor the Henley and Grange council itself had been part of any discussions about the proposals.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I thank the honourable member for his question. Like the member for Colton, I have been surprised, to say the least, at this most extraordinary outburst by the Mayor of Henley and Grange. I do not think any Government or project manager has spent more time communicating to the public what is going on with the project which, I remind members, is the largest urban development and environmental clean up that this State has seen for many years. It is one for which this State and particularly the metropolitan area has waited to see for many years.

The Henley and Grange newsletter of February/March included a claim by the Mayor who stated that there had been no consultation with the council over the project, but that is

the most gross untruth that I have ever seen published in any council funded newsletter. If the council has set itself on a course to torpedo this project, I am equally determined to ensure that we get this environmental clean up under way.

I will put the facts before the House. I refer to a sequence of dates, times and events that will establish once and for all that consultation has been followed and will continue to be followed. First, there was the presentation of the Patawalonga Catchment Steering Committee on 13 October 1994, and the City of Henley and Grange was present. The priority of capital works projects to excavate and flush the Patawalonga was explained. There was then a presentation at a public meeting convened by the Australian Conservation Foundation on 14 November. There was a presentation at a public meeting in the Patawalonga Golf Club on 1 December, followed by approximately fortnightly meetings that have taken place with Glenelg council (in open council so that any member of the public could be present), and there was then the release of a newsletter throughout the Glenelg area but it has been spread far and wide.

There was a presentation to the West Torrens council in an open meeting on 20 December, and in relation to the city of Henley and Grange the following should be noted. First, following the clarification of Kinhill's proposals for the excavation contract during December 1994, Kinhill approached the City of Henley and Grange and met with the City Manager and other council staff as late as 23 December. Kinhill then met with the Mayor and local member on 9 January and again on 13 January. Two officers attended a full council meeting on Monday 16 January. Council was invited to attend and observe the dredging trials carried out on 19 January, and that can be noted because there is a photograph in the community newspaper of the Mayor actually at the dredging trials. Also, the Western Adelaide Consortium Group, including Henley and Grange, was briefed again on 3 February.

My advice from the project manager which came through from the City Manager of Henley and Grange on 7 February a couple of days ago was that, in its meeting of 6 February after receiving the 3 February briefing and additional information provided by Kinhill, council proposed that it was happy with the arrangements for public consultation. With all that evidence, I do not think anyone in this Chamber could say that we have not gone out and consulted thoroughly and with the intention of making sure that every person, particularly the representatives of the council, would be kept up to speed on the project. For the council now to start to run a campaign to denigrate the whole project smells very much of mischief and a political attempt to undermine something that has been canvassed Australia-wide—because the Federal Government has picked it up—as one of the big environmental clean-up projects which should have the support of the whole community.

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Did the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations consult the owners of boats that are to be moved from the Patawalonga about the requirement to move them, and what arrangements have been made to assist with the moving of boats while the Patawalonga is dredged?

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: Clearly, I personally have not spoken to them, although my officers have done so, and there will be a meeting at my electorate office in Glenelg tomorrow, at which continuing discussions will take place. In my ministerial role it is accepted that project managers

have full authority to go out and speak to boat owners. An offer has been made to boat owners to use the North Haven facilities, and a good financial offer has been made to facilitate that. We must remember that, as many jetties run out into the area, if we are to dredge out the basin to three metres, it is extremely difficult in terms of the engineering process to dredge around boats that are already tied up to marinas and, because of the very small nature of the pool, it is very difficult to move boats to one side, dredge and bring them back, because the whole lake has to be emptied for the dredging process. I am not an engineer, but when I have checked and rechecked, my engineers have assured me that, unfortunately, all the boats will have to leave the pool while the dredging takes place. I can only heed that professional advice.

LOBSTER FISHERY

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Gordon): Will the Minister for Primary Industries tell the House what arrangements are in progress for a review of the quota system currently in operation for the southern rock lobster fishery?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I thank the member for Gordon for his question and interest in this matter. I do not have to tell the House how important the rock lobster industry is to the South-East and to South Australia. It is our second biggest fishing industry in dollar terms. In the honourable member's electorate and in mine, it is the majority of the industry. We have had a problem in that fishery, which was resolved under the previous Administration with a total allowable catch ensuring that only so much can be taken, and that is a little over 1 700 tonnes. It is working very well.

The fishermen themselves have decided that they want to adjust their transferable quotas from a certain quota to so much per pot and get an equal amount per pot, and that has caused some consternation amongst the fishermen in the South-East. However, the integrated management committee very sensibly organised that a certain amount of the total allowable catch would be kept aside each year for the next three years to ensure that those people who could prove hardship could get some of that. The department has assisted the integrated management committee in listening to those appeals; that appeal process has been finalised and those who have proved some disadvantage have been allocated extra quota.

So, over the next three or four years the amount of catch will be the same per pot throughout the southern rock lobster zone. We will go through quite a difficult period of reconstruction, which has been going on down there in the allocation of quotas. The integrated management committees have been working very well. The Government's keeping away from it and having as its only interest the total allowable catch, which preserves that fishery as a profitable fishery for posterity, is now recognised by the fishermen, because they are controlling their own destiny, although they now realise that they have to sort out their problems in the allocation of their quota and that the Government will have discussions with them only on the total allowable catch. The fishermen themselves in that fishery have put up quite a bit of money for research, and that is a very responsible attitude, and it ensures that not only those fishermen but also their children and the South-East generally will have a profitable industry for a long time in the future.

LANDS BRANCH AIRCRAFT

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources confirm that the Lands Branch survey aircraft has been grounded in Bangladesh? What are the reasons for the grounding, why is this aircraft in that country and why is it being flown by a pilot from the Police Air Wing?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would suggest that that is a very interesting question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I did know it was around. I will be very happy to get a report for the honourable member on that question and, recognising the urgency of the matter, I will do it straight away.

EMERGENCY PROCEDURES

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Emergency Services advise the House what is being done to ensure the safety of South Australians from non-English speaking backgrounds during a disaster or emergency?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I thank the member for Hartley for his question. Members would be aware that the member for Hartley is one member who has stood up in this House before and spoken about the need for communication cards or interpretive cards to assist people from non-English speaking backgrounds. In line with the honourable member's personal campaign in this area, representing the vast culture in his own electorate, I am pleased to advise the House that the South Australian Police Department has adopted a nationally devised strategy for an emergency communication card and emergency procedures poster. This package was a joint initiative of the Australian police commissioners, the Australian Bicentennial Multicultural Foundation and the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs.

The emergency communication card is a special communication aid which visually relates messages either to evacuate premises and follow directions to an assembly point or to stay inside the building, turn on the radio and/or television and listen to public announcements. The card will be used by police officers and uniformed personnel from the State Emergency Service at the discretion of the forward commander in times of disaster or emergency. Police and uniformed SES personnel who are required to confine or mobilise people of a non-English speaking background will use the communication card by showing the appropriate side of the card to convey the correct set of messages. Police officers in plain clothes must also show their personal police identification when presenting this particular card, and only State Emergency Service officers in uniform may present or carry this card.

A comprehensive education program will be conducted statewide to ensure that the emergency communication card will be effective during any disaster or emergency operation. The responsibility for the education program rests with the South Australian Police Department, State Emergency Service and ethnic community groups. Police divisional officers will ensure that personnel within their command are fully acquainted with the messages conveyed by the card and the use of the card. The emergency instructions conveyed by the card are explained in English and 15 other languages.

Further, officers in charge of stations will endeavour to contact individual ethnic community groups or organisations within their police district to ensure that they are aware of the

card, the messages it represents and who is permitted to use the card. Posters and cards will be distributed to every police station and the State Emergency Services in South Australia. In addition, posters will be distributed to migrant resource centres, ethnic organisations, ethnic media and community health services and also offices of members of Parliament.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE MEALS

The SPEAKER: Earlier this afternoon the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked me a question about the use of the catering facilities. The catering facilities are under the control of the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee, which this year is chaired by the honourable President and, therefore, they are not directly under my control as Speaker. I suggest to all members that, if they are unsure of the rules and guidelines which apply, they should have a discussion with the Catering Manager, who will be only too pleased to assist them in regard to what is permissible. I point out to the House that on a regular basis I have groups from outside contacting me wanting to use these facilities and I have to advise them that is not within the rules. Therefore, I suggest that all members should bring themselves up to date in relation to the requirements.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S BILL

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr BRINDAL: In the course of debate this morning I undertook to the House to give notice of my intention to introduce a Bill next week. I merely wish to advise the House that Parliamentary Counsel has not yet prepared the long title, so I am unable to do so now and will do so on the next day of sitting, I hope.

ELECTORATE EXPENSES

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mrs ROSENBERG: Mr Speaker, I should like to make a personal explanation about questions you were asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition regarding my activities. It is true that in my Kaurna newsletter I have listed, under the heading '1994 Electorate Expenses for Kaurna,' the expenses that have been incurred by the electorate office at 99 Dyson Road, Christies Beach. It is also right for me to put on record here and now that it is my desire to see the total accountability of this Government and its members.

The reason for these expenses being listed in this newsletter is to counter a belief in the community that we, as members, pocket our electorate allowances. I can tell you, Mr Speaker, that as a member of Parliament in these 12 months I will be receiving back a considerable sum, in thousands, as a tax return. The reason why I have that considerable tax return coming to me is the amount of money that I have spent from my pocket to inform my electorate. I should like to question how many other members of this Parliament will be receiving a similar tax return.

In regard to the issue within the newsletter, a considerable number of expenses are listed which have been expenses from the electorate. Included are most of the costs that I have paid. As you will see, there is an amount of \$13 556 which

has been paid by me personally and at that stage does not even include car expenses.

By way of personal explanation, I am prepared to stand by the fact that I intend to be totally accountable to my electorate. I will continue to publish the sort of cost that is involved to keep an electorate fully informed, which, in my opinion, is what the electoral allowance is meant to do.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): On Thursday 2 February the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations announced his decision to call for an environmental impact statement—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation. I ask members to allow the member for Newland the courtesy of addressing the Chair.

Mrs KOTZ: —relating to the proposed landfill site at Highbury within the extractive industry zone. The development application was filed by the company CSR. During July last year, Mrs Grace Nelligan, Secretary of the newly-formed HEART action group, informed me that CSR had notified residents of its intention to apply for landfill rights at the Highbury site. The action group of residents was totally opposed to the proposal, and from that time I offered advice and support with which to fight it.

In the following months CSR held meetings with residents but did not submit its proposal formally until November. My advice to the HEART executive was to continue to extend their support group of residents and to continue to supply them with information relative to the concerns and objections that the HEART group had already identified, because, no matter what action the residents group undertook during that time, the real fight would take place when a decision was taken on the application, and the most likely probability would be the instigation of an EIS.

When the application was formally submitted, I initiated meetings with relevant Ministers and their departmental staff and with officers of Tea Tree Gully council. These representatives covered development and planning, environment and natural resources and waste management. During this period prior to Christmas over 60 residents either wrote or telephoned expressing their objections to the proposed landfill. That number has now increased to 72 residents. I summarised all the objections, concerns and opinions in my constituents' letters and forwarded them to the Ministers, and all correspondents received updates on the processes and progress leading up to the time of the Minister's announcement that an EIS would be undertaken.

On the day of that announcement, last Thursday, I had letters in the mail to all interested parties, which arrived in their mail boxes on Friday, advising my constituents of the Minister's decision. Throughout the course of this whole scenario I continued to have discussions with the Secretary of the HEART action group and later the Chairperson of that group. Prior to Christmas, 20 members of that group met me in my office to reaffirm the commitment to object to the proposed landfill and to discuss the possibility of an early

'No' decision and, if not, the need to have accurate information to assist the residents' protest.

I document this lengthy process and involvement because I should like members of Parliament to understand my utter amazement and disbelief when I received a telephone call from a Messenger Press journalist seeking my reaction to the Minister's announcement and advising me that she had received criticism about my alleged inaction on this issue from unnamed sources but claiming to be part of that action group. I must admit that I was taken aback initially by this blatant inaccuracy of the claim. Those claims led to the headline on the front page of the Messenger *Leader* this week, 'Anti-dump lobby declares war on Kotz'. What a very dramatic headline that turned out to be!

Then I was advised by further information that a public meeting would be held on 20 February. This was organised before the Minister's announcement. This meeting was encouraged by one of our members of Parliament who approached the HEART Chairperson and offered their services to speak at a public meeting. Two other members of this Parliament also accepted the opportunity to speak at this public meeting in my electorate. Who are these members of Parliament? Would it surprise my colleagues on this side of the House to learn that the Hon. Terry Roberts, MLC, the Hon. Mike Elliott, MLC, and the member for Torrens have decided to concentrate their joint activities in my electorate? Mr Speaker, I am sure you will forgive my cynicism if I now believe that the negative comments forwarded to the Messenger Press journalist were also encouraged by this recalcitrant group. The Leader of the Democrats' participation in this political gamesmanship is no surprise to me—

Mrs GERAGHTY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I ask that the member for Newland withdraw the remark insinuating that I and other members gave information to the Messenger Press. It is a blatant untruth, and I ask the member to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume her seat. That is not a point of order. I advise members that if they do not like the comments of another member that is not unparliamentary.

If the honourable member is the next person to have the call in the grievance debate—which is a relatively new innovation in this House—that affords that honourable member an opportunity to respond to comments with which he or she does not agree or which they believe to be inaccurate.

Mrs KOTZ: As I said, I am sure you will forgive my cynicism, as I believe now that the negative comments were encouraged by this group. The Leader of the Democrats is no surprise to me, because he is renowned for attempting to gain political advantage, expressing his opinions anywhere on everything, which he can never deliver. It is a surprise to me—

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I understand that, during the previous point of order by the member for Torrens, the clock was stopped, and I understand that time-on is not granted in grievance.

The SPEAKER: There was a slight error. The person operating the clock thought that the honourable member had finished. The honourable member's time has expired.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Before I commence my contribution to the grievance debate, I want to state again that the comment made by the member for Newland that I or other members gave information to the Messenger newspaper is a

blatant untruth. I have not contacted the Messenger newspaper, nor do I believe have the other members. My only contact with the HEART group occurs when it asks for my support, and I give it my support. That group came to me, I am told, because it could not get support from its member. I have a genuine interest in the dump because it will affect the Torrens River, which passes through my electorate. So, my interest is genuine.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: I do not.

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

Mrs GERAGHTY: I am sorry that the member for Newland is so obviously distressed about the article that appeared in the Messenger newspaper. I had nothing to do with it. The residents did that. I might say that members around this Chamber are invited to speak at functions in electorates not necessarily their own, and what is wrong with that? Nothing.

Mr Speaker, I want to raise the issue of SANDS. I appreciate the comments from both Ministers who answered my questions today, but I feel that there is still a need to make sure that members in this House are aware of the services provided by SANDS and, hopefully, give it their support. SANDS was established, as I am sure all members would be aware, to help grieving parents who have suffered the loss of a baby. In the early days there is great support for these people by family and friends, but unfortunately the sad consequence is that eventually family and friends get on with their own lives and the bereaved parents are often simply left alone, unable to get on with their lives. The initial shock often means many years of pain, guilt, anguish, anger and confusion—a multitude of emotions. As I said, family and friends get on with their lives, but quite often for the parents who have lost their baby their life simply stops.

They have great difficulty recovering, and some mothers often spend the whole day in tears, and that is a most sad and unfortunate situation because they are simply suffering alone. There is a real impact on the whole family and particularly on other children. There is little doubt that the stress has long and lasting effects on everyone involved. One mother has told me that her life did not resume any form of normality until the birth of another child. That is something that must touch us all. These people need ongoing support to recover, and that ongoing support is vital to their recovery. Without it, God only knows the suffering they would go through.

It is here that SANDS provides an invaluable service. There is no better group to help grieving families. The group is comprised of people who have been through the same type of trauma. They know exactly what the person is suffering and they can provide the support and the words needed. SANDS has been very successful on a small budget. It has regular meetings and holds training for counsellors. It has a great network and, on a very small budget of \$2 925, has been exceptionally successful. Without that funding I am very concerned as to who will provide the service, which we must remember volunteers have provided. Without some financial assistance from the Government I am very worried that the organisation will not be able to continue. If the service is to be provided by the health system the costs will simply be horrendous.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): What an appalling display we have seen today of ignorance and/or bad manners and bad conduct from the Opposition, demonstrated not once, not twice, but

several times since business began this morning in this Chamber. At the outset, I guess, the member for Elizabeth did not know anything about urgency motions when yesterday she rose, as is her right, to give notice of a motion that she would move today in private members' time, to do something which should, in the normal course of events given the nature of the allegations contained, be part of an urgency motion brought on by the Opposition for debate during what would otherwise have been Question Time. But, no, in conspiracy with her ignorant leaders, she—

The SPEAKER: Order! I would suggest to the honourable member that those comments are not necessary.

Mr LEWIS: I cannot help it if they do not know, Mr Speaker. I defer to your ruling. I cannot help it if they do not know the Standing Orders, or if they otherwise seek to abuse the rights of other private members by taking up private members' time on what is really a partisan issue, and, in doing so, not delivering to the Parliament or through that medium in this House to the public any factual information whatever about the matter. It was clearly either an urgency motion or, if it was not an urgency motion, a matter which should have been taken up more seriously as a matter of no confidence.

But the member for Elizabeth obviously did not understand that, and I assume then that it was not really bad manners or any mischief aforethought on her part, but simply that she did not know that that was the normal procedure in those circumstances and the decent thing to do. Then, I was appalled—that is the only word I can use—at the way in which the leadership of the Opposition, through the Deputy Leader, obviously in consultation with one another, chose to slip into the gutter and have a go at the member for Kaurna during Question Time with such allegations.

Had it not been for the very tolerant and understanding nature of the member for Kaurna, a good many other members may well have taken such exception to it as to have caused a disruption to Question Time. The way in which the Deputy Leader, by inference in the questions he asked, attacked the integrity of the member for Kaurna without having first approached her or anyone else on the Government side to discover the truth of what he was attempting to allege or, in such a scurrilous fashion, 'expose' is disgusting. I have never attacked any member of this place, Government or Opposition, at any time since I have been here without having first warned them of what I regard as being their misdemeanours or misunderstandings. I have attempted to explain to them, either by note or by personal conversation, that what they may have done is improper or brings no credit to themselves or to other members and should not otherwise have been undertaken as an escapade or adventure.

I guess that there is a great deal of angst and bitterness there from the previous Labor candidate in the electorate of Kaurna who really believed, as most of the Labor Party believed, that it ought to be a Labor seat. In fact, they do not believe under any circumstance that the honourable member who won that seat fairly and squarely should have ever become a member of Parliament. I find that that is the kind of way that some of the people opposite tend to think. There is a sickness in the culture of their attitude. They regard the interests of the Party as more important than the good conduct of the business of the Parliament and, in the process, they abuse the Parliament as an institution. There are two other matters that concern me. One is the way in which misinformation was obviously given to the Minister about the WorkCover case involving 'Santa Claus'.

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

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I have voiced my concerns in the House before in respect of the blatant attempts of Paul Keating and his colleagues to undermine both the State and local government system. I was delighted to have some correspondence sent to me by a concerned Australian citizen, namely Councillor Bevan O'Regan of Narrabri, who alerted me to some further concerns that make it evident that Paul Keating is still hell-bent on taking over Australia in a dictatorial capacity.

Among the information sent to me by Mr O'Regan is an article on Wayne Goss, the Labor Premier of Queensland, who was interviewed by Madonna King recently. The article states:

Premier Goss, the Premier of Queensland, last night warned that the States would face abolition within seven years unless the centenary of the nation's Federation was marked by a radical overhaul of Federal-State relations.

Then, not long after that, we saw the big episode in Canberra involving Keating's Labor mate, Peter Woods, who has now stood down from his two year term and the job he was put in there to do for Keating. Peter Woods advocated the inaugural national meeting of the councils and put up the motion that there be 80 councils instead of State Governments.

Why would Bevan O'Regan, a Councillor of Narrabri, write to a State member of Parliament with concerns if he thought that what Keating was doing was above board? It is fairly simple. Most people know the background of Federation, the fact that the Commonwealth was formed after agreement with the States, and the fact that it is important in a country as diverse and broad as Australia to make sure that we do have three functional operating tiers of government, so he wrote to me and I am sure to others with his concerns.

Bevan O'Regan is aware that Keating will not only try to undermine and destroy the States but that he intends to replace local councils as well, with absolutely huge regional governments directly financed and controlled by a central government, to obviously abolish the States and ultimately abolish the current Constitution in favour of a centrally directed republic. I do not want to get into the republic debate now, but I want to highlight to this House and the people of South Australia that it is time we opened our eyes and took much more interest in what Paul Keating is on about.

Let us look at the jigsaw and the way it is falling into place. One has only to look at what Keating is now doing with COAG (the Council of Australian Governments) and the fact that he cancelled one meeting. We can also look at how he is forming committees to push his republic issue, the Hilmer report, the overall debt that we have, his association with the World Trade Organisation, and it can go on and on. What really worries me is the lack of knowledge of most Australians with respect to the Australian Constitution. In fact, a recent survey shows that Australians, and particularly unfortunately our young people, have little knowledge of the Constitution and our system of government.

As was the case when my father and the fathers and mothers of many other colleagues in this House went to the Second World War over Hitler, the same thing has happened. People were either not interested, had lost their way or had little knowledge of what was going on, and people like Hitler came in and made a hell of a mess. It makes it easy to remove our rights and easy to manipulate us and change situations behind our back if people are not made aware of what is

happening. I believe that the Keating principles at the moment are being deliberately set aside because he believes in forming a superior group to undermine the smaller States like South Australia.

I will personally continue to bring to the attention of all people the fact that Keating is out there alive and well on this and, if we are to look after particularly South Australia and the importance of the democracy of the three tiers of government, we must all start getting in there and telling Paul Keating that enough is enough and, if he believes in democracy at all, he should get in there and do it fairly by referendum.

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

Ms WHITE (Taylor): In light of the response by the Minister for Environment and Natural Resources to a question on Tuesday about the Government's upcoming stormwater management legislation, I want to bring to the attention of the House an important aspect of this issue that I think has not attracted due public attention. We have heard much about the state of the Patawalonga and Torrens waterways—indeed, we all recognise the environmental problems associated with those catchments. We do recognise the need to manage our stormwater better.

However, what is also pertinent to our considerations as we move towards the establishment of regional catchment management authorities is the considerable work and the successful outcomes that have already been achieved by councils in the northern Adelaide region. Four or five councils in the northern region—and the Salisbury council must be given particular recognition here as a major contributor—have successfully extended their management of stormwater beyond traditional measures for drainage and flood prevention, and they should be recognised for their exemplary work through the Dry Creek and Little Para drainage authorities.

As an example of that work, I point to the Greenfields Wetlands. Most of us would be familiar with that facility for directing stormwater from an industrial catchment. The long established Paddocks Wetlands is about to enter into its second phase with construction of a bore, allowing recharge of the underground aquifer and providing water for the irrigation of the surrounding paddocks reserve, and that will save ratepayers about \$60 000 per annum. Indeed, the expertise of the Salisbury council has been acknowledged in its appointment as project manager for the MFP Barker Inlet Wetland project, a project designed to minimise the effect of untreated urban stormwater and industrial run off flowing into the Barker Inlet, which is significant in its wildlife haven and fish nursery with an important mangrove area. That project will provide not only a flood mitigation system and filter stormwater but also a habitat for a wide variety of flora and fauna, creating both a visual and recreational amenity.

It is a project with a concept that has attracted international focus. The funding for much of this work has come out of the Drainage Subsidy Scheme and also the Better Cities Scheme. The flood retention basin and wetland being constructed near the DSTO site was funded through the Better Cities Scheme, as was a major portion of the Waterloo Corner Road/Kaurna Park facility and the Salisbury Highway/South Road connector facility. Under the new catchment management authorities being proposed, the councils will apply a new stormwater levy which will be collected from ratepayers and used to fund future initiatives and maintain existing infrastructure.

The authorities are to be governed by boards of between five and nine members, according to the Premier's press release of November last year, and they are to have equal representation from both State and local governments. However, the problem I see with that arrangement is that, for the number of councils that would need to be involved in each catchment authority, it would not allow for representation by each of the constituent councils. That is a problem because all levels of Government need to work collectively towards the integration of catchment management, and that requires a measure of goodwill between all parties.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I rise in the grievance debate this afternoon to further explore a couple of points I raised with the Speaker during Question Time today. In particular, I refer to a newsletter which I understand was distributed by the member for Kurna to all householders residing in that electorate. I listened with care to what the member for Kurna had to say in her personal explanation. However, I think there may be some elements of confusion on the part of the member for Kurna and how she interpreted my question to the Speaker. I was alluding to the fact that in the newsletter, which was distributed recently by her in her electorate and on which I congratulate her, there was a breakdown of electorate expenditure for 1994 for that seat, and that listed a whole series of expenses, making a grand total of \$28 382.

The left hand column is entitled 'Electoral Allowance' and it shows the figure of \$14 816. We all know that the electoral allowance is public knowledge and that it is paid to all members of Parliament. At the bottom of the right hand column, after the figure shown as the grand total, the document states:

Excess paid by me personally: \$13 556.

If you deduct \$ 14 816 from the grand total it gives you precisely \$13 566. My problem is that I believe that is misleading information given to the electorate in that when you look under the heading 'Expenses' you see the following items:

Computer (remains the property of the Government): \$2 170.

Folding machine (remains the property of the Government, used to fold various newsletters and householders): \$2 500.

Mobile phone (remains the property of the Government): \$1 000.

Other figures deal with photocopying; telephone expenses, which amount to in excess of \$1 700; and postage expenses, which amount to slightly in excess of \$7 000. Those expenses, in the main, are picked up by the Department for Industrial Affairs. The electoral allowance of \$14 816, as we all know, is fully exhausted by every member of Parliament. In fact, in every case of which I am aware every member of Parliament spends well in excess of that allowance in the conduct of their business representing their electorate. So there is no dispute with me on that point.

However, it is very clear from the newsletter put out by the member for Kurna that she claims to have paid for a number of items personally, over and above her electoral allowance, and that is demonstrably not so. I do not quibble with the payment of those expenses or the purchasing of that equipment, such as the folding machine, the computer and the mobile phone; they are all perfectly legitimate and perfectly entitled to, and they are acquired by all members on both sides of the House. However, I take exception to the fact that a member of Parliament seeks to use that and give the

impression that they have personally paid for it out of their own pocket, and that is the sad part about it all.

Some people might say, 'It is a bit rough of you, in your own tent, so to speak, to examine one another.' This information came to me from a constituent in Kaurna as I am the duty Labor member for Kaurna, and this item would have been raised in any event, either in the local media or through other forums. Consequently, I believed that it was appropriate to raise this matter in the House because it is quite proper to use Government resources to purchase things for our offices and to conduct our duties; that is fine and it is appropriate, but the Government or the taxpayer should be given recognition, not an honourable member personally.

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

CORPORATIONS (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (JURISDICTION) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The Corporations Law (enacted by the Commonwealth) applies as a law of South Australia by virtue of the *Corporations (South Australia) Act 1990* ("the South Australian Act"). Recent amendments to Commonwealth laws have impacted on the operation of the *Corporations Act 1989* of the Commonwealth affecting references in the South Australian Act. The South Australian Act must be amended so that the Commonwealth amendments can apply in South Australia.

The Ministerial Council for Corporations has voted to approve the introduction in each State and Territory of legislation amending each of the relevant Corporations Acts so that the national scheme for the administration and regulation of companies and securities in Australia continues to operate consistently. The Corporations Acts must be uniform in each jurisdiction.

The object of this Bill is to amend the *Corporations (South Australia) Act 1990* so as to—

- confer jurisdiction on lower courts to hear civil matters arising under the Corporations Law and to enact consequential savings and transitional provisions;
- make an amendment that is consequential on the *Corporate Law Reform Act 1992* of the Commonwealth;
- make an amendment that is consequential on the proposed *Evidence Act 1994* of the Commonwealth;
- make a minor amendment to clarify the powers of the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions in relation to offences under the former companies and securities co-operative scheme laws (the Companies (South Australia) Code and related laws).

The Bill, in conjunction with parallel amendments made to the Corporations Acts of the other States and the Territories and complementary amendments to the Corporations Law, will confer jurisdiction in civil matters arising under the Corporations Law on lower courts (*ie*: courts that are not superior courts) throughout Australia. The superior courts (*ie*: the Federal Court of Australia, the Supreme Courts of the States and Territories, the Family Court and the State Family Courts) already have jurisdiction in civil matters arising under the Corporations Law by virtue of existing cross-vesting provisions in the Corporations Acts of the States and Territories.

The Bill's conferral of jurisdiction on lower courts will not extend to "superior court matters" (*ie*: matters that the Corporations Law reserves to the jurisdiction of the superior courts) and will be

subject to the monetary limits for civil claims which apply in the lower courts concerned.

I commend the Bill to Honourable Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 40—Operation of Division

The proposed amendment to this section is of a minor drafting nature only.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 41—Interpretation

This proposes to insert new definitions used in the Bill (such as "lower court", "superior court" and "superior court matter").

Clause 5: Insertion of s. 42B

42B. Jurisdiction of lower courts

This inserted clause vests jurisdiction in all Australian lower courts in respect of civil matters arising under the Corporations Law (except superior court matters). This new clause parallels existing provisions of the Act which "cross-vest" civil jurisdiction arising under the Corporations Law in superior courts. (See also new clause 44AA.)

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 43—Appeals

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 44A—Transfer of proceedings by Family Court and State Family Courts

The amendments to these clauses are consequential on the amendments conferring jurisdiction on lower courts to hear civil matters.

Clause 8: Insertion of s. 44AA

44AA. Transfer of proceedings in lower courts

This clause provides for the transfer between courts of civil matters arising under the Corporations Law (except superior court matters). This new clause parallels existing provisions of the Act which "cross-vest" civil jurisdiction arising under the Corporations Law in superior courts. (See also new clause 42B).

Clause 9: Substitution of s. 44B

44B. Further matters for a court to consider when deciding whether to transfer a proceeding

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 44C—Transfer may be made at any stage

Clause 11: Amendment of s. 44D—Transfer of documents

Clause 12: Amendment of s. 45—Conduct of proceedings

Clause 13: Amendment of s. 46—Courts to act in aid of each other

Clause 14: Amendment of s. 47—Exercise of jurisdiction pursuant to cross-vesting provisions

Clause 15: Amendment of s. 50—Enforcement of judgments

Clause 16: Amendment of s. 51—Rules of the Supreme Court

The amendments to these clauses are consequential on the amendments conferring jurisdiction on lower courts to hear civil matters.

Clause 17: Amendment of s. 60—Interpretation of some expressions in the ASC Law, and the ASC Regulations, of South Australia

This amendment proposed to the definition of "officer" will update a reference to an official manager of a body corporate and is consequential on the *Corporate Law Reform Act 1992* of the Commonwealth which replaced the official management provisions of the Corporations Law with provisions for voluntary administration of bodies corporate. The term "official manager" is therefore redundant. The Bill replaces "official manager" with "administrator" and "administrator of a deed of company arrangement".

Clause 18: Substitution of s. 75

75. Application of Commonwealth Evidence Act

Section 75 of the principal Act as currently in operation provides for the application of certain provisions of the *Evidence Act 1905* of the Commonwealth under the Corporations Law. This amendment is consequential on the proposed enactment of the *Evidence Act 1994* of the Commonwealth and updates references to provisions of the 1905 Commonwealth Act with references to the equivalent provisions of the proposed 1994 Commonwealth Act.

Clause 19: Amendment of s. 91—Conferral of functions and powers in relation to co-operative scheme laws

The proposed amendment to section 91 of the Act is to clarify the powers and functions of the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions ("DPP") in relation to offences under the former Companies Codes (and the other legislation of the former co-operative scheme for companies and securities). The section currently operates to confer powers and functions on the Commonwealth DPP in relation to those offences by reference to the powers and functions conferred on the Commonwealth DPP by the *Director of Public Prosecutions Act 1983* of the Commonwealth ("the DPP Act") in relation to offences against the Corporations Law

(and other national scheme laws). There may be a concern that the *DPP Act* does not directly confer powers and functions in relation to offences under national scheme laws (and instead does so as a result of those laws being treated under the national scheme as laws of the Commonwealth). To address that possible concern, it is proposed that the section be amended to provide that the powers and functions which are conferred by the section are those that the Commonwealth DPP has under the *DPP Act* in relation to offences against the laws of the Commonwealth.

Clause 20: Insertion of schedule

SCHEDULE

Savings and Transitional Provisions

The schedule contains provisions of a savings and transitional nature.

Mr ATKINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

DOG FENCE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 November. Page 1013.)

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I have had extensive consultations in relation to this Bill with the Opposition shadow spokesperson for Primary Industries, the Hon. Ron Roberts, and he informs me that he has had quite extensive consultations with all persons in the industry who will be affected by this legislation. I do not think he has consulted with the dogs that are sought to be excluded from certain parts—

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: The Minister provokes me, Sir, by saying, 'He should just talk to his colleagues.' The shadow spokesperson has informed me that he has consulted with the South Australian Farmers Federation, the relevant farmers federations covering the pastoral lands and the local government bodies that have an interest in this matter. It is my understanding from the Hon. Ron Roberts that all these bodies support the amendments proposed in the Bill. The Opposition supports the Bill without proposing any further amendment.

The new arrangements allow for different styles of fencing, ranging from the traditional netting fence to solar powered electric fences. However, I would be delighted if, in his second reading response, the Minister would advise the House as to what happens in the event of damage to the electrification system, and whether the unelectrified structure is a safer barrier to wild dogs entering into our pastoral areas. In other words, if one of the solar panels is knocked out and therefore no electricity is being generated, it will not zap the dogs trying to get through. Would the unelectrified structure be safer on the basis that it is not subject to solar panels being knocked out? On behalf of everybody, except the dogs that will be excluded from this State, the Opposition supports the passage of this Bill.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): The dog fence has particular benefit to the Eyre Peninsula area of my electorate. Its retention and maintenance contributes to the State's coffers through the protection it gives to stock, thus allowing a higher standard of husbandry along with fewer deaths and a consequent drop in farm income. Eyre Peninsula has approximately 2.6 million sheep contributing about 14 per cent of South Australia's wool. As recently as 1989, three dingos penetrated the dog fence near Ceduna and killed more than 120 sheep. It does not take long to total the financial loss which depredations of this magnitude would bring across the State. We are so accustomed to the protection of the dog

fence that few, even pastoralists and farmers, know what life was like prior to its erection.

Going back to the first years of settlement in South Australia, I understand that sheep were looked after by shepherds who were with them day and night. Sheep were regularly yarded at night to protect them from dingo attack. Something like the magnitude of the loss from dingos can be ascertained by the experience at Cowell in the 1890s recorded in local history books. It was reported that Mr Melrose shore in the vicinity of 30 000 sheep in about 1890, but by 1897 when he sold out he could muster only 1 300 sheep, which he drove around Port Augusta to other properties. The same book told of an old timer who, in the 1960s, recounted how the South Australian Government offered a bounty of two and six (25¢) on dingo scalps. The old timer said it was possible to make up to £100 (800 scalps a week) around Wudinna without much effort. He said the bounty law was soon repealed because it would have bankrupted the Government had it continued.

As late as 1920 in the Butler districts, farmers were asked to cooperate by yarding their sheep each night from 10 April to 24 April and doing everything possible to kill the dingos in the district. Killer dogs occasionally ravage sheep, but they are quickly hunted down and killed. The losses which they cause demonstrate only too vividly what would happen should the dog fence be dismantled. It takes only one or two dogs to cause hundreds of dollars worth of damage in a few hours. South Australia and all the people in it benefit from the income derived from sheep, and our standard of living would take a nosedive if the sheep industry were excluded from the State.

The dog fence is a unique part of Australia's history and heritage. It is something which no other nation in the world has. Its construction and continued maintenance is a tribute to the cooperation of several States working together for the common good and to those who serve on the voluntary boards involved. I believe this is a structure which we could build into tourism, something along the lines of the Great Wall of China—which everyone has heard about. The dog fence is easily accessible from Ceduna but I do not know of any move to use it as a tourism drawcard. Much of the impact of tourism is the spiel that goes with it, and there would be plenty of stories about the dog fence and those who have patrolled it over the years to keep visitors interested for a couple of hours or even more. The maintenance of the dog fence over the years has been a lonely job for the fence riders. It has taken a special sort of person to do this job. It is not one for chatterboxes and those who like the high life. It has taken a long time for technology to come into this area. Again, we in Australia can be proud of our use of technology applied in unusual circumstances and in innovative ways.

Rural people, who are compelled by isolation and the environment to be innovative and self sufficient, are seldom aware of their skills in this area. I believe that solar powered electric fences have been trialled for some time on the dog fence. One advantage is that they provide an alternative to fence riders, whose safety in the event of an accident could not be guaranteed, for some of our communication facilities, which we take for granted in the more populous areas, do not work in remote locations. Even in my electorate of Flinders, which is nowhere as remote as the dog fence, mobile phones cannot be used away from Port Lincoln.

There is also the cost of employing people physically to patrol the dog fence. With the solar guards, the number of fence inspectors can be reduced without reducing the

effectiveness or viability of the dog fence. The patrolling of the dog fence should be more practical with solar powered electricity. Patrols back up the solar generators, which are set to give warning of any breakdown in the fence itself. This would be a definite benefit to those living along the fence. I am sure that records will be kept and the operation of the dog fence reviewed regularly to check efficiency and, of course, its primary purpose of keeping dingos from the agricultural districts of the State. It would be a great thing if foxes could be treated similarly to dingos, for foxes cause great damage to fauna, particularly around nesting birds or those animals which live mostly at ground level.

I congratulate those responsible for working out how to harness solar power in order to electrify the dog fence. We must pay more than lip service to the environment, and this is environmentally friendly technology which will fit in well with the region it serves. Most see the more arid areas as fragile, so the use of solar power is particularly apt for the area of Australia through which most of the fence passes. One of the great plusses of solar power is that no refuse is generated. The pristine environment of much of outback Australia is another tourist drawcard. The erection and maintenance of this fence has had little effect on the overall environment.

The board's responsibility of ensuring the continued maintenance of the dog fence at a high standard is important to the survival of sheep farming in my electorate. I am delighted to see that its powers have been extended to better enable it to continue to provide this great service. I commend the work of the people on the boards, both past and present, and I support the Bill.

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

LANDS BRANCH AIRCRAFT

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Earlier today the member for Playford asked me whether the Department of Environment and Natural Resources Lands Branch survey aircraft was in Bangladesh. Members will be interested to know that the plane is in Bangladesh, but it is not grounded: it is fully operational. The aircraft is being used to undertake forest mapping for environmental management purposes in association with a private company, QASCO. An officer of the police air arm is piloting the aircraft due to an introduction of efficiencies. In other words, the Department of Environment and Natural Resources now does not have a pilot and it uses the services of the Police Force in that regard.

If we did not use this plane for commercially viable exercises in conjunction with the private sector, we would not be maximising its value. It is in use overseas or interstate only when it is not required in South Australia. In South Australia, the plane is required to carry out regular aerial photography and special projects such as MFP work and so on.

The question that was asked today provides me with the opportunity to say that I am very pleased that we are able to sell our technology to international markets and to be working with the private sector. This is a good example of the important work, both within Australia and overseas, that the Department of Environment and Natural Resources is involved with.

THOMAS HUTCHINSON TRUST AND RELATED TRUSTS (WINDING UP) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.55 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 14 February at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 7 February 1995

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

CONVENTION CENTRE AND ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

49. **Mr LEWIS:**

1. How many casual and permanent staff employed during each of the past two financial years at the—

- (a) Convention Centre; and
- (b) Entertainment Centre,

were or are close relatives or friends of any senior management staff member or board member?

2. Will the Minister refer the matter to the Auditor-General for examination under the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987, section 31 (2) and other sections?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:

1.

(a) One permanent staff member is a relative of the Convention Centre's senior management, from a total of 71 employees. Four casual employees are related to senior management, from a total of 262 casual staff employed at the Adelaide Convention Centre.

(b) No close relatives or friends of any senior management staff member or Board member have been employed in the past two financial years either as a casual or permanent staff member at the Adelaide Entertainment Centre.

2. The Auditor-General, as the official auditor of the Convention Centre, already conducts his audits in accordance with section 31 (2) including payroll and personnel appointments on an annual basis. As the Convention Centre made an operating profit of \$1.8 million in 93-94 any concerns regarding efficiency or economies and the way the centre uses its resources are answered by that result. Under these circumstances I do not see a need to specifically refer this matter to the Auditor-General.

TOURISM DEPARTMENT

84. **Mr BECKER:** What is the answer to Question on Notice No. 29, asked on 15 February 1994?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Question on Notice No 84 was asked on 6 September 1994 and Question on Notice No 29 was asked on 15 February 1994. Both of these questions refer to an original Question on Notice of 8 April 1992 which was asked of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, representing the Minister of Tourism, the Hon. Barbara Wiese.

The information was not provided at the time and the records pertaining to the 12 months referred to are not available. Since this time, the Department of Tourism (Tourism SA) has been abolished and the South Australian Tourism Commission has been formed in its place.

The extensive changes caused by this restructuring, including a large number of personnel, have made accessing the information requested by the member almost impossible and the effort involved cannot be justified.

BAWDEN, SHANE KURT

115. **Mr ATKINSON:** Will the Crown appeal against the sentencing of Shane Kurt Bawden to four and a half years imprisonment with a non-parole period of 30 months and a driving disqualification of 12 years for causing by reckless driving the deaths of Mr Giovanni and Mrs Katerina Latassa and their youngest son Vincenzo and, if not, why not?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The Attorney-General has advised that in this State, as in other States and Territories, the Attorney-General has neither the authority nor the responsibility for making decisions about prosecution and appeal in criminal matters. That function is given by law to the independent office of the Director of Public Prosecutions.

The Attorney-General has, however, asked the Director of Public Prosecutions for an opinion about the sentence imposed and the prospects for appeal against it.

The maximum penalty for the offence of causing death by dangerous driving is 10 years imprisonment. The Director of Public Prosecutions advises that this case was at the upper end of the scale of seriousness. He also says:

I am firmly of the view that it cannot be said that the sentence strikes an inappropriate balance between the various competing considerations or that it was outside the range of penalties legitimately available to the learned judge. In addition I can find no fault with her remarks on sentence in the sense that they do not disclose any error of fact or principle nor any suggestion that she has given too much or too little weight to any factor that she had to take into account or that she has ignored some matter that she was required to take into account.

Thus the Director found that he had no confidence that any appeal against sentence would be successful. Put another way, he was of the opinion that a court on appeal would not find any error and would not find that the sentence was manifestly inadequate.

Neither the Attorney-General nor the Director of Public Prosecutions is insensitive to the tragedy which has befallen the Latassa family.

In addition, the Attorney-General is currently examining the level of maximum penalty applicable to these offences in the legislation with a view to determining whether any increase is warranted and whether any increase will have a discernible effect on the level of penalty actually imposed or the number of offences which occur. The Attorney-General has also asked the Director of Public Prosecutions for advice regarding any steps which might be taken to encourage courts to toughen penalties within the range that is currently available.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

128. **Mr BROKENSHERE:** Why did the driver of Government vehicle registered VQQ-140, when driving on Main South Road between Reynella and Morphett Vale at approximately 1.55 p.m. on 8 September, cut across a continuous white line without indicating and then tailgate the car in front to Morphett Vale?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Vehicle registered VQQ-140 is leased to Noarlunga Health Services.

The Chief Executive Officer of Noarlunga Health Services has spoken to the staff member who was the driver of the vehicle at the time mentioned, and the staff member has no recollection of the alleged incident.

THIRD ARTERIAL ROAD

133. **Mr ATKINSON:**

1. Will the third southern arterial be of four lanes or two lanes reversible?

2. How many minutes will it save on an average automobile journey from the city to Reynella?

3. How much will construction of the road cost?

4. What will be the private sector's role in construction and operation of the road?

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

1. A recently completed study of the third arterial road carried out by consultants confirmed that there is a need for additional road capacity in the corridor in the future. It was also determined that the additional capacity was only required in the peak direction of travel. That is, northbound in the mornings and southbound in the evenings.

The option of building a single carriageway, operating as a reversible facility, was shown to be practicable. Provision for later duplication could be incorporated into the works where appropriate.

2. The projected average peak hour peak direction travel time saving in the year 2001 is between 4 and 7 minutes. However, the actual saving will depend on many factors, including the southern population, the location of employment and the share of public transport trips in the year 2001.

3. Depending on the option adopted by the Government, the cost of the third arterial project will be between \$55-\$80 million.

4. Any role that the private sector can play in this project will be determined following further consideration of the 'whole-of-life' costs.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

137. **Mr LEWIS:**

1. What Government business was the driver of the vehicle registered VQQ-088 attending to whilst driving slowly along the Robe to Nora Creina Road on Sunday 15 May 1994 and why were there six adult passengers in the vehicle?

2. To which Government department or agency is this vehicle attached?

3. Were (and are) the terms of Government Management Board Circular 90/30 being observed by the driver of this vehicle and, if not, why not and what action will be taken to address any breach?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:

1. On Sunday 15 May 1994 vehicle VQQ-088, an eight seater mini bus, was being used by Community Accommodation Support Agency Inc. (CASA), Mt Gambier. CASA provides accommodation and tenancy support for people living in the South-East of South Australia who have intellectual and/or multiple disabilities. Support staff of CASA were assisting a group of clients, who live in Mt Gambier and who receive CASA services, to participate in a camp being conducted in the Robe area. The camp commenced on Friday 13 May and concluded on Tuesday 17 May.

2. The vehicle was hired from State Fleet by Community Accommodation Support Agency Inc (CASA) of Mt Gambier.

3. The vehicle was being used in accordance with the terms of Government Management Board Circular 90/30.

WITCHCRAFT

138. **Mr LEWIS:** In which public schools in Murray Bridge are witches and/or witchcraft discussed or form part of the curriculum and what are the names of any teachers who refer to witches and/or witchcraft in any course presented to their classes?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: My colleague the Minister for Education and Children's Services has provided the following response. I am advised that witchcraft is not a topic in any teacher's program in Murray Bridge schools.

In some required areas of study (e.g. language studies, society and the environment and the arts) teachers may use material which includes witches and fantasy. For example Shakespeare's *Macbeth* or Roald Dahl's highly acclaimed children's story *The Witches* are examples of the inclusion of a theme relating to witches in literature studies. In studies about society, myths, legends and Dreaming stories are significant components of approved curriculum. The story of Ngurunderi is an example of a Dreaming story about a 'supernatural' being which is relevant to the local area and is approved content in Aboriginal studies. In the Arts, especially drama, the use of motivational themes sometimes includes reference to gypsies, witches, heroes, Halloween, fairies or other topics designed to stimulate attention and interest. These topics may include Christian celebrations such as Christmas and Easter.

Teachers in Murray Bridge use various topics to assist students' understanding of our cultural diversity. Nevertheless teachers remain responsive to the concerns of parents whilst delivering a broad and balanced curriculum to all students. Where small groups of parents or individual parents have strong views about specific components of curriculum and have indicated their concerns to the principals, teachers have respected those sensitivities and have withdrawn materials or provided alternative activities for those children.

All schools in the Murraylands have clearly articulated parent participation policies and grievance procedures, and opportunities are provided for people to contribute actively to discussions about curriculum content and teaching methodologies. These processes are both democratic and inclusive and allow schools to develop a broad, balanced and responsive curriculum.

THE PARKS REDEVELOPMENT

142. **Mr ATKINSON:** Will all new dwellings built in the Parks area on land vacated by South Australian Housing Trust tenants under the Minister's redevelopment plan be retained for public housing?

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: The South Australian Housing Trust will not retain all new houses built in The Parks area redevelopment for public housing. At present, more than half of the houses in the suburb known as The Parks area are owned by the Housing Trust. This is one of the highest concentrations of public housing in the State.

New development on land vacated by the Housing Trust will recognise urban consolidation principles and provide more houses than currently exist in the area. If the trust were to retain all new dwellings, the concentration of public housing would increase further.

The Government believes that trust housing should be more evenly spread throughout the community and will, therefore, be looking to provide public housing in other locations, funded in part by redevelopment of The Parks.

While some new dwellings built in the redevelopment area will be retained for public housing, the majority will be sold in the private sector. This process will reduce the concentration of public housing while providing at the same time a greater variety of better quality housing more suited to the trust's present and future needs.

FLINDERS HOTEL

143. **Mr ATKINSON:** How long did it take police to respond to the pressing of the duress alarm at the Flinders Hotel, Pennington during the recent attack by 15 members of a motorcycle gang?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The Police Commissioner advises that information was received at the Police Communication Centre at 7.40 p.m. and despatched at 7.43 p.m. The first patrol arrived at 7.45 p.m. Subsequent patrols arrived between one and three minutes later.

HEAVY VEHICLES

144. **Ms STEVENS:**

1. What is the forecast for the number of students who will undertake stages 2 and 3 heavy vehicle maintenance courses at O'Halloran Hill in 1995, and which institutes are they attending in 1994?

2. What are the reasons for no longer offering heavy vehicle mechanic road transport courses at Whyalla, Croydon and Mount Gambier, how many staff will be displaced and what are the annual savings from this decision?

3. How many staff will be transferred as a result of the decision to consolidate stages 2 and 3 heavy vehicle maintenance courses at O'Halloran Hill, and what will be the cost?

4. Were students consulted before the decision was made to consolidate stages 2 and 3 heavy vehicle maintenance courses at O'Halloran Hill and if so, how was this process undertaken and did students agree?

5. Which heavy transport companies were consulted before the decision was made?

6. Will O'Halloran Hill need to acquire additional equipment to conduct heavy vehicle maintenance courses and if so, what will be the cost of purchase or transfer?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH:

1. O'Halloran Hill forecast the following enrolments for 1995 in the three components of Heavy Vehicle Mechanic (Road Transport, Agricultural, Plant and Earth Moving).

Stage 2 (1994)		Stage 2 (1995)	Stage 3 (1994)		Stage 3 (1995)
O'Halloran Hill	28	90**	O'Halloran Hill	23	73
Croydon	28		Croydon	40	
Spencer	18*		Spencer	5	
South East	4		South East	5	
TOTAL	78	90		73	73

* This is the total number of trainees undertaking the three

components which require separate tuition and equipment.

** This figure includes possible CVE (Prevocational) students.

The preceding table shows the 1994 and estimated 1995 enrolments for Stages 2 and 3 by location, and the likely translation. It does not include students currently undertaking pre vocational courses who may enrol in 1995. A further analysis of enrolments indicates that 66 per cent of the students will elect the Road Transport option and 34 per cent will elect the Agriculture and Plant and Earth Moving options. The distribution is more even in the case of non metropolitan delivery points.

2. A national common competency based curriculum has been developed for Heavy Vehicle mechanics including the three specialities. SA DETAFE commenced implementation of it in 1993, with the Stage 3 being implemented in 1995 at O'Halloran Hill. The concentration of resources to one location follows the example set in Western Australia, Victoria and New South Wales, where there is one heavy vehicle training facility in each of those States. The Spencer and South East offerings have been transferred due to the small number of enrolments, with Automotive Mechanic training being concentrated at Croydon and Heavy Vehicle at O'Halloran Hill. The cost of equipping all locations to satisfy the requirements of the National curriculum would be an inefficient use of the States training resources. No Transport Engineering staff will be displaced from the Spencer or South East Institutes. It is expected that there will be annual savings in the order of \$150 000.

3. Adjustments in staffing levels at the three metropolitan institutes teaching Automotive Mechanical Repairs have been occurring over the last several years. These adjustments have been as a result of changing student numbers, retirements and Targeted Separation Packages. For 1995, two staff will return to Croydon from O'Halloran Hill and four staff will be transferred to O'Halloran Hill from Croydon.

4. As part of the consultation process, the employers of the trainees were contacted for their views. It should be noted that training is only available in one location for plumbing, sheetmetal, pattern making, upholstery, with sprinkler fitters being required to travel to Victoria or New South Wales to complete their training. This is also the case with many degree and post graduate programs.

5. Ninety nine employers were selected in consultation with the Motor Trade Association and received a letter seeking comment to assist in making decisions. In addition, staff from seven group training schemes were consulted. Of the 99 letters sent, 31 were to firms or organisations involved in the Heavy Vehicle Mechanic stream. There were 25 replies received. (A list of the contacts made is attached.)

6. Equipment will be transferred from Croydon to O'Halloran Hill and vice versa for the Automotive Mechanics stream. New equipment required for the implementation of Stage 3 of the Heavy Vehicle Mechanics course will need to be purchased, if not students will be required to travel interstate to complete Stage 3. If this is to be purchased as new the estimated cost is between \$250 000 and \$300 000. However, the department is negotiating for the purchase of second hand equipment which could cost approximately \$90 000. Items to be transferred are currently being identified. However, quotations for removal have yet to be called. It is expected that this cost will be in the order of \$20 000.

Rob Ellis Motors, West Terrace North, WIRRABARA SA 5481.

Specialty Tuning, 26-27/788 Marion Road, MARION SA 5048.

Tom Johnston Motors P/L, 244 Waymouth Street, ADELAIDE SA 5000.

Ultra Tune Cumberland Park, Cnr Goodwood/Cross Roads, CUMBERLAND PARK SA 5041.

K J Motors, 12 Andrew Street, ADELAIDE SA 5000.

Southcott Pty Ltd, GPO Box 1063, ADELAIDE SA 5001.

TNT Komatsu Forklifts, Cavan Road, GEPPS CROSS SA 5094.

Thompson Auto Repairs, 19 Wandearah Road, PT PIRIE SA 5540.

Voltruck CMV, PO Box 369, BLAIR ATHOL SA 5084.

Yeates Mechanical Services, 249-251 Angas Street, ADELAIDE SA 5000.

Solitaire Automotive, 26 Belair Road, HAWTHORN SA 5062.

T B Prescott & Co P/L, GPO Box 2421, ADELAIDE SA 5001.

Unley Nissan, PO Box 819, UNLEY SA 5061.

Western Auto Repairs P/L, 49-51 Ashwin Parade, TORRENSVILLE SA 5031.

North Park Auto Services, 2 Jones Street, NAILSWORTH SA 5083.

O G Roberts, PO Box 546, MT GAMBIER SA 5290.

Povey Motors, 140A Tolley Road, ST AGNES SA 5097.

Price Alexander Motors, 455 Goodwood Road, WESTBOURNE PARK SA 5041.

Ron Lewis Motors repairs P/L, 3 Hewer Street HAMPSTEAD GARDENS SA 5086.

New Port Nissan, 963-969 Port Road, CHELTENHAM SA 5014.
Paradise Motors (Sales) P/L, PO Box 171, CAMPBELLTOWN SA 5074.

Peter Page Holden, PO Box 94, ELIZABETH SA 5112.

Ross Aiston Motors, 212 Payneham Road, EVANDALE SA 5069.

Rusack Motors P/L, 738 Port Road, BEVERLEY SA 5009.

Nhill Toyota, PO Box 169, WHYALLA SA 5600.

Peter Motors, 27 Barnett Avenue, GLYNDE SA 5070.

Pritchard Auto Repairs, 94 Corconda Street, ENFIELD SA 5085.

Road & Truck Services SA P/L, 3 Collins Street, ENFIELD SA 5085.

R & M Diesel Maintenance P/L, PO Box 2005, REGENCY PARK SA 5942.

Kruger Motors, 14 Kensington Road, ROSE PARK SA 5067.

Kingswood Motor Garage, PO Box 95, KINGSWOOD SA 5062.

Len Miller Motors P/L, 6 Albert Street, CLARENCE GARDENS SA 5039.

Mobil Peachy Road S/Stn, 41 Peachy Road, ELIZABETH WEST SA 5113.

Motorlab Pty Ltd, 21 Edmund Avenue, UNLEY SA 5061.

Kent Town Auto Tune, 6 Little Rundle Street, KENT TOWN SA 5067.

Levels Diesel Service, PO Box 528, SALISBURY SA 5108.

Monza Motors, 184 Portrush Road, TRINITY GARDENS SA 5068.

McKenzie Motors, 77 Port Road, QUEENSTOWN SA 5014.

McLay Mechanical Repairs, 857 South Road, CLARENCE GARDENS SA 5039.

K & D J Oliver, 4 Gordon Avenue, CLEARVIEW SA 5085.

Lyall's Auto Repairs, 59 Coglein Street, BROMPTON SA 5007.

M & B Cribb Auto Centre, 22 Devereux Road, LINDEN PARK SA 5065.

Maughan Thiem Motor Co P/L, 1013 Port Road, CHELTENHAM SA 5014.

Mobil Warradale, 158 Sturt Road, WARRADALE SA 5046.

Colin Drennan Mech Services, 19 Grove Avenue, MARLESTON SA 5033.

D Smith & Son Pty Ltd, 659 Magill Road, MAGILL SA 5072.

Freeman Motor Trucks, 285 Hanson Road, WINGFIELD SA 5013.

Highbury Garage, 1013 Lower North East Road, HIGHBURY SA 5089.

Ike Ades Toyota, PO Box 129, PROSPECT SA 5082.

Complete Motor Garage, 406 South Road, RICHMOND SA 5035.

Dent Motors, 10 Kondando Terrace, EDWARDSTOWN SA 5039.

Gundlach Motors, 4 Meredith Street, NEWTON SA 5074.

Hancock & Just, Streiff Road, WINGFIELD SA 5013.

Ian Trower Mechanical Repairs, 3/9 Ventail Court, HOLDEN HILL SA 5088.

Cool Cat Auto Air, 2A Roslyn Street, MILE END SA 5031.

Fred Wells Pty Ltd, 87-91 Portrush Road, EVANDALE SA 5069.

Graham West Workshops P/L, 668 Marion Road, PARKHOLME SA 5043.

Hawthorn S/Stn, 107 Cross Road, HAWTHORN SA 5062.

Jacksons Auto Repairs, 16 Swan Avenue, HAPPY VALLEY SA 5159.

Amherst Motor Repairs, 11 Amherst Avenue, TRINITY GARDENS SA 5068.

Adelaide Fuel Injection Service, 7 Opala Street, REGENCY PARK SA 5010.

Bob Moon Motors/Automatics, 622 Regency Road, BROADVIEW SA 5083.

Bostons Motor Repairs P/L, 1-9 Ayr Street, JAMESTOWN SA 5491.

Caltex Midway S/Stn, Cnr Midway Rd & Hornet Crescent, ELIZABETH EAST SA 5112.

Ampol Salisbury Park S/Stn, PO Box 842, SALISBURY SA 5109.

Auto Steer & Wheel Align Spec, 650 Port Road, BEVERLEY SA 5009.

B S Stillwell Ford, PO Box 55, GOODWOOD SA 5034.
 Butlers Mechanical Repairs, PO Box 671, PT AUGUSTA SA 5700.
 CMI Hino, PO Box 2041, REGENCY PARK SA 5942.
 Ardtornish Motors, PO Box 614, ST AGNES SA 5097.
 Adelaide Clutch Services, PO Box 242, TORRENSVILLE SA 5031.
 BPB Auto Repairs, 5 Crichton Avenue, ROYAL PARK SA 5014.
 Castle Motors Norwood, 231 Portrush Road, NORWOOD SA 5067.
 Con Kiosses Motors, 573 Grange Road, GRANGE SA 5022.
 Kevin Clark, Australian National Railways, 320 Churchill Road, KILBURN SA 5084.
 Roger Paech, Paech Motors, PO Box 9, OAKBANK SA 5243.
 Trevor Richards, Specialised Drilling Services, PO Box 10, OLYMPIC DAM SA 5725.
 Peter Hood, Peter Hood Holden, South Road, MENINGIE SA 5264.
 Eddie Hill, E & WS Department, Grand Junction Road, OTTOWAY SA 5013.
 Russell Thorpe, McMahon Construction, 67 Greenhill Road, WAYVILLE SA 5034.
 Rob Marchetti, International Trucks, 605 South Road, REGENCY PARK SA 5010.
 Guido Vuaran, Department of Road Transport, PO Box 82, BLAIR ATHOL SA 5084.
 David Rawnsley, State Transport Authority, GPO Box 2351, ADELAIDE SA 5001.
 Bill Learmonth, Cummins Diesel Sales and Services, 45 Cavan Road, GEPPS CROSS SA 5094.
 Graham Healey, Greyhound-Pioneer, 111 Flinders Street, ADELAIDE SA 5290.
 Des Ind, Kain and Shelton, 141 Jubilee Highway (West), MT GAMBIER SA 5290.
 Ross Rofe, Cavill Power Products, 315 Main North Road, ENFIELD SA 5085.
 Bob Kilsby, Graham Harrison Forklift Trucks, 475 Grand Junction Road, WINGFIELD SA 5013.
 John Docherty, E.T.S.A., PO Box 21, LEIGH CREEK SA 5731.
 Michael Crawford, CMI Toyota, 307 Wright Street, ADELAIDE SA 5000.
 Bob Watkins, City Holden, 252 Pirie Street, ADELAIDE SA 5000.
 Les Felix, Rebel Ford, Elizabeth Way, ELIZABETH SA 5112.
 Bruce Sampson, Australian Motors, 23 Goodwood Road, WAYVILLE SA 5034.
 Harry Rhodes, Gilbert Motors, 57 Adelaide Road, MT BARKER SA 5251.
 Greg Povey, Barry Maney Ford, PO Box 442, MT GAMBIER SA 5290.
 Brad Ramsey, Ramsey Brothers, Fourth Street, CLEVE SA 5640.
 Colin Lehmann, Rural G & J East, Goldsworthy Street, KADINA SA 5554.
 Russell Matthews, Hage & Co Ltd, 50 Murray Street, TANUNDA SA 5352.
 Malcolm Gibbs (086) 58 1103, Gibbs Garage, Orroroo.
 GROUP TRAINING SCHEMES.
 MTA—Graham Bryant.
 Combined Group Training Inc—Kevin Petherick.
 Mid-North Group—Gary Donaldson.
 SA Local Government Training Scheme—Janice Page.
 Spencer Gulf Group Training—Jim Dawson.
 Riverland Group Training—Monika Kemp.
 SERGAS—Steve Toop.

COUNTRY TRANSPORT

146. **Mr ATKINSON:** Why do Government departments put Peterborough in the Port Pirie region when there is no public transport between Peterborough and Port Pirie?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The arrangement is a long-standing one which, were it to change, would put greater distance between Peterborough and departmental regional officers. The lack of public transport between Peterborough and Port Pirie is due to the curtailment of rail services resulting from decisions of a Federal Labor Government. The member for Frome advises me that he has an electorate office in Peterborough which is open two days a week

to facilitate contact between constituents and Government departments. The member has received few complaints about the matter raised in the question. The Government's commitment to the future of Peterborough is also reflected in the allocation of \$1.5 million to upgrade the Peterborough High School.

PETERBOROUGH POLICE STATION

147. **Mr ATKINSON:** How many police officers live in Peterborough and at what time in the evening are phone calls for Police assistance from Peterborough switched through to Port Pirie police, and why are these calls switched through to Port Pirie?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Peterborough police station has seven members and one ASO1 clerical assistant. The station telephones are diverted to Port Pirie when members are performing patrol duties and the station is unoccupied. This normally occurs between 5 p.m. and 12 midnight Sunday to Thursday, and up to 2 a.m. on Friday and Saturday nights. Any calls for police assistance received by Port Pirie police are relayed by police radio to the Peterborough personnel on patrol duty. After Peterborough members have completed duty for the night, the telephones are diverted to the private homes of two supervisory members.

PRISONERS' EMPLOYMENT

148. **Mr ATKINSON:** Further to the answer to question number 122, what are the details of the 'variety of primary, secondary and service industries' in which prisoners are employed and trained?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Generally, prisoner employment is provided by the Department for Correctional Services within the following broad industry base:

Primary Industries:

Vegetable production, animal husbandry, orchard and fruit production, cereal production, poultry and egg production, plant propagation, viticulture, glasshouse cultivation, dairy, general farm and irrigation practices.

Secondary Industries:

Carpentry and joinery, sheetmetal work, engineering, spraypainting, automotive, silkscreening and signwriting, textiles and clothing, cannery, concrete products.

Service Industries:

Kitchen, laundry, maintenance (building, grounds and general), domestic services, bakery, clerical, prisoner programs.

These industries present prisoners with the opportunity to develop vocational skills in a range of specific trade and employment areas, and are established in a way which allows prisoners to continue gaining skills and experience in the area of their choice as they progress through the correctional system in accordance with their pre-established sentence plan.

Trade qualified custodial specialists provide supervision and training for prisoners in each area, with further specialised training being provided through the Offender Education Service as requirements dictate.

LAND SUBDIVISION LEVY

149. **Mr ROSSI:**

1. When was the 12.5 per cent levy introduced on land subdivisions either in money value or area so as to be used for future open space in residential areas?

2. How much money has been collected by this levy?

3. Has this money been spent and, if so, how much in each council area and how much in the Albert Park/Seaton suburbs in particular?

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD:

1. The 12.5 per cent open space levy was introduced when the Planning and Development Act was proclaimed in 1968. Proceeds are paid into a fund known as the Planning and Development Fund which has been established under planning legislation.

2. The amount of money collected through this levy and paid into the fund from 1968 up to 30 July 1994 has been \$32.8 million.

3. The fund is used for the purchase and enhancement of open space although it can also be used for other strategic planning and development purposes as authorised by the Development Act. All the money previously collected by the levy has been spent on planning and development projects with the majority used in securing and improving open space. In fact additional money was

borrowed in the 1970s to purchase open space available at the time. Part of this debt is still outstanding. I referred to this matter in the House on 2 November 1994 when I stated that a debt repayment strategy has been put into place when I announced this year's open space programs.

Councils are advised each year of the availability of open space programs through the fund and a booklet is sent to every council in the State calling for applications. This year I also arranged to have copies of the booklet distributed to every member of the House for their information.

I do not have the specific figures for each individual suburb. However, the amount spent in the former Woodville council area is \$90 000. The amount provided to specific councils is to a great degree dependent on their own open space programs and strategies. The amount of money that has been spent in each council on open space programs up to 30 June 1994 is shown in the attachment.

If the member has any specific open space project in mind then he should make representation to the Hindmarsh and Woodville council to submit an application under one of the programs that I announced.

Council	Open Space Funding \$'000
Adelaide	120
Angaston	296
Barmera	20
Barossa	50
Beachport	10
Berri	10B
Brighton	5
Burnside	515
Burra Burra	30
Bute	5
Campbelltown	2 343
Central Yorke Peninsula	97
Clare	70
Cleve	5
Coober Pedy	15
Crystal Brook/Redhill	5
East Torrens	935
Elliston	6
Enfield	1 937
Franklin Harbour	45
Gawler	8
Glenelg	225
Happy Valley	1220
Hindmarsh & Woodville	90
Jamestown	22
Kapunda	38
Kensington & Norwood	85
Kimba	4
Kingscote	106
Lacepede	276
Lameroo	10
Le Hunte	19
Lower Eyre Peninsula	80
Mallala	47
Mannum	14
Marion	1 817
Meningie	3
Millicent	25
Minlaton	18
Mitcham	2 330
Morgan	10
Mt Barker	240
Mt Gambier (city)	150
Mt Gambier (district)	5
Mt Remarkable	76
Munno Para	1 550
Murray Bridge	1 170
Naracoorte(town)	80
Noarlunga	6 240
Northern Yorke Peninsula	135
Onkaparinga	537
Penola	45
Pirie	20
Port Adelaide	1 175
Port Augusta	130
Port Elliot & Goolwa	910

Port Lincoln	75
Port MacDonnell	40
Port Pirie	175
Renmark	155
Ridley Truro	84
Riverton	40
Robe	70
Robertstown	28
Rocky River	10
Salisbury	1 355
St Peters	170
Stirling	1 518
Strathalbyn	20
Streaky Bay	35
Tatiara	50
Tea Tree Gully	1 615
Thebarton	48
Tumby Bay	5
Unley	100
Victor Harbour	1 033
Wakefield Plains	12
Walkerville	10
Walleroo	10
Warooka	26
West Torrens	80
Willunga	1 850
Yankalilla	29
Yorketown	15
Total	\$34 187 000

PLAYFORD HIGH SCHOOL SITE

150. Ms STEVENS:

- Who is the aged care accommodation provider building a 35 bed hostel on the site of the old Playford High School?
- What is the size of the proposed building and will it be single or multi storey?
- What is the expected completion date for the project?
- What is happening to the remainder of the land?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Portion of the former Playford High School at Elizabeth is now under contract to the Anglican Church for an aged care complex. This facility when completed will provide a 40 bed single storey hostel together with 10 independent living units and sundry support facilities. It is expected that the project will be developed over a two year period.

The church has obtained a grant from the Federal Government to assist in the construction costs. In addition the church has negotiated to sell portion of the land to a residential developer who will create a number of individual housing allotments.

CROWD CONTROL

151. **Ms GREIG:** What initiatives are being undertaken under the Commercial and Private Agents Act pertaining to crowd control and compulsory training of crowd controllers and when will the details be made publicly available?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The Attorney-General has provided the following answer in response to your question concerning the initiatives being undertaken under the Commercial and Private Agents Act pertaining to crowd control and compulsory training of crowd controllers:

Two groups are currently examining the question of whether to prescribe training and educational criteria as a prerequisite for obtaining a licence under the Commercial and Private Agents Act. These are:

- an informal group known as the Commercial and Private Agents Training and Qualification Discussion Group established through the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs; this group consists of representatives from the industry, relevant agencies and educational institutions and meets when a need arises to discuss industry training issues; and
 - the Course Advisory Group attached to Adelaide College of TAFE. This group is overseeing the development of a course of training for the security industry which TAFE is intending to offer in 1995. The course will consist of modules based on the various classes of security work.
- It is expected that the Course Advisory Group will have a draft proposal for course structure and content available for comment on

27 January 1995. This will be reviewed by the informal discussion group in February 1995, which will then make recommendations on the best method of implementing training and educational criteria under current legislation. For example, regulatory requirements may be considered.

As the Commercial and Private Agents Act is currently under review, the outcomes of this process will be reflected in proposed amendments to the legislation due to be introduced to Parliament in the autumn session in 1995.

YOUTH AFFAIRS COUNCIL

153. Mr ATKINSON:

1. Does the Minister support the Government funded Youth Affairs Council's explicit promotion of the doctrine of humanism in its letter to members of Parliament on 22 November about the Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Bill?

2. Will the Minister counsel the executive director of the Youth Affairs Council, Mr Kym Davey, about using his taxpayer funded position to promote his personal opinions about religion and politics?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH:

1. My interpretation of the circular letter of 22 November 1994 is that the YACSA Council was seeking the support of all members of Parliament for the retention of the age of 16 as the appropriate age for medical power of attorney; a matter within the Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Bill 1994.

An analysis of the letter does not reveal 'explicit promotion of the doctrine of humanism'. Consequently I cannot comment on support or otherwise for any explicit promotion of the doctrine of humanism.

2. The Executive Officer operated under the instruction of the YACSA Council and, in writing the letter of 22 November 1994, was doing so as requested unanimously by the council. The council operates under its own independent constitution and, as such, the Minister has no role to play in the internal management of the council. I support the council's independent role as an advocate for the interests of young people and, without commenting on the merits of the case presented, support the raising of important issues which concern young people.

TRANSADELAIDE EMPLOYEES

154. Mr ATKINSON:

1. Why do the new employees on board TransAdelaide trains not have power to check whether passengers have valid tickets and, if they do not have tickets, power to issue them with infringement notices?

2. What has happened to the previous Government's plan to install barriers at Adelaide Railway Station at which tickets could be checked?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:

1. Approximately 60 Passenger Service Assistants (PSAs) are being progressively introduced to TransAdelaide rail services. The first group of 15 PSAs commenced service on Sunday 27 November 1994 with a further 15 commencing prior to Christmas.

Their primary roles are customer service, revenue protection and regaining customers confidence in the rail system. The new PSAs have already conducted numerous visual ticket checks both on board trains and at Adelaide Railway Station. The primary role of the PSA's is to visually check tickets. From time to time they will be involved in ticket checks with field supervisors. While they cannot issue transit infringement notices as they are not currently authorised officers under the terms of the Passenger Transport Act of 1994, it is intended that this be reviewed when the full complement of numbers are employed and TransAdelaide is in a position to roster them on full revenue protection duties.

2. The previous Government had not decided to install barriers at Adelaide Railway Station. Quotations were called by the STA (TransAdelaide) for the installation of barriers as part of the assessment process but a decision was made not to proceed when all of the information was available.

TransAdelaide could not justify the expenditure as the barriers would have provided limited revenue enforcement as the rest of the rail system would still be open. The barriers needed to be compatible with the current ticketing system and there is a likelihood that some difficulty would have been experienced because of the age of the ticketing system. The role of the Passenger Service Assistants in

respect to revenue protection further reduced the cost/benefit of the barriers.

PIPELINES AUTHORITY

156. Mr QUIRKE:

1. How many staff will be employed by PASA on its remaining administrative functions following sale of the gas haulage and pipeline business and how many staff are employed in the business to be sold?

2. What are the revenue and expenditure budgets for each of these parts of PASA?

3. What will be the impact in each of these parts of PASA in terms of staff numbers, wages and conditions of employment following the sale?

4. What will be the impact of loss of tax exemptions previously available to the Government as owner of PASA on the price of sale to a private provider?

5. What will be the impact on Government revenue following the sale of this public utility?

6. Will the Minister guarantee that the price of sale of PASA's commercial operations will exceed the present value of the future income stream if PASA were to remain in public hands?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER:

1. At 31 December 1994, PASA's permanent work force level is expected to be 115 FTE employees.

Approximately 4-5 employees are expected to be employed by PASA for its remaining administrative functions. The other 110 employees are engaged in the gas haulage and pipelines business which are being offered for sale.

2. PASA does not separately budget for revenue for each of these parts of its current business.

Providing the honourable member with an estimate of such revenue or a breakdown of PASA's expenditure at this critical stage of the assets sale is inappropriate for obvious commercial reasons.

3. In answer to Question 1, I have indicated that approximately 4-5 employees are expected to be employed by PASA for its remaining administrative functions. Employees retained in this role are expected to maintain existing wages and conditions under normal income maintenance provisions.

The Government expects that the new owner will require the majority of the remaining employees for the gas haulage and pipeline businesses being offered for sale. The terms and conditions to apply to employees who transfer to the new owner are subject to current negotiation. However, the Government is seeking to ensure that they will receive remuneration arrangements which, overall, are comparable to their existing arrangements. There will, of course, be some elements of these arrangements which will be different when employees transfer out of the public sector and into the private sector.

4. A purchaser of the assets of PASA will not enjoy the existing tax exemptions enjoyed by PASA. However, the new owner is expected to gain certain tax benefits through its ownership and operation of PASA's assets, such that the impact of its tax obligations will not significantly detract from the sale price.

In addition, the Government expects to realise a substantial benefit in the sale price for the strategic value of the assets, which is difficult to achieve under Government ownership.

5. There will be minimal direct impact on Government revenue following the sale. The loss of the dividend that the Government would expect to receive will be balanced by the reduction in the interest charges as a result of paying off some of the State's debt.

On the broader front, the PASA assets sale is part of the Government's SA Recovery Program aimed at reducing the State's debt. The reduction in the State's debt will put the State in a stronger financial position overall, and ultimately provide assistance to the State in regaining the higher credit rating which it once enjoyed.

6. As I have already indicated, the Government expects to realise a substantial strategic value in the sale price. The Government, therefore, expects that the sale price will exceed the straight net present value of PASA's future income stream if PASA were not to be sold. In addition, one of the intangible factors that will be considered when selecting a preferred purchaser of the PASA assets is the economic benefits that the purchaser will bring to South Australia.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

162. Ms STEVENS:

1. How many of the 13 formal complaints to the Equal Opportunity Commission carried over to be finalised by February 1994 are still in progress, at what stage are they and when will they be finalised?

2. What was the budget allocated in 1992-93 for assistance in presenting complaints to the tribunal for determination and how much was actually spent in assisting these cases?

3. How many complaints to the Equal Opportunity Commission are outstanding and for how long have they been active?

4. What is the longest outstanding complaint and what is the reason for any delay in finalising it?

5. What is the length of time for a legal opinion to be formed for referral to the tribunal after a complainant requests referral?

6. How many legal opinions are normally required before referral to the tribunal?

7. If the commission is or has been over budget is there any protocol for the determination of priorities and are cases deferred due to over expenditure?

8. How many complaints have been made to the Attorney-General's Department and to the Ombudsman regarding the operation of the Equal Opportunity Commission, what was the nature of these complaints and what action has been taken to have these complaints resolved?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER:

1. It is assumed that the '13 formal complaints' refer to the reference in the Sixteenth Annual Report of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity—1992-93, page 64. This reference refers to complaints referred to the Equal Opportunity Tribunal but not heard prior to 30 June 1993. The outcome of these matters is reported in the Seventeenth Annual Report of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity—1993-94 as follows:

- 1 still awaits hearing after the complainant took a jurisdictional issue to the Supreme Court of South Australia
- 4 were dismissed by the Equal Opportunity Tribunal
- 7 were struck out after the complainants failed to present particulars
- 1 was settled by the parties prior to hearing and withdrawn.

2. There is no specific allocation in the commission's budget for funding legal assistance in present complaints to the tribunal for determination. In the 1992-93 report year the actual expenditure on legal fees related to assisting in presenting complaints to the tribunal was \$886,90, which was allocated from the commission's general administration budget.

3. As at 30 November 1994 the number of complaints currently under investigation totalled 352. Of these,
 122 (35 per cent) have been active for less than 3 months
 68 (20 per cent) have been active for less than 6 months
 82 (23 per cent) have been active for between 6 and 12 months

50 (14 per cent) have been active for between 12 months and 24 months

30 (8 per cent) have been active for more than 24 months

4. The longest outstanding complaint as at 30 November 1994 is one lodged in January 1992. The complaint involves a complex issue of discrimination. The matter has necessitated a close examination of a significant amount of data. Recently the matter has been the subject of a legal review.

The outcome of this review was that if attempts to conciliate fail, it is recommended the matter be referred to the Equal Opportunity Tribunal. However, it is likely this complaint will be resolved without the necessity of referral for judicial determination.

5. The commission's 1993-94 and 1994-95 strategic plan indicates a performance indicator of six weeks for the preparation of a formal merits opinion by the legal section of the commission from the date of request. A formal merits opinion would be sought by the commissioner prior to referral of any matter to the Equal Opportunity Tribunal.

6. Generally, only one formal merits opinion is required before referral to the tribunal. However, it may be necessary for further information to be obtained or investigation undertaken following legal review of the complaint to enable the formal merits opinion to be finalised.

7. In the event that the commission's budget is, or is likely to be, in deficit priorities are determined in accordance with the commission's plan and the strategic planning process. Programs are prioritised to ensure service delivery to the public is maintained and pro-active programs are cut, delayed or postponed.

The commissioner has a statutory responsibility within the terms of Section 95(9) of the Equal Opportunity Act 1984 (SA) to assist the complainant either personally or by counsel or other representative, in the presentation of the complainant's case to the tribunal if requested, where the Commissioner has determined that the matter does not lack substance.

To date, limited resources have been required for counsel fees in the representation of complainants in matters referred to the Equal Opportunity Tribunal. Referrals have never been deferred due to over-expenditure.

8. In the 1993-94 financial year, the Ombudsman's office handled 14 complaints against the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity.

The outcomes of those complaints were:

Declined	1
Preliminary Investigation—Not Sustained	2
Preliminary Investigation—Not Sustained, Explanation Given	4
Preliminary Investigation—Reasonable Resolution	2
Full Investigation—Not Sustained	1
Full Investigation—Reasonable Resolution	1
Still Under Investigation at the end of the year	3

In addition to the above complaints, there were seven contacts in relation to the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity where the matter was finalised on the basis of the Ombudsman's office providing advice to the complainant as to action they may take.