

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 16 February 1995

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

PROSTITUTION (DECRIMINALISATION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 9 February. Page 1509.)

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I would like to oppose the Bill of the honourable member for Unley for reasons that I will briefly outline, so that there will be more time to go into the debate more fully. I do not doubt the intentions of the honourable member in bringing about this discussion with his Bill. However, I believe that the honourable member is misguided. I know his concern for human issues and, as a good friend and as someone who has looked at what he has involved himself with in the past with regard to these social issues, I was quite surprised that he had gone down this path. For those reasons I know that, despite the fact that some people might think he is cynical, his intentions are honourable, for he has a record to that effect. However, in this case, he is misguided.

He is proposing to bring in a Bill that will decriminalise prostitution and, at a later date, to bring in another Bill to regulate the industry. He is asking us to support something that we do not know will happen in the future. We are not fully aware of what these regulations will be. In other words, what he is proposing is to decriminalise prostitution, make it not a criminal offence, and then we will deal with how to regulate it later. I do not believe that is the way to go. I personally do not believe that decriminalisation of prostitution will be in any way the right path to take, in the sense that it will be more protecting of prostitutes, and so on.

There is difficulty with the proposition of decriminalisation, because it is not the case that if it is decriminalised all the problems are gone. As I said, I will speak only briefly, but evidence from other places where this has been done and, indeed, places where it is legalised, indicates that they still have problems. I do not hide my head in the sand and say that we let the law stay as it is and that prostitution does not exist. It has always existed and it will always exist. However, the way society reacts to the problem is very important. Just because it has always existed does not mean we will have to adapt the laws so that we somehow condone it. There is a big difference between acknowledging the reality that prostitution is there and decriminalising or legalising it.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: As the member for Unley says, it is not illegal now. I agree with him, and I believe that the member for Spence this morning, on 5AN, outlined that point quite clearly, that the actual act of prostitution between two adults is not illegal. It is when it becomes a commercial proposition that it becomes a problem. So, I believe that, as I said, the member for Unley is misguided in this area.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: The member for Unley is interjecting and he has a right to do so—I know he does not often do that! As to the problem with prostitution, I know that there are difficulties with the present law and I am one of the first to

admit that we have to look at it. Indeed, the Social Development Committee is looking at this very problem—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr SCALZI:—and has been for the past two years, the member for Unley tells me. In other words, he is saying that, as a result of that, if we keep looking we should come up with something. Indeed, we should, but we should do it in such a way that we do not rush into things and end up with more problems. To do so would be irresponsible. As I said, if we look at the ACT, Victoria and other places where prostitution has been decriminalised or even legalised, the problems associated with prostitution have not disappeared. Indeed, in some cases they have become worse.

Irrespective of where we stand on the moral issues of prostitution, I do not believe that prostitution is in any way a profession that should be treated like any other, because it is not. Those people who say that you can divorce it and just turn it into a mere occupation like any other occupation I think are really misguided. Prostitution is different. It has been around for a long time, but our reaction, the way we treat it, is very important. I agree with the member for Unley that there is a problem in the sense that the prostitute is treated as a criminal yet the client gets away with it. There is a sense of injustice there, and I believe that that should be looked at, but that does not mean because there is a sense of injustice that we go the other way and create more problems for society. That is not the right way to go. That is not the path we should all follow. To say we have been looking at it for two years, therefore we should decriminalise it and at a later time bring in something else to replace it, is not a responsible attitude.

I believe the member's intentions are honourable for he has had a history of looking at social issues, but on this issue he is misguided. The honourable member has introduced something which will abolish the way we deal with the problem now and will then say, 'Look, get rid of this and at a later date we will get it altogether.' That is not the way to go. There are many other problems associated with prostitution. Members should realise that when we are dealing with prostitution we are not dealing with just female prostitution; we are dealing with male prostitution and all the other things associated with it. If we decriminalise prostitution, we must be realistic and say that male homosexual prostitution should be decriminalised as well, because equal opportunity laws apply.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: Yes, I have no problems with what people do in private. I have my moral stand as others have theirs, and I respect the stand that people take.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: No, the reality is that we are dealing with a commercial proposition.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: The member for Unley continues to interject. There is a big difference between what people do in private and what occurs with a commercial proposition. Indeed, my under age children can drink wine at home, whilst in a hotel they cannot. What people do outside and what people do in private when it becomes a commercial proposition (although that might be a poor analogy) are two different things.

Mr Brindal: They are not getting sex on the streets.

Mr SCALZI: No, but we all have our moral or religious standards within the privacy of own home; that is a different matter. When it becomes the concern of the whole of society

because it is a commercial proposition and there is exploitation of individuals, it becomes the business of this House. I believe that that will not be addressed by the member for Unley's Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. I take it that the member for Spence is the lead speaker and will have 15 minutes. I point out to the House that the lead speaker should be present when the debate resumes. This is not a practice that I will continue in the future if the lead speaker is not present.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Brothels are a public nuisance. Customers ringing the doorbells of our homes after midnight looking for brothels are a public nuisance. Prostitutes soliciting and accosting passers-by on our streets are a public nuisance. The Bill will result in these public nuisances being lawful, and neither the police nor citizens will be able to do anything about them; therefore, I oppose the Bill. The Bill seeks to abolish offences related to prostitution. It abolishes the offences of procuring a person to be a prostitute, keeping and managing a brothel, soliciting in a street or public place, living off the earnings of prostitution and letting flats, units and houses knowing they are to be used as a brothel. The Bill does not abolish any law against prostitution itself, that is, any law against selling sexual favours for money because there never has been a law against that. This is not a Bill to legalise or decriminalise prostitution; it is a Bill about legalising or decriminalising the employment of prostitutes in brothels.

Clause 4 abolishes section 63 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act headed 'Procuring persons to be prostitutes.' Section 63 provides:

Any person who procures any person to become a common prostitute shall be guilty of an offence.

Clause 4 of the Bill also repeals section 270(1)(b) of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, which provides:

Any person convicted of any of the following common law offences, that is to say, keeping a common bawdy house or a common ill-governed and disorderly house, shall be liable to be imprisoned for a term not exceeding two years.

This is the offence of keeping a brothel. By whatever name it is known at law, a brothel exists only when there are two, three, four or more prostitutes working on the same premises. The law in South Australia has never punished a prostitute working alone. It is quite lawful to be a prostitute in one's home or on premises on which one is the only person selling sexual favours for money. This is why police find it most difficult to prosecute so-called escort agencies. Clause 5 of the Bill repeals the offences of consorting with prostitutes and permitting premises to be frequented by prostitutes. I know of no recent prosecutions for consorting with prostitutes, and this offence is probably no longer necessary or just. Clause 5, which abolishes the offence of soliciting, provides:

A person who in a public place, or within the view or hearing of any person in a public place, accosts or solicits a person for the purpose of prostitution or loiters in a public place for the purpose of prostitution is guilty of an offence.

If the member for Unley's Bill is carried, accosting or soliciting for prostitution will be lawful in any street or public place in South Australia. That is the natural consequence of his Bill. I understand that many members would support an extension of this law to punish men who solicit for the services of a prostitute. In the United Kingdom this offence is called gutter crawling. I would support such a change. I

would also support changes that gave the police clearer authority to enter brothels.

Clause 5 of the Bill also knocks out the offence of living off the earnings of prostitutes. The section of the Summary Offences Act that defines a brothel and makes keeping and managing one unlawful is abolished by the Bill. If the Bill passes it will then be lawful to let flats, units and houses to be used as brothels. The last paragraph of the member for Unley's Bill ends the authority of the police to enter premises that they suspect on reasonable grounds to be a brothel.

The member for Unley tells us not to worry about this proposal to abolish these offences because, he says, 'Parliament will write something to take their place.' This is legislative recklessness. It is odd that I, a speaker against the Bill, should be the first member to explain its substance. The member for Unley found it unnecessary to do this when introducing the Bill last week. He spent 30 minutes not explaining the Bill.

The member for Unley portrays us who oppose his Bill as people who think prostitution can be stamped out. He and his allies say we are unworldly. They say we just do not realise that prostitution is the oldest profession. I am an opponent of his Bill but I do not have any of these illusions. I concede that none of these laws proposed to be repealed, nor any other law we draft, will stop prostitution or brothels in South Australia. I quite agree that prostitution, like trafficking in narcotics or sexual abuse of children, will never be stamped out. But I believe it ought to be restrained and minimised by the law. It is partly a question of what status we give prostitution.

Keeping prostitution in the streets of shame, like keeping pornography under the counter, gives it an appropriate status in society and maintains a boundary, however fragile and indistinct, between decency and indecency. This boundary, which the member for Unley wants to throw down, might one day just keep one of my children from entering the trade. Under the member for Unley's Bill there will be more prostitution, not less.

It is odd that the feminists of the last three decades of Queen Victoria's reign should have struggled for the laws against brothels and procuring that the Bill abolishes and that the self-styled feminists of today's Parliament should support the Bill. King Henry II of England legalised prostitution in 1161 for the purpose of 'licensing the stews of Southwark'. The brothels were sacked during Wat Tyler's rebellion, yet he and his followers do not figure in English history as conservatives or reactionaries. The licensing system survived until 1545. So, England had licensed prostitution for 400 years.

Legalised and licensed prostitution was tried again in Britain from 1864 with the passing of the Contagious Diseases Act. The Act allowed officials to designate women as common prostitutes and to require them to have periodic medical examinations while they were in the trade. There was no criminal penalty for being in a brothel or being designated a common prostitute. The first schedule to the Act gave the law force in Portsmouth, Plymouth, Chatham, Woolwich, Sheerness, The Curragh, Cork and Queenstown (where, by the way, my great-grandfather had his boatyard). These locations may give a few members some insight into why Tory members of Parliament connected to the Royal Navy and the Army resisted attempts to repeal it. So, a little over 100 years ago, if one accepts the reasoning of the Hon. Carolyn Pickles and the member for Unley, the progressive Party comprised the Tories, who wanted brothels to keep

soldiers and sailors happy, and the reactionaries were the feminists and the liberals, who wanted the Contagious Diseases Act repealed and the laws against brothels restored in the districts specified in the schedule.

Our great grandparents had heard this tiresome debate before we were thought of. France legalised prostitution in the last century and then abandoned the experiment. It did the same this century. There is nothing new, clever or progressive about repealing laws against brothels; it is something politicians do when they are bored. So, let us not hear any more clichés about progress, steps forward and back, first steps and third steps, and the twenty-first century.

It is an opportune moment to reply to the member for Unley on public health and sexually transmitted diseases. It is true, as he says, that the prostitutes who work in the licensed brothels of Melbourne are, on average, less likely to have sexually transmitted disease than a random sample of the public. Alas, one cannot say the same for the greater number of Victorian prostitutes who continue to work illegally because they are not sufficiently seductive to appear in parades at the big Melbourne brothels, because they choose to have lower overheads and charge less, because they like to work in small business or for themselves, because they are addicted to drugs or because they do not insist on the customers wearing a condom. No way of doing a health survey of these prostitutes has yet been devised. The Parliament can establish a system of licensed brothels and health checks, but the incubation or window period of sexually transmitted diseases will defeat the laudable aim.

Responsible prostitutes attend regularly for checking or treatment under any system. Medical confidentiality is respected now, but irresponsible prostitutes, especially those on drugs, will not attend for checks and treatments under any system. These prostitutes will not work within any legal framework. If the member for Unley thinks all prostitutes will work within his legal framework, he displays a greater naivety than any of his opponents. Even in Melbourne's licensed brothels, the intensity of competition between prostitutes in the same establishment has led to offers of sex without a condom.

People become prostitutes because they are poor, unskilled or uneducated, or because they need quick money to buy drugs. It is my Party's tradition to oppose the exploitation of labour, even if workers agree to exploitative contracts. The Bill introduced by the member for Unley is not about legalising or decriminalising prostitution because, as he well knows, a prostitute has always been free to ply her or his trade from home or on premises on which no other prostitute works at the same time.

This Bill is about legalising the employment of prostitutes and that is why Adelaide's madams are doing the rounds of the radio stations and fronting the television cameras to support it. If my arguments against the Bill were on moral grounds, I should be obliged to move an amendment to outlaw prostitution as distinct from brothels, soliciting, procuring and pimping, but I will not be doing that, because prostitutes working alone from their own premises or through an escort agency are not a public nuisance. I do not believe that the criminal law ought to set the police impossible tasks. Administering the law against brothels is difficult but not impossible. Prosecuting prostitutes working alone is not, in my opinion, in the public interest, but suppressing brothels and street soliciting is in the public interest because of the nuisance they cause. Penalising men for seeking the services

of prostitutes probably is a good idea and I would support it. Let me regale the House, a House of local members—

Mr Wade interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON:—certainly—with a constituent case from Ovingham on the public nuisance caused by brothels. It is relevant because the inner suburban electorate I have the honour to represent will, if the Bill is passed, become Adelaide's red light district owing to its proximity to the city and North Adelaide, its comparatively low real estate values and its mixture of rental accommodation with industry and commerce. The Bill will, whether or not he intends it, put the brothels in Bowden, Brompton and Beverley.

The constituent case goes like this: a brothel was established in two flats on Park Terrace. It started business in the early evening and continued until dawn most nights of the week. Customers drove into the nearby streets and parked their cars. Their cars lined the pavement of the streets near the brothel so the residents found it difficult to park in front of their homes. Youths shouted and swore through the open windows of these cars as they anticipated their sexual gratification and looked for a park. The drivers and their passengers slammed the car doors going to and from the brothel. Some of the men were obviously drunk as they walked to the gate of the flats. The workers in the brothel shouted at one another and sometimes fought noisily. The voices of unruly customers who were ejected reverberated through the small suburb. Men gathered on the street outside the brothel assaulting one another and vandalising and breaking into cars. Some customers knocked on the doors of flats and houses near the brothel during trading hours and would not believe the weary householders who explained that their home was not a brothel and that they were not prostitutes.

Now members know why the common law called brothels 'bawdy houses' or 'common ill-governed houses' and 'disorderly houses'. Some of the brothel's neighbours wrote to me and asked me accusingly, 'What would you do if a brothel were to set up business opposite your home?' If this Bill becomes law, I would have to write back to them to say that there was nothing I could do; they would have to tolerate all these things of which they complained. Perhaps they could move to suburbs such as Unley Park, Dulwich, Norwood and Kings Park—insulated from red light status by real estate values. The member for Unley would say that if and when a new legislative scheme was enacted I could refer my constituents to the City of Hindmarsh and Woodville, whose general inspector would be able to abate the nuisance by such swift and compelling devices as the planning regulations.

This story has a happy ending: the member for Unley's Bill was not the law. I wrote to the inspector at Hindmarsh police and he referred my letter to the South Australian Police's Operation Patriot. The police visited the brothel and warned those who were in it about the laws that the member for Unley wants to repeal. The brothel owners moved out of Park Terrace, Ovingham, and the nuisance was completely abated. Newer members should know that the people who tell opinion pollers that they are in favour of legalised prostitution are in favour of it only in the abstract: they are not asked whether they are in favour of legalised brothels. How many would be in favour if a brothel opened in their street or next door? Voting for this Bill will let members find out. I am not so foolish as to believe that the Park Terrace brothel did not in time reappear somewhere else. However, the law we have keeps prostitution unobtrusive, small and impermanent. It is

a useful law; it can be improved; it ought not to be repealed entirely.

Mr ROSSI (Lee): I totally agree with what the member for Spence has said. As a matter of fact, there was a red light business several doors from where I lived some years ago and I know the problems that were caused. The other thing that concerns me is that decriminalisation of prostitution encourages young people to take on this profession and it also lowers the standards of equality that women have been fighting for years to achieve. My understanding is that in some of the countries where prostitution is allowed, the women become second-class citizens and are not treated very well at all. The other problem is that, given the normal birth rate of human kind, more females than males are born. Of course, that leads to some females having to resort to prostitution to survive. For example, I would not like to be a woman in Lebanon, Iraq or the Philippines, which are just a few of the countries where women are not held in high regard by the male population.

Of course, with regard to the matter of not controlling prostitutes, murder is a common occurrence, as is stealing and rape—they have been going on for ever—but should we decriminalise those types of activities? The answer is 'No.' If this legislation does nothing else, it tells every member of the younger generation, in particular, what type of standards the community will accept. With deregulation, anything can happen. There would be no direction to the community about what should be done and what is acceptable.

With regard to disease, of course, we have hepatitis C and G and AIDS, which take up to two or three months to show up in blood tests. Therefore, this will not reduce the spread of disease. Also, if councils are allowed to zone areas in which prostitution can occur, the same thing will happen as happens now with second-hand car dealers and mechanics: there will always be backyard operations. When demand exceeds the zoning supply, we will still have prostitutes working in residential areas in flats and houses. So, I totally support what the member for Spence has said, and I condemn the deregulation of prostitution.

Mr CAUDELL secured the adjournment of the debate.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE: COURTS ADMINISTRATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Cummins:

That the fourteenth report 1994 of the committee on the Courts Administration (Directions by the Governor) Bill be received.

(Continued from 1 December. Page 1356.)

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): I want to say a few words on this topic, on which I seem to have spoken a great deal over the past 12 months. To recap: I introduced the Bill because of the disquiet that it apparently caused in the Liberal Party. I think it was the member for Chaffey who, a long way from the action, moved that the matter be referred to the Legislative Review Committee as a way of killing the issue because of the difficulty that certain members opposite were having in opposing the Bill.

As with all these things, that did not work. It would have been far easier from the Liberal Party's point of view just to oppose it, knock it off, and people would have had to take their chances out in the electorate. I do not think that, apart from me, the two members principally concerned (the

member for Gordon and the member for Eyre) would have lost their seat over this issue. They may lose their seat over other issues, but I do not think that this is the one that would have tipped them out. So, I think the Government went about it in rather a silly way.

Nevertheless it did this, and I have some very authoritative advice that, because of that procedure, the Bill is now dead, but I will, of course, as members opposite will be pleased to know, introduce another Bill in a slightly different form, more in accord with some of the comments that were made in the report of the Legislative Review Committee. Whilst the committee touched on the question of the reduction of services in country areas, I do not think it gave it anywhere near enough weight. The influence of the Chair of that committee (Hon. Robert Lawson, QC) was overwhelming, because the report was something of a non-report; it was a very legalistic one rather than one which in my view had full understanding of the issues that those of us in country areas are concerned about, that is, as I stated, the constant reduction of services in those areas, the withdrawal of professional people from those areas and the continual downward spiral that we appear to be on. As I understand it, the downward spiral will continue.

I understand, too, that the courts in Kadina and Naracoorte are to close altogether and that 30 full time equivalents are to be taken out of the Courts Administration Authority as a result of a reduction in their budget. If my information is correct—and it has come from a usually very reliable source—those local members who represent Kadina and Naracoorte ought to be using their influence wherever they can, particularly in the Cabinet, to see that that does not occur.

I was very disappointed throughout this exercise with the total lack of support or apparent understanding from members opposite of the importance in non-metropolitan South Australia of having not just the services but also the people who deliver those services resident in our local communities. The general reduction of services and the depopulation of areas are very real problems, not just on Eyre Peninsula (but, as I understand the figures, particularly on Eyre Peninsula), and I think the acceleration of this over the past 12 months has been quite staggering.

The Department of Primary Industries has led the way in reducing its services on Eyre Peninsula and throughout non-metropolitan South Australia. Obviously, I do not know what goes on in the Liberal Party room, but I appeal to members opposite who represent country areas not to allow this to continue, because in some areas it is creating virtual ghost towns. The communities are no longer becoming viable.

I will not go on about it in this debate, but in another debate I will refer to a very fine series of articles from the *Advertiser* of a few weeks ago. I think they were by Nigel Hunt; if not, I apologise to the author. It was an excellent series of articles, pointing out the degree of Government services that have been removed from Eyre Peninsula. People were very happy to go on the record in those articles saying what a dreadful deal they were getting out of the Liberal Government, which they thought was their Government, and that they would certainly be considering how they voted in the future. As I say, I appreciate not the parliamentary support but the public support I have had for my measure from the member for Eyre. I have made that clear in all the local media.

This has been useful and encouraging and will encourage me to go on even further because, despite the rather legalistic

nature of the report, I will certainly take note of the comments made in the report and ensure that when I introduce the new Bill it will be in a slightly different form from that which was referred to the committee. I hope that all members of the House will then give it the consideration that it deserves and look at it in the light of attempting to make a statement about the maintenance of public services and of public officials outside the metropolitan area. A lot of lip service is given to that, not just from members opposite but also from people in the general community, who feel uneasy about the depopulation of our areas. But, when we have a means of at least maintaining the status quo in these areas (in which I would prefer that we made some advances), I do not hear anybody suggesting any action to do it. Everybody just weeps, everybody laments and while they are doing that the non-metropolitan areas are becoming depopulated. That is very sad for our community. I know that members will look forward to this debate starting again when I introduce the new Bill to deal with this issue.

Motion carried.

LOTTERY AND GAMING (TWO UP ON ANZAC DAY) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 24 November. Page 1205.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): To refresh members' memory about this Bill, it is a Bill to legalise the playing of two-up on Anzac Day. As most members know, two-up has a long—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: As the member for Giles says, my Bill may damage our morals. The member for Newland and the member for Lee have put that point of view. In fact, members have said it is a danger to children.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: I tell you what, they do not have much of an idea about what children get up to these days if they think that two-up is going to excite them: children need much greater stimulation.

Mr ATKINSON: As the member for Giles says, children now need much greater stimulation than two-up when it comes to games. The Bill seeks to legalise two-up on Anzac Day. Two-up has a long tradition: it was played in Newgate Prison in England and was brought to Australia by the convicts. It then became part of the tradition of our diggers during the two world wars when it was played on the battlefield and played on the troop ships on the way home. It is a feature of Anzac Day that after the dawn service and the march, when the diggers retire to their hotels and clubs for a drink they play two-up.

Under the Lottery and Gaming Act two-up remains illegal. The diggers can be fined for playing two-up on Anzac Day. I am pleased to say that it is the policy of the police not to fine the diggers for playing two-up on Anzac Day and I commend the police on that attitude. Nevertheless, a small number of diggers continue to play the game just on Anzac Day, that one day of the year, and it is played at some RSL clubs. I understand that among Government members there is some concern that my Bill does not limit the playing of two-up to RSL clubs. There is some concern amongst Liberal Party members that this game may proliferate dangerously on Anzac Day, that diggers may have the temerity to play it in the laneway behind the scoreboard at Adelaide Oval.

The offer I make to Government members is this: that if the Bill should be amended to confine the playing of two-up

on Anzac Day to RSL clubs, I am happy to accept that amendment at the Committee stage. But I appeal to Government members, please give me a Committee stage on this so that we can look at the law in some detail. I am willing to accept that amendment from Government members. The House has been debating some serious moral issues in the last couple of days. We have been debating the question of brothels and prostitution. Yesterday we were, in effect, discussing the matter of active voluntary euthanasia. I cannot believe that there are Government members—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Giles interrupts to say that I have misrepresented the Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Bill. Perhaps I have, and for that reason I shall now say that yesterday we were discussing not active voluntary euthanasia, but palliative care, and perhaps the former only intruded slightly on the debate by those who were opposed to the Bill. Nevertheless, we have been debating serious moral issues. I find it hard to believe that there might be some Liberal members who support legal brothels and active voluntary euthanasia but who will not vote for two-up on Anzac Day because it is a danger to people's morality. I find it hard to believe that there could be such a member, but the member for Wright may disappoint me.

Mr Lewis: Or gratify you.

Mr ATKINSON: Gratify me, perhaps. I ask members to support the second reading of the Bill for the legalisation of two-up on Anzac Day for the benefit not just of the diggers but for another generation of Australians who have never served their country in battle and who would like to learn the game lawfully from their grandfathers.

The House divided on the second reading:

AYES (36)

Allison, H.	Andrew, K. A.
Armitage, M. H.	Atkinson, M.J.(teller)
Baker, S. J.	Bass, R. P.
Blevins, F.T.	Brindal, M. K.
Brokenshire, R. L.	Buckby, M. R.
Caudell, C. J.	Clarke, R.D.
Condous, S. G.	Cummins, J. G.
De Laine, M.R.	Foley, K.O.
Geraghty, R.K.	Greig, J. M.
Hall, J. L.	Hurley, A.K.
Ingerson, G. A.	Kerin, R. G.
Kotz, D. C.	Lewis, I. P.
Matthew, W. A.	Olsen, J. W.
Penfold, E. M.	Quirke, J.A.
Rann, M.D.	Rosenberg, L. F.
Scalzi, G.	Stevens, L.
Such, R. B.	Wade, D. E.
White, P.L.	Wotton, D. C.

NOES (7)

Ashenden, E.S.	Becker, H.
Evans, I.F.	Leggett, S.R.
Meier, E.J.	Rossi, J.P.(teller)
Venning, I.H.	

Majority of 29 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

WOMEN'S CRICKET TEAM

Ms GREIG (Reynell): I move:

That this House notes the outstanding performance of the South Australian women's cricket team in winning the national championship in Canberra on 8 January 1995.

In moving this motion, we are yet again illustrating the high achievements of South Australians in the sporting arena and, most importantly, the achievements of women in what has been, until recent years, a male dominated sport. The South Australian women's cricket team lost just one match of its seven, beating Victoria (seven wickets for 154) when it comfortably reached four for 155 with 1½ overs to spare in the grand final. This is South Australia's third championship in four years and is a measure of its dominance in women's cricket. It is important to note that a record four players—Joanne Broadbent, Lee-Anne Hunter, Karen Rolton and Caroline Ward—have been selected in the Australian team to tour New Zealand.

Wicket-keeper Tunde Juhasz was named the most valuable player of the national titles. She scored 333 runs at a batting average of 66.5. The team was captained by Andrea McCawley and coached by Denis Brien. This performance is further evidence of the strength of women's sport in South Australia that has been obvious in recent times. We only have to look back to 1994 to see that South Australia provided one quarter of the World Cup winning Australian hockey team. In Contax and Garville, we have the best two teams in the national netball league; Adelaide Quit Lightning won the Women's National Basketball League final; and the South Australian volleyball team is the national titleholder. We can also boast a number of individual athletes, including Amy Safe for rowing and Libby Kosmala for shooting, both truly South Australian and a credit to their sport.

Motion carried.

PORT ADELAIDE FOOTBALL CLUB

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I move:

That this House congratulates the Port Adelaide Football Club on being awarded South Australia's second licence to compete in the Australian Football League.

I never thought that I would reach the point where I could congratulate Port Adelaide on being awarded the second licence to compete in the Australian Football League. Considering the trials and tribulations of the past four or five years, which have seen the Crows emerge and, with the role that Port Adelaide played in that, I thought that we had the weight of the world against us in achieving the right to have the second licence in the AFL. It is a very important decision not just for my electorate, which is steeped in Port Adelaide tradition, but for all South Australians, as we now have two sides competing in the National Football League. However, more importantly from my point of view, we have a side which not only deserves to be in the AFL but which has earned the right to be in the AFL.

Whilst I will attempt to not be too parochial in my contribution this morning, I will probably have to stray a little from that. We really have to look at the history of Port Adelaide and at what the great Port Adelaide Football Club has brought to not just South Australian football but Australian football. As you would know, Mr Deputy Speaker, as a supporter yourself, we have been premiers of the league in South Australia 31 times; we have been second 34 times; and we have been out of the major round only 12 times since

1877. We have an Australian club record of six premierships in a row and, of course, we were champions of Australia in 1890, 1910, 1913 and 1914.

Port Adelaide is a very financial club. We have been turning over surpluses consistently for many years, and indeed we had \$1.7 million in members' funds as at July 1993. So our financial base has been built up for well over a decade of football. If we look at attendances in terms of what proportion of supporters attending the league every week are Port Adelaide supporters, we see that some 41 per cent of those people who go to the football on Saturday or Sunday support Port Adelaide. That is a significant statistic.

Port Adelaide has seen a significant increase year on year in recent times. Over the past three years we have seen a 13 per cent increase in the number of Port Adelaide supporters going to the football—at the same time as SANFL attendances have declined 14 per cent. So at a time when the general population's support of the SANFL is dropping, the Port Adelaide supporters are coming out in force. The number of grand finals that I have mentioned and the times that we have come second equate with the fact that Port Adelaide has appeared in an SANFL grand final, on average, every second season. So every second year the mighty Port Adelaide Football Club has appeared in a grand final in South Australian football.

Moving on, let us have a little closer look at the history of the Port Adelaide Football Club. Are we good enough, are we strong enough and are we viable to put quality footballers into the AFL? Since 1979, 27 Port Adelaide players have donned AFL guernseys in Victoria, and there are some champions amongst them. I do not intend to name all 27, but let us have a quick look at some of them. We have my childhood hero, Bruce Abernethy, who made it with North Melbourne and Collingwood. We see—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: He is the same age, I know, but I always wanted to be a Bruce Abernethy; that was my secret. I never really wanted to be a politician; I wanted only to play for Port Adelaide. We also have Craig Bradley. Russell Ebert, of course, played a season with North Melbourne. He came third in their best and fairest that year and was the only player not to miss a game with North Melbourne. Of course, Gavin Wanganeen was the 1993 Brownlow medallist—and in his second season. That is but a snapshot of the quality of the players. Nathan Buckley, the 1993 AFL Rookie of the Year, is another fantastic footballer. Look at Greg Phillips. Many members here represent the West Coast, and I am sure that, if the member for Eyre were here, he would agree with me, as I am sure the member for Giles does.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: He certainly does.

Mr FOLEY: The Phillips family, of course, has produced a number of children who have played for Port Adelaide, but none greater than Greg, who holds the SANFL record for the number of games played with Port Adelaide and who had a distinguished career at centre half back for the mighty Victorian Magpies.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Grainger actually came from Victoria, if you knew a bit about football. He was from St Kilda originally. As at December 1993, included in that list of 27 players who currently play or have played AFL football, 10 former Port Adelaide players had been drafted, and I understand a further 13 have been since that time. Almost 60 players produced by the Port Adelaide Football Club have either played AFL football or are in the draft. That is almost three football

teams: in the course of some 15 or 16 years, the Port Adelaide Football Club will have supplied three football sides. So, that is just a little bit of background as to the success and strength of the Port Adelaide Football Club, which clearly put us in a good position to be considered as the second side, although it was not automatic.

As we would all agree, you cannot just run on your record; you have to be about what you can do for the future. Port Adelaide put in a lot of work, and at this time I would like to pay special tribute to some individuals there. I have to be careful that I do not try to name them all, because that would be impossible. But the work of Greg Bolton, President of the Port Adelaide Football Club, must be acknowledged. His drive and leadership in putting the bid together was absolutely critical. As a lifetime supporter of Port Adelaide, I am indebted to his work. Another great footballer (and it was a tragedy that he did not play for a Victorian side or an AFL side) is Brian Cunningham, the Chief Executive Officer of the Port Adelaide Football Club, and the work that he and his team have done behind the scenes has been important.

There are many people to thank and I cannot name them all, but the names of Jim Nitschke, one of the board members, and Barry Wilson, the Chairman of the club, readily come to mind, as does that of Ian McLachlan—not he of political fame but a fellow board member, who has also been an important part of the team that put together the package that finally saw Port Adelaide being successful. But what did Port Adelaide say to the AFL and the SANFL that clinched it? History would not have been sufficient. Port Adelaide Football Club's detailed research showed that we had the largest supporter base, apart from the Crows; 26 per cent of all supporters who go to the football support Port Adelaide. No other side could get within a bull's roar of that figure.

We believe that we had a distinct marketing edge on the Crows. I do not want to knock the Crows: they are important for football. But we believe that the Port Adelaide Football Club provided a cultural difference from the Crows; that we could develop a significant difference between what the Crows were all about and who supported the Crows, and the type of supporter who supported Port Adelaide. The brand name 'Port Adelaide', of course, was a nationally recognised name, and 'Port Adelaide' could be easily identified by people throughout Australia. There would be very little difficulty in establishing, like Fremantle, a brand name for the Port Adelaide Football Club. Of course, if I can just indulge myself briefly, we do have an ingrained winning culture at Port Adelaide; we thus go into the AFL with that ingrained culture that winning is everything. Anyone who says that they play sport only for the enjoyment has never played sport; you only play sport to win.

The Port Adelaide proposal will result in the optimum financial position for all SANFL clubs. Our proposal will provide the best dividend for all SANFL clubs. The financial support resulting from Port Adelaide's entry into the AFL will help sustain the SANFL. A club-based side, against a further amalgamation of clubs, will allow minimal disruption and set up costs associated with that bid.

The market research produced some very interesting results. It showed a significant majority of the South Australian football community wanted a second side in the AFL by 1996. So, despite the rhetoric of some people—media commentators and those with vested interests—the overwhelming majority of South Australians under the independent research that we conducted wanted a second side by 1996. A total of 79 per cent of the community who

supported the idea of a club-based side in the AFL favoured Port Adelaide. It is interesting that 45 per cent of Crows supporters also supported a second side in the AFL. They are some of the statistics. I now want to enter into a little indulgence and rhetoric in the remaining few minutes.

The road to Port Adelaide coming into the AFL has been long and bumpy. I must say I had my reservations at the time Port Adelaide made its original bid for the AFL under the then leadership of Bruce Webber. Looking back, if Port Adelaide had not taken that bold and radical initiative, where we would be today? I suspect we would have had the Crows for only one season, if we had the Crows at all, and we would have seen perhaps another 100 footballers go to the AFL and not stay within South Australia, and that would have led to a vastly different picture of football and our league than we have today in South Australia. If people were fair and reflected back on the events of the early 1990s, and Port Adelaide's bold thrust into the unknown when it made an ambitious and failed attempt to join the AFL, even those who are most critical of the Port Adelaide Football Club would not at least acknowledge that that was a pivotal decision in the transformation of this league and the establishment of the Crows which by any criteria have been an overwhelming success.

Brian Cunningham, Greg Boulton, members of the Port Adelaide board and others have not achieved this result because of their work just in the past six or 12 months. The reason we were successful and perhaps other clubs were not is that we started our work some two to three years ago. The ground work that was laid by Brian Cunningham and Greg Boulton was absolutely pivotal in our submission's being rated without peer when they were judged by the independent commission. The professionalism of the Port Adelaide Football Club and the way in which it conducted itself given the events of the early 1990s is clearly evident. It was a massive PR job, in having to massage all the interest groups who were out to get Port Adelaide and stop the club at every turn. The very skilful work of Brian Cunningham, Greg Boulton and others in working the media, the corridors of power, the SANFL and the AFL will never be known, but I know that they were significant and very much the reason that the Port Adelaide Football Club was successful.

In the few minutes remaining, I reiterate that I am not asking members to say whether or not they agree with Port Adelaide. I suspect that, if put to the test, many members would be still stewing over the decision to give Port Adelaide the second licence. I can accept that. I am big enough to accept that people are still very aggrieved by the decision. However, let us at least stand in this House today and congratulate a great football club that has served not only my electorate, the people of my electorate, and the workers of my electorate but also has provided enjoyment to the people throughout South Australia. Our breadth of support is demonstrated by the fact that I know that I will be joined by the member for MacKillop, you, Sir, and others from all walks of life, from all political backgrounds and all geographical regions of South Australia in congratulating the Port Adelaide Football Club. The decision to give the licence to Port Adelaide was a great thing for Port Adelaide and, indeed, a great decision for South Australia.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER (Minister for Mines and Energy): I support the member for Hart in his comments. The granting of the licence has ended a long saga of unease in the football public in South Australia since it was first

mooted that there would be another AFL licence. I have been, as no doubt the member for Hart has been, a lifelong supporter of the Port Adelaide Football Club. When I was at boarding school in South Australia in the 1950s I remember attending grand finals every year and cheering on the mighty maggies. The Port Adelaide Football club is now very successful, and there is no doubt that it is the most successful football club in South Australia and, in fact, the most successful Australian Rules football club in Australia; no-one can take that away.

Members should understand that, administratively, the Port Adelaide Football Club is very well managed; and the players have a culture whereby they never say die. It is a culture where it does not matter if the side is being thrashed at three quarter time, you still give everything for your jumper (and those members who have played football will understand what that means), the coach and the club. It is that tremendous will to win that has made the Port Adelaide Football Club the success it is. For those people who are not supporters of the club or who criticise it, it really says something about life. There are many people who have come from a working class background in that area. Historically, the club was built up on the wharves of South Australia at Port Adelaide, and that battler image has gone through the club's history. Some of the nonsense that I hear and some of the abuse that other small-minded people dish out at the success of the Port Adelaide Football Club demeans—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I did not say anything; the honourable member is trying to incite me into saying other things. I have always made it very public that I have supported Port Adelaide Football Club all my life. When the first AFL licence was mooted and the row was on, I happened to be Leader of the Opposition. I was absolutely staggered at the threats made in relation to what these people would do to the political Party to which I belonged if I did not come out and say it was a terrible thing that Port Adelaide was going for this licence. The innuendo that went on during that period from not only officials of other football clubs but supposedly supporters of the Party that I represent really made me understand that some people cannot see the big picture.

As people who know me would be aware, I refused to do it on any issue of principle, because who you support in your sporting affiliations, the clubs you join and whatever else you do surely has to be your enterprise, and no-one should interfere. The negotiations that occurred around South Australia were quite heated, and there was bipartisan agreement on both sides of the political spectrum in respect of how we could sort out the mess.

I congratulate Greg Boulton, Brian Cunningham and members of the board. I especially congratulate Brian Cunningham, who is the club's executive officer. He has done an excellent job in trying to allay the fears of the South Australian public. I do not mind the fears of those who are jealous. Unfortunately, Australia is basically a nation of knockers, and anyone who is successful and achieves anything is usually criticised by someone. I guess a lot of that has been going on. The people at Port Adelaide understand that. They understand that, if people are successful, they have to be twice as sensitive. They have succeeded well. Not only that, but I believe the workings with the South Australian National Football League have shown a maturity and vision for the betterment of football that we have not seen in South Australia for a long period. It is all good. I congratulate Port Adelaide Football Club on becoming part of the AFL. When

it is let into the league I can assure members that I will be proudly standing there as one of the people who has worked damned hard behind the scenes to get Port Adelaide into the AFL, and I have done it unashamedly.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I have great pleasure in supporting the motion moved by the member for Hart. I agree with his sentiments and those of the Minister. Port Adelaide is one of the oldest football clubs in Australia and it is a very successful club. As the Minister rightly said, it is the most successful club in Australia. There is much tradition in the club and in many ways it is the heart and focus of the whole Port Adelaide wider community.

I will not refer further to the achievements of the club because the member for Hart has adequately covered them, but I would like to make a couple of points. First, Port Adelaide Football Club President, Greg Bolton, announced recently that, as the club will be going into the AFL, many new jobs will be created at the club. With the granting of the AFL licence, in addition to the introduction of poker machines, more than 50 new jobs have been generated within the club itself. That is a great effort.

While talking about jobs, I refer to what the Port Adelaide Football Club has done to try to put something back into the community to which it owes so much in the way of support for well over 100 years. Late last year the club in conjunction with the Port Adelaide CES initiated the special '1 000 Jobs by Christmas' project. This was a successful initiative and I was on the committee that helped run the project. By Christmas, well over 1 000 jobs had been created in the local area. That is something that the Port Adelaide Football Club has put back into the community to say 'Thank you' to its many supporters over the years who have supported the club.

It is very much a community based club and I join with the Minister and congratulate club President, Greg Bolton, Brian Cunningham and other officials and club supporters for the work that they have put in in obtaining this licence. I wish them well when they enter the AFL, probably next year.

Ms HURLEY (Napier): In common with the member for Hart, I grew up wanting to play football for Port Adelaide.

Members interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: I did realise a bit earlier than the member for Hart that I did not have much of a chance to do so. My mother and father both grew up in the Port and my father was actually on his way to getting a game for Port Adelaide when he moved to the Mount Gambier League and played for South Gambier. Nevertheless, he taught all three of his children how to play football, and all of the girls could beat the boys for a long while. However, we gracefully retired at an early age. When we moved back to Adelaide, it was not any use going to my grandmother's on Sunday if Port Adelaide had lost the day before.

An honourable member: Bad losers!

Ms HURLEY: They were not bad losers. I simply make the point that it will be hard for Port Adelaide in the first few years in moving into the AFL. One of the reasons why it is good that Port Adelaide got the second AFL licence is that it knows that all its supporters will stick behind it, no matter what happens. We may be disappointed if they lose, but they know that they can depend on our support through all the ups and downs of their games. This is why it was so important that the second AFL licence did go to a team which, as the member for Hart has outlined, has a strong history and strong following in Adelaide. I certainly hope that in 1996 we will

be well on the way to competing in the AFL. It will not come soon enough for me.

Mr BASS (Florey): I begrudgingly support the motion of the member for Hart. I will put my cards on the table: I am a supporter and I have been for many years.

Mr Foley: Was that Sturt?

Mr BASS: Yes, it was. I am a proud Sturt supporter, but I believe that Port Adelaide has a place in South Australian football history.

Mr Atkinson: When was the last time Sturt beat Port in a grand final?

Mr BASS: I refuse to be led astray by the member for Spence. There is no doubt that Port Adelaide was the catalyst for the birth of the Crows and, as the member for Hart said, the club has an excellent record, with six premierships in a row. It was nearly not the only team to have that because of poor umpiring decisions when Sturt nearly became premier six times in a row. There is no doubt about it: Port Adelaide has produced some brilliant footballers, and the member for Hart told us how many the club has produced in the past few years.

It is good that we will have another AFL team, but the South Australian National Football League and Football Park must not become the only area where AFL football is played. The Adelaide Oval is a beautiful ground and it will be silly to have two teams in the western suburbs. The Adelaide Oval should be used and I hope that, whatever is finally negotiated between Port Adelaide, the Crows and the South Australian directors, it is the best for football across South Australia.

Its supporters are fanatical. Throughout South Australia football supporters generally are very good. If you have ever been to Europe and watched a soccer match, where the fans are separated by high fences and have to be kept apart, you will know why I say that I hope this never happens in South Australia. I have been to many football games and I have watched the fans. They stand alongside each other; part of the enjoyment is being with fans from opposing sides and being able to barrack without the violent behaviour that takes place in England and Europe.

Because Australian football is our national game and is played nowhere else in the world, it is important that we make it a truly national concept and, with the entrance of Port Adelaide to the AFL, we will have two teams here; with the Fremantle Dockers, Western Australia has two teams; and there is one team in Sydney and one in Brisbane. The sooner there is a team in Tasmania, two in Sydney and two in Brisbane, the better it will be for our national game.

We have had the advent of the national soccer league, the basketball league, cricket, netball and rugby—and the rugby codes are already spreading their wings and coming into South Australia where the game is really foreign to a majority of South Australians. I think it is excellent. I begrudgingly congratulate the Crows for what they have done in the past and what they will do in the future. I must compliment not just the team itself but also the people behind the team: the backroom boys, the committee—the people who negotiate the deals and who do all the work that makes the players heroes but who never get the recognition that they deserve.

The member for Hart has named quite a few of those people and I, too, congratulate them and say that they have done an excellent job for the Port Adelaide football team. I look forward to the local derby in the years to come, when we see Port Adelaide meet the Crows, and I am sure that there will be standing room only. I support the motion.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I want to put on the record my support for this motion. Like the member for MacKillop, I have been a Port supporter from the very early days, when I first came from the country.

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: If members will wait I will tell the whole story. I can remember very vividly when I journeyed to Prospect Oval with many of my country people, most of whom were North Adelaide supporters. I was not committed at that stage. I would have been about 10 or 11 years of age. At three-quarter time North Adelaide was in front by nine goals and the people with me were quite pathetic. In fact, it was quite embarrassing to be with them: they were so cocky that they would wipe off the mighty Black and Whites. I wished then that these people would be taught a lesson. Well, Port won that match by five goals.

The late Wally Dittmar, whom I will never forget, put on a fantastic display, and I have been a supporter ever since. They have never let me down. I joined the club with the likes of the Hannaford brothers, particularly Ian Hannaford—I was a great fan of his. He took massive marks and I worshipped the ground he walked on. Likewise, another local boy, Graham Sweeney, joined Port Adelaide and there were many others.

Australians love success; we all love success; and Port has been the epitome of success. It wins even when the chips are down. It is a pity that more Australians do not follow this example. No-one should underestimate Port Adelaide at any time during the game, because it is not done or down until the final siren blows. Port Adelaide is the only other team from South Australia that could be expected to play in the AFL competition. Port has the support base, as the member for MacKillop and the member for Hart said, with 41 per cent of supporters, and it is easy to understand why.

Even my wife, who is not an avid football supporter, quietly admires Port, even though she would never admit that. When I am not there she always watches the match and she always knows the score. Many South Australians, even though they may not be members, admire Port Adelaide Football Club's success. The winning of 32 premierships speaks for itself. Port Adelaide will deliver to the AFL competition what the Crows could not; that is, the guts and the will to win. 'Never lie down' is the prevailing attitude. I will be upgrading my membership, because I did let it lapse in the middle years, and I will be a very proud member. If you ever want a lesson, just consider the last grand final. Who were the underdogs on that day?

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I don't know; I have forgotten; they were the also-rans, but, irrespective, the Port club was not expected to win. It was down with injuries, and the record speaks for itself.

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: You can bellow all you like, but the record is there for all to see. I wish the club all the best in the future, and I hope that its entry into the AFL will be marked with continued success.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): It gives me pleasure to support this motion. I am not a traditional football supporter or, indeed, a Port Adelaide supporter, but I support the motion because the granting of a second licence is a great support for football and for South Australia. Regardless of where we sit on the football boundaries, we must acknowledge the fact that this South Australian club has a great tradition and history.

Regardless of whom one supports in the competition, one must admit that this club has made it, it will represent us and the State with this second licence, and I think all members should congratulate the Port Adelaide Football Club, its loyal supporters and all those people who made it possible for them to get that second licence. I am sure that football will be the better for it and that, as a result, I am likely to see a few more football matches—when Adelaide City is not playing!

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): The arguments for this motion have been nauseating. I had the pleasure to attend the grand final in 1966, 1967, 1968, 1971, 1972 and 1976. What those grand finals had in common was that Port Adelaide lost them all. In fact, in 1971—

Mr Condots: They lost the ones in 1945 and 1953 to the Eagles, too.

Mr ATKINSON: I thank the member for Colton for that contribution—the Port Adelaide Football Club could not even register a goal up to half time, and that in a grand final!

Mr Foley: That was 24 years ago.

Mr ATKINSON: Well, I am old enough to remember, I was there. Port Adelaide could not register a goal up to half time, which is a disgrace to any club competing in a grand final and, I think, has been paralleled only by the North Adelaide Football Club in the 1989 grand final.

I am a member of the Woodville-West Torrens Football Club and before that club came into existence I was a member of the Woodville Football Club. My constituency covers the areas of Hindmarsh, Croydon, Woodville and Findon. The amalgamated club covers an area broader than that as it includes the Town of Thebarton and the City of West Torrens.

It is commonly supposed in Adelaide that, if you stand on the crest of the hill at North Adelaide and look down towards Port Adelaide, everyone from there to the port is black and white. This kind of ignorance was once displayed at a public function by His Grace the Archbishop of Adelaide (the Most Reverend Ian George), who had the discourtesy to attend the centenary of the Hindmarsh branch of the Royal District Nursing Society and ask during this celebration why our colours were not black and white. They have never been black and white. The district of Hindmarsh and Woodville has an entirely different tradition. We have our own football club and we are proud of it.

I am a supporter of the South Australian National Football League. I support a local club and I enjoy local football. I enjoy football which is played at local grounds. I enjoy a football system that nurtured young people in schools to play Australian Rules Football. What we find today, with the advent of the Australian Football League, is the commercialisation of football, that football is losing its district roots and that the current AFL clubs have no relationship with any district in Melbourne. Some clubs, such as Fitzroy, are entirely rootless. Fitzroy Football Club no longer draws support from the Fitzroy district; it is some kind of floating commercial organisation that draws its support from wherever it can. So I am opposed to South Australia going into the AFL. I recognise that, regrettably, it is inevitable, but football will never be like it was—and that is very sad indeed.

What does the AFL do to nurture football in our schools, particularly our high schools? There is not one school in my area that has a senior Australian rules football team; not even Woodville High has an Australian rules team any more. That is because the AFL does not really care about the national game. What the AFL is about is making money and televising

the gladiators battling on TV. In fact, it is all about TV. An umpire in the AFL cannot now bounce the ball after a goal is scored until a little light goes on in the grandstand saying the ads are over and he can start the game. That is what Australian rules have been reduced to. It is the treason of the Port Adelaide Football Club against local football that has led to South Australia losing our football tradition. If Port Adelaide Football Club gets its way, soon no high school will have an Australian rules football team; the players will be hired guns on contracts. So, the only place that the game will exist any more will be on television. This is a tragedy for Australian rules football: we are losing our national tradition and Port Adelaide Football Club is the traitor that is losing it.

I am a follower of a club which is right up against Port Adelaide. We have to live in the shadow of Port Adelaide and that has been very difficult for the Woodville Football Club over the years.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence has the call; there will be no trial by television, either.

Mr ATKINSON: So, my club has had to live in the shadow of the Port Adelaide Football Club, because it is a much longer established club and it has a much bigger following, most of it, I might say, from outside the Port Adelaide area. So, it is with trepidation that I see that the AFL proposes to carve up Adelaide into two zones, one south of the Torrens, which would support the Adelaide Football Club—the Crows—and another team north of the Torrens, which would support the Port Adelaide Football Club. I think that this colonial approach to Adelaide is undesirable and that the Woodville West Torrens Football Club would be unwise to enter into any kind of association with the Port Adelaide Football Club. I certainly do not want our club to be a tributary for players to the Port Adelaide Football Club.

I would support the Port Adelaide Football Club in the AFL if it were proposing to make some concessions to other clubs north of the Torrens, such as North Adelaide, Central District or the Woodville West Torrens Football Club, but there will be no concessions on home ground or location of the social club, on colours or on symbols. Port Adelaide Football Club will just go its own way. It is not interested in any of the other clubs north of the Torrens. There will be no concessions to us. So, I can only take a personal decision, and that is that I will not support AFL football. I will not be going to their games, nor will I be watching them on television. I do not care if I am alone in that: I will support the old tradition of the district system and my pleasure will be going to Woodville Oval on a Saturday afternoon, win, lose or draw.

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I would like to add my congratulations to the Port Adelaide Football Club: it was a worthy recipient of the second licence. Being a very strong, parochial South Australian, although I am not going to support Port when it plays the Crows, I will certainly support it the other 15 or 16 times when it plays teams from the AFL competition. I say that, because I never switch: once I make my mind up that is it. I have been a Crows supporter from day one and I will continue to be. We have heard the glowing reports—how fantastic it is and what a great side—but I can remember an old codger many years ago when I was a kid. He had this horse in the backyard and he used to say how in its last six races it ran first in every race. Someone said to him, 'Where has it won?' He said 'It has won at Strathalbyn,

Port Pirie and Bordertown.' When I walked away one of the fellows said, 'Poor old bastard; what happens when he takes it to Flemington—that will sort out the men from the boys.'

That is what Port Adelaide has to worry about. It is all right winning at Alberton, or knocking South or Sturt off by 10 or 15 goals at the Adelaide Oval; wait until it gets to the real world at the MCG and there are 120 000 Victorians barracking for Essendon or Collingwood, then let us see where the guts is. The Dockers are in for a hard year and Port is going to have a harder one when it enters in 1996 as well—that will sort out the men from the boys. George Fiacchi will not be spinning pizzas; George Fiacchi will be sitting on the sidelines cooking spaghetti for the boys when they get trounced by 20 goals.

Port supporters are a selfish mob: as the member for Spence just said, they want their cake and they want to eat it, too. What it wants to do is form an AFL side in 1996 and turn around and have 40 licensed machines down there on the Port Road where it has a wonderful licensed facility, but it does not want to relinquish its one-ninth share in the Crows. So, it wants to make the profits that it is going to generate, but at the same time, when the Crows are in Victoria or playing at AFL Park and it has attracted 48 000 people, it wants a ninth share of that profit as well. It has gone one step further than that again; it wants to create another licensed premises, so it has gone down to Port Districts—a wonderful amateur league club where everyone gets paid. We from the Henley-Greek Football Club lost one of our players because we could not hold him. We lost a player because he would no longer play for nothing. He went down to Port Districts and it paid him \$300 a game.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CONDOUS: And Ebert's brother is down there playing for \$350 a game. Port Adelaide has now decided that it will amalgamate its SANFL side with Port Districts. It is going to put another 40 pokies down there and say, 'Listen, if you support the Port Adelaide SANFL side go down to Largs because that is where we are; and if you want to support the AFL side it is on Port Road.' Port is going to get the money from both to become wealthier, but it is also going to sponge off the Crows because it does not want to relinquish that at all.

The practicalities are that football is a way of life. It is a culture in this country: it is something that we look forward to. I would say I have paid to see in excess of 1 000 matches since 1945. I cannot spend a Saturday without going to a football match: I do not feel right for the rest of the week. That is the sort of culture it is to me. It is my relaxation, excitement and buzz in life. How will the other eight SANFL teams compete when Port Adelaide has 42 registered players on its AFL list, 21 of whom will play in the AFL competition, with the second best 21 being streets ahead of all those footballers in the other eight teams? Will I go along every week, will my colleague here who is a West Adelaide supporter go along and will others who barrack for Sturt go along and watch a class team, whose players are ready to go into the top AFL side, thrash teams week after week by 15 or 20 goals? What Mr Basheer and the CEO have to consider is that if they do not get smart pretty soon there will not be an SANFL or a breeding ground for future champions. Every one of those eight other teams will be breeding the future champions to go into the Crows or the draft to supply the rest of Australia.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: I am the patron, I know. I am saying that the rest of the teams in the SANFL will be providing these players for the draft while Port Adelaide retains 42 players, the best 21 of whom will be playing AFL and the second best playing SANFL, and the numbers of people who will go to SANFL matches will drop dramatically until it is hardly viable for that competition to continue. I do not think it is fair. While I congratulate Port Adelaide—I think it was deservedly the team that had to go into the competition—it is a sad state of affairs when it is not decent enough to drop out of the SANFL and simply concentrate on the AFL. No other team in Australia has that advantage. Not one of the 16 teams competing in the AFL has the advantage of being able to play a team in the AFL and a team in the second best competition in Australia, the SANFL. You can always kill the goose that laid the golden egg. Unless the South Australian National Football League is not very careful, it will kill off that local competition and there will be nothing left.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I was listening to the debate in my room and, being bemused by it, I came into the Chamber to listen to it further. I commend the members for Spence and Colton on their contributions. I came down because some of what I had heard previously I just did not believe. As the member for Colton said, football is a way of life. I heard some very interesting comments from both those speakers, comments which I hope will be more widely reported, because they deserve the serious attention of all South Australians. It is the second time that I have heard the member for Spence speak well this morning. In both cases I believe he is marginally wrong and represents an anachronistic stance. Nevertheless, he has spoken well.

I will support this motion, because we live in the world in which we live and it is a world of change, and what the member for Colton said especially needs to be taken on board because it is possible to kill the goose that laid the golden egg. We can stand here and wax lyrical about football teams, enjoy the debate and carry on. We can all do that really good Australian thing: support a champion. It is one thing that no politician ever loses out on: getting out and supporting the champions and being seen to stick up for sport. In football it is said that a champion team always beats a team of champions. That is true, except in this place. South Australia is owed a team of champions in this place—champions of decent causes and of right and wrong. I would ask those members who have spoken this morning to think carefully about what they said regarding the virtues of Port Adelaide, because I agree with them. If they support the member for Hart's motion, as I will, I suggest that they put it into practice in their political lives and try to act like a team of champions, try to emulate Port Adelaide and what it is doing, and act responsibly in this place.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I move:

That this House condemns the Opposition and in particular the Leader of the Opposition for its continual negative carping attitude to the economic recovery now under way in South Australia.

I commence my remarks by quoting the following press report:

'South Australia has to change its business culture and dropkick whingers to the sideline if it is to succeed economically in the future,' a Minister says. 'We need action, not words, and we need

to escape from the blame mentality where it is always someone else's fault that things aren't being done.' . . . 'I see whingeing and blaming as a substitute for a lack of ideas and a lack of guts.' . . . 'In the US, they set an objective and then work towards it, solving problems along the way.' . . . 'It never ceases to amaze me in South Australia just how much credence is paid to that small minority of knockers who are always pessimistic about our chances of success yet are the first to claim credit when we score a win.'

These quotes appeared under the headline 'Dropkick whingers, says Rann' in the *Advertiser* of 3 September 1993, just before the last State election. Of course, we have spoken in this House on plenty of occasions about the history of the State's debacle, which was well known to all prior to December 1993. It is interesting that, when we start to debate something that is crucial to this State, that is, bipartisanship and getting on with a positive and aggressive job of helping this State recover from the debacle we have seen, only one member of the Labor Party is prepared to get involved.

In December 1993, there was a new chance, a chance to get on with the job. What happened when we came into Government? It would be fair to say that, until about September 1994, members of the Opposition appeared to be in an absolute daze; in fact, we hardly heard from them in the press and we did not hear from them much at all in the House. Then, in September 1994, along came the so-called new direction for the South Australian section of the Australian Labor Party, together with the new Leader of the Opposition, the gentleman whose comments I have just quoted. He claimed that he had a new direction, that he would be bipartisan, positive, that he was a new image, a new broom sweeping clean. He was not a part of the State's debacle; he was the new image for the Labor Party, he would look at the conduct of this House; and he certainly would not be carping about anything unless it had total validity.

One would think from the Leader's comments that members opposite had now seen the light and for once would become a firm, fair and credible Opposition, willing to point out genuine concerns with the Government (which is fair enough) but, where the Government is getting on with the job, likewise getting on with their job, realising the importance of supporting the Liberal Government's endeavours. Of course, we must be prepared to accept that there has to be recovery, there has to be some planning, some of which will cause a bit of pain for all of us, and there has to be a true vision for South Australia.

Let us move on and see what has started to happen with the so-called clean new image of Mike Rann and his Opposition team. It was interesting to note on 3 February this year the headline 'Premier applauds industry recovery'. That is quite a good and fair report dealing with the industrial recovery of South Australia, only some 12 months after we came into Government. I will now quote a few other messages from the Leader and tie them in with this picture of the negative Party opposite and the particularly negative Leader of the Opposition. As I said, the headline read, 'Premier applauds industry recovery', and the Leader of the Opposition accused the Premier of talking up the economy. I quote:

The ACM figures show SA manufacturers led the nation in production levels in the December quarter, with 60 per cent of SA firms surveyed reporting an increase—

That, I might add, was the best performance of any State in Australia. The article further states:

The survey shows 56 per cent of SA firms recorded increased sales. Western Australia was top with 58 per cent.

Of course, the Department of Employment, Education and Training skilled vacancy survey released that day showed that the number of places available for jobs had been increasing steadily, that is, new vacancies available for jobs since mid-1993. I have just pointed out to this House how Mike Rann wants to start pulling down the good work of this Government—although he was the person who as recently as September 1993 was having a go at those people he believed were negative and carping about this State.

It is interesting that, on 25 November 1992, a headline from the Leader of the Opposition read, 'Hints from a tourist who never went home'. The Leader said:

I actually think we tend to undersell what we've got to offer.

Yet, on 3 February 1995, when we started to see a recovery, Mike Rann accused the Premier of talking up the economy. What double standards. What right has any person, in the capacity of Leader of the Opposition, to go around pulling this State down? None whatsoever. Many members on this side of the House came in here to get on with the job; we wanted to be part of the recovery. We have put up with this for 12 months, but we will not put up with it any longer, because the people of South Australia are telling us that the Opposition is now totally irrelevant, absolutely negative and has no desires whatsoever for this State other than to try to pull down the good work being done by this Government, for cheap political point scoring in the hope that it might start to claw back a few votes at the next election.

I ask: where is the evidence of the Opposition supporting the *bona fide* and good policy laid down by this Government prior to the last election and that we now want to carry out? Frankly, and unfortunately, the Opposition has given neither me nor the people of South Australia any evidence of that. In another article on 30 January, the Premier warns about the mandate we have and how important it is for the fundamental recovery of this State that this House work in a bipartisan way in the interests of South Australia. Mike Rann said:

The Government's mandate was not absolute.

I ask members: if we did not have an absolute mandate when will we ever have a mandate that is absolute in this State? He further states:

Brown says we are irrelevant, until he needs our support.

Of course, the Opposition is irrelevant because it has not been prepared to give any crucial fundamental support to this State, and its attitude, as I have already said, is absolutely deplorable. Take law and order, for instance. I received, along with my constituents, a flier, a piece of propaganda and trash, indicating that the Leader of the Opposition is now, suddenly, after being a member of a Government with a pretty chequered history on law and order, concerned about gang warfare, etc, and he has written letters to all electorates about that.

He did not do too well down our way, I might add. In fact, I had a phone call from one constituent who said, 'What audacity the Opposition has to write this sort of trash,' and he added that it went straight into his bin after he had read it. He also said:

Since your Government came into power I have very much appreciated the increased police presence in our southern area. I have appreciated the fact that you have opened an additional police station in the southern area. Frankly, all I can see from this is that Mike Rann and the Opposition are now trying to get on the band wagon, because your Government has got on with the job and started to correct some of these problems, such as law and order.

In relation to health, everyone knows that we have a problem there. Graham Richardson, the previous Federal Minister for

Health, has indicated that he thinks that the Federal Government is really floundering with the health problem. Of course, if the Federal Government is floundering with that problem, it does not help the situation in South Australia. Members opposite now want to have a crack at the Government every time some issue comes up in relation to health, yet they know that under their Government the area of health was pulled apart in this State. The Opposition spokesperson referred to health and country hospitals in this House the other day, but what did the former Labor Government do to the McLaren Vale Hospital in my electorate? It destroyed that hospital. What did we do when we came into Government? We reinstated the funding and gave autonomy to that hospital.

Let us look at the tragedy in relation to Garibaldi. What a tragedy for the Robinson family. Having children myself I was, as much as any person in this State, really broken-hearted to read about what had happened there. Obviously, we were also pretty upset, as a State, about what was happening all up with that food scare. However, for very cheap political point scoring, which is evident in a recent article on food poisoning, the State's Labor Opposition tried to make political mileage from the official handling of the matter. I think it is pretty sad when you get a situation where you have children and adults in a serious condition in hospital, where unfortunately you have had the death of a lovely child, where you have 1 500 workers whose jobs rely upon selling mettwurst and smallgoods, and you have an Opposition that once again wants to carp and destroy, purely for political point scoring. As the Coroner said, everything is being done, and he has the broadest possible powers to get on with an investigation. The people on the streets are clearly saying, 'For goodness sake, why don't the Opposition shut up on this, and get on with the job.'

I could go on about the negatives in relation to reform, job creation, new investment, and so on. Of course, the picture has continued to deteriorate for the negative Party opposite and its Leader. Only this week in the House, for some desperate point scoring, members opposite decided that they were going to drag in, fabricate and totally misrepresent statements, such as 'WorkCover bidders for claims management had donated to the Liberal Party' and the inference then that they had preferential treatment. Of course, yesterday the Minister exposed once again what the fabricator and the negative Opposition were up to.

I read recently that, in December, the Hon. Mike Rann all of a sudden was calling for a mini-budget for South Australia. Mr Rann said that the Government had failed to plan for expected developments in the national economy. What a joke! And once again it is absolutely negative scandal. The fact is that the former Labor Government not only failed to plan: it destroyed. We have a blueprint, the plans are working and members opposite damn well know it. I believe that Federal information back in February/March/April last year was indicating a 1 or 1½ percentage point increase in interest rates. Of course, we all know what has happened there.

Sure, we have a problem, but it is the Federal Labor Government that is not prepared to take on board the restructuring and the reform. It is tired, it has been in government for too long and it does not have the vision or direction that this State Government has to get on with the job and cut the deficit, create jobs and be responsible with its own spending. So, we know that all the Federal Government did was to decide, once again, on a totally simplistic plan, to raise interest rates rather than look at other issues. People have said to me, 'Why would you want the Opposition involved in

economic summits in this State, commenting on mini-budgets, and so on, when its track record stands thus?' I trust that, for all South Australians and future South Australians, the Labor Government's record will stand alone as the absolute worst record that this State has ever seen.

In conclusion, I, for one, can say that my constituents are fed up and sick and tired of the Opposition's negative carping attitude to all the good work that has been done in this State. If the negative Party opposite wants to remain in Opposition for an even longer time than will be the case, I say to members opposite, 'Keep up the poor and negative attitude and the lack of bipartisanship which you are currently illustrating and which you have illustrated particularly since September 1994, when the so-called leopard with the new spots tried to create a new image, and you will be in Opposition for the next 15 or 20 years.'

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PASSENGER SERVICE ATTENDANTS

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): I move:

That this House congratulates the Government on its decision to respond to the public outcry following the former Government's decision in 1992 to get rid of guards on trains, by progressively introducing from November 1994 60 Passenger Service Attendants on rail services in the Adelaide metropolitan area; and, further, that it notes the positive impact they are having on TransAdelaide's campaign to wipe out fare evasion and increase security for passengers generally.

Before I speak to my motion, I indicate that I was amused—I think that is the word—at the depth of debate that was given to the member for Hart's ideas about Port Adelaide and the AFL. I look forward to a similar number of members being interested enough to debate the Supply Bill and the appropriation of \$600 million. I encourage members to debate the important issues that we put forward in private members' time rather than trivialities, such as a football team.

For some time I have been concerned about the previous Government's removal of guards from the train system, because it has caused a serious decline in patronage, in confidence in our public transport system and in the return of revenue. My second reason for raising this issue is to attempt to clear up some misconceptions that have been pushed into the community by the confusion of the roles of the Passenger Service Attendants (PSAs) and the Transit Squad. I have previously placed on record in this place my congratulations to both the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Correctional Services for the actions that both have taken to address safety issues, patronage and revenue retention on our public transport system.

Previously, I have also addressed the decreased patronage's being mostly attributable to lack of confidence in our transport system and the lack of security on that system. As early as 1987 the problem of train security was raised with the then STA and the Australian Railways Union, which was called in to talk with the STA and the previous Government. There was at that time a growing problem of anti-social behaviour on our transport system. To attempt to combat this growing problem, a small number of police worked with special constables at the Adelaide Railway Station.

The previous attempt to overcome the growing problems by using the 20 members of the Transit Squad and rail guards proved unsuccessful. Rail guards became confused about their role in this process, because they clearly were originally

in place to be ticket checkers. Under the new development they were increasingly being expected to confront this anti-social behaviour and to deal with it without any appropriate training. Placed in such a position without adequate training, they unfortunately found themselves in assault situations; they were verbally and physically abused and, in some cases, the previous Government even made them responsible for the level of damage that was caused on the public transport system.

In 1991, as a result of these problems, guards were replaced completely by transit officers. At this time there were 48 transit officers, and they were employed with the specific role of curbing anti-social behaviour. However, the problem with this policy was that the transit officers were then given the specific role of acting on the behavioural problems but still were virtually untrained, so they had untrained status and limited powers to deal with the problem. Consequently, they also became the target of the anti-social behaviour. They lacked police power to deal with the major problems and were virtually impotent to take action when problems arose and only gave the facade of a policed system. Obviously the general public, as users of the service, were not fooled by this smokescreen put in place by the previous Government. They felt unsafe; they experienced escalating problems on the transport system; and they left the service in droves.

When coming to government, we were faced with a major problem to be addressed with urgency. The previous Labor Government oversaw rapidly declining patronage, blatant fare evasion and major security problems. From January to December 1993, the system under Labor recorded 168 arrests and 225 reports on the public transport system by police officers and transit officers. There was a total of 393 incidents in 1993. This was during a time when the current Leader of the Opposition identified an escalation of gang violence and general poor behaviour, including graffiti and vandalism, and this was growing in the public transport system. I will compare this lack of activity to the current successes in a short time.

I raised in this House the issue of vandalism and attacks on drivers as early as 11 October 1994, after spending time with my southern colleagues talking to union representatives in the southern area. Coincidentally, that was sometime before the Leader of the Opposition's copy of the New South Wales Labor Leader's gang policy was released as a new innovation for us to consider in South Australia. Our Government has not played with the system. We have addressed the issue head on and achieved results. Fare evasion was estimated to be some 50 per cent as viewed by camera surveillance prior to the introduction of our measures. It is estimated this cost taxpayers \$320 000 annually.

Our method of dealing with this problem was to introduce Passenger Service Attendants (PSAs). By March this year we will have 60 new guards on trains with plans to put some onto buses. The primary role is to provide customer service and revenue protection and to regain customer confidence in the rail system. They are not authorised officers under the Passenger Transport Act 1994, so they do not have the power to issue transit infringement notices. By allowing them to do this, we would simply be repeating the mistakes of the previous Government.

In the role of customer service, the PSAs provide a high level of service to passengers, particularly those with special needs. They allow the disabled to use the service with dignity. They assist with ticket needs and transfers, and this is very

important for the elderly and those who are using the system for the first time. They have a role in revenue protection by performing ticket inspections both on and off board. They monitor and report security problems to the relevant trained authorities. The obvious success of this system of the PSAs working closely with transit police and field supervisors is borne out by the figures. In 1994, between January and December, there were 953 arrests and 971 reports, a total of 1 928 incidents, compared with 393 in the previous 12 months. In January 1995 alone, there were 95 arrests and 73 reports—a total of 169 incidents, which is more than double the previous January. This success speaks for itself. Our Government must be congratulated for this excellent result.

PSAs conduct visual checks of tickets and work in conjunction with field supervisors who do the more detailed electronic checks and can issue transit infringement notices. It was never intended that PSAs perform the action of transit police. The very act would repeat the previous Government's mistake and totally negate the friendly service role that they are intended to have. There are in fact a list of 33 duty requirements that the PSAs perform, and I am therefore unhappy to hear the member for Spence's publicly degrading their role, which I believe is really responsible, when he said:

They're cheerful, they welcome people onto the train and sometimes they make little announcements about what a nice day it is and how the train is on time.

I am sorry that the Opposition spokesman for transport trivialises the valued work of the PSAs in such a way. The honourable member also said in the same radio program on 5DN at 8.40 a.m. on 3 January 1995:

The Labor Government had botched things up a bit by getting rid of the old guards.

He further said:

... the new PSA had had no effect on fare evasion.

I have to counter such inaccurate statements by bringing to the notice of the House the success story of the recorded revenue banked from transit vendor machines for the period September 1994 to January 1995. The success represents a three-fold increase in revenue take during the time the PSAs were put onto the transport system as opposed to the member for Spence's suggestion that they have not made any difference to revenue. To suggest then, as the member for Spence has suggested, that the PSAs are not worth the money it takes to pay them and that they should be replaced by a ticket barrier at the Adelaide Railway Station is not accepted.

The statement that the Labor Government had decided to buy barriers at the railway station is also not correct. The previous Government called for quotations via the STA for the installation of barriers, and a decision was made not to proceed when all the information had been gathered. TransAdelaide could not justify the expenditure on the basis of the revenue that would be recovered.

The other spin-off or positive effect of the PSAs is the reduction of graffiti and vandalism, and that is greatly appreciated by commuters. TransAdelaide has received good feedback with many commendations from passengers. I refer to a letter received from a person living in the Salisbury area who congratulated TransAdelaide on the cleanliness and friendliness of the staff. It is only one example of the correspondence received. The role of the PSAs as it currently stands was instigated quite deliberately and on the advice of the senior sergeant of the Transit Police Division. Clearly, the transit police have greater powers and are properly trained to face the confrontation process. It was important to separate

the roles and to allow them to remain apart. Transit police have the benefit of training; the PSAs should not be placed in a situation of confronting anti-social behaviour. This will clearly take the role of the PSAs away from customer service.

In conclusion, I put on the record further successes that this Government can be proud of. There are now 67 fully trained police—an increase of seven since our coming to government. The increase in the number of reports and arrests already alluded to speaks for itself. The anti-graffiti program from Lonsdale and the use of protective film on windows and security screens for bus drivers will give greater protection to drivers. The introduction of PSAs onto our trains has been a very successful and necessary move to address Labor's mistakes.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

WINE TAX

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Brokenshire:

That in the interests of the Australian Wine Industry, and in particular the South Australian wine industry, this House requests that the Federal Government reverse the current policy to increase wine tax to 26 per cent in July 1995 and cap the tax at the general level of 21 per cent.

(Continued from 1 December. Page 1366.)

Mr VENNING (Custance): I totally support this motion and commend the mover, the member for Mawson. I am amazed, absolutely flabbergasted and grossly annoyed, to say the least, that the Federal Labor Government has seen fit to slap this impost on Australia's greatest success story, that is, our wine industry. We certainly do not have many industries in this position at the moment. The success of our wine industry has attracted world acclaim: it is an industry that has got it right, against strong opposition and against the tide.

This industry is Australia's largest growth industry. While we cannot meet the demand, other countries are pulling vines. Therefore, it is totally beyond belief in the light of all this success that the Federal Government sees fit to clap on a tax which will be an impost to further investment, production and market share. The new tax will affect Australia's new pearl.

All our industries suffer in the world market place because of our local high cost of production. Our wine industry is world class and world competitive, so what does the Federal Government do? It kills off the advantages and incentive and whacks on a home grown impost. Can we not see and learn from our international trade problems? The Australian wine industry, and particularly our South Australian industry which comprises more than 60 per cent of the total, has a remarkable record.

As you know, Sir, I attended the national Outlook Conference in Canberra last week and our wine industries received the highest accolades. All aspects are positive, including high production and high prices. Demand is high, so much so that shortages are now causing prices to rise, and in some markets that has caused us to lose market share, particularly in the United Kingdom, which has been a super market for us. But exports are particularly strong in the United Kingdom, Sweden, the US, New Zealand and Canada, and many other markets are coming on. We must generate new markets and we are looking at Germany and The Netherlands. These are good markets but both are price sensitive, so we need to watch our input costs. Prices will

determine what we are able to sell, but for now we cannot produce enough and our prices are increasing.

There are estimates of 2 013 million litres by the year 2000, worth \$733 million. Members should realise that more than 60 per cent of that is from South Australia. Let us consider the record from 1989 to 1992: more than 2 000 hectares a year was planted and last year we planted an extra 3 000 hectares, or 7 500 acres. That is staggering.

The largest growth area in Australia (and the member for Mawson will love this) is the McLaren Vale and Adelaide Hills area, the South Australian central zone, and growth is expected way into the future. We do not see a horizon for this industry if we treat it properly. Of the new plantings, 60 per cent will be premium whites and 35 per cent will be premium reds. I am happy to say that 80 per cent will continue to be private vineyards and 20 per cent corporate vineyards.

Multipurpose grapes will fall from 31 per cent to 20 per cent, but that is a trend in itself. We have long lead times in the industry: it takes four years to get a vineyard up and running and it takes two years to establish a winery. But as to the decisions we make, the industry cannot adjust quickly. The prices for premium reds will hold up but the prices for premium whites will ease a little due to the high plantings.

Regarding exports by type, reds comprise 16.8 per cent, sparkling wines 83.1 per cent but champagne minus 8.5 per cent. That is the area we need to watch. The growth of our market will be moderated only by high price, so we do not want to add to that with higher tax. Surprisingly, we are only the eleventh largest producer in the world and I was staggered with that statistic. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

COROMANDEL VALLEY

A petition signed by 175 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to change the suburb name of Coromandel Valley to Craighburn Farm was presented by Mr Evans.

Petition received.

LINEAR PARK

A petition signed by 240 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to sanction the completion of the Linear Park development at Paradise was presented by Mrs Hall.

Petition received.

KING GEORGE WHITING

A petition signed by 3 186 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to close specific King George whiting nursery areas and tourist beaches to net fishing was presented by Mrs Penfold.

Petition received.

LEIGH CREEK MINE

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Last night, accompanied by the General Manager of the Electricity Trust of South Australia

and you as the local member, Mr Speaker, I met with the management team of the Leigh Creek mine at Leigh Creek and with union representatives and a group of women representing the Leigh Creek Lifestyle Repair group to discuss action which I will now detail. I indicate to the House that I received strong and unanimous support from all three groups. Over the past two years, occupational health and safety issues at ETSA's Leigh Creek mine have received considerable public attention. As a result, the people at Leigh Creek have constantly been subjected to negative reports about their working and living environment which have had a destabilising effect on the community. Recently it has also become public that the occupational health and safety of the mine's operations might in the future become the subject of legal proceedings.

The continued successful operation of the Leigh Creek mine is essential for the independence of South Australia's economy. Leigh Creek is the sole source of coal for the northern power station at Port Augusta, which plays a key role in the provision of base load electricity power for South Australia. The recent decision by the board of ETSA, which was strongly endorsed by the Government, to spend \$55 million on upgrading equipment at the mine is a sign of confidence in the safety of the operations at Leigh Creek and shows the board's and the Government's commitment to the future of the mine.

In the past there have been extensive assessments of occupational health and safety at Leigh Creek. Previous assessments by the Health Commission gave Leigh Creek a clean bill of health, and neither the public investigations of the Industrial Commission nor ETSA's internal research has found any evidence of a health risk. In fact, the recent report of the Review Committee of the Industrial Commission states:

No evidence was produced that could lead to the conclusion that there was any generalised danger from emissions from coal fires—or fires in the overburdened dumps to the health of the work force at Leigh Creek—much less to residents of Leigh Creek South. The system of work for protecting employees engaged on controlling coal fires and overburden fires is adequate and safe.

Whilst I am personally satisfied with assurances given to me that the investigations carried out to date should remove any doubt about the occupational health and safety of the operations at Leigh Creek, as the responsible Minister I have a public duty towards the workers at the mine. I have consistently said that the workers' health is the paramount consideration in this matter and that I will continue to pursue that issue to ensure that the assurances given to me are sound.

The matter needs to be resolved so that the constant questioning of the work environment at Leigh Creek and its destabilising effects on the activities of ETSA and on the people in the town can be put to rest once and for all. I have therefore instructed the Crown Solicitor to advise me on the health and safety issues at the Leigh Creek mine and for that purpose to commission an independent assessment of the work environment at Leigh Creek by engaging WorkSafe Australia. This assessment is to be completed within the next few months. WorkSafe is an arm of the National Occupational Health and Safety Commission, set up under the Occupational Health and Safety Commission Act 1985. It is a tripartite body consisting of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry and Government, both Federal and State. Its role is to enhance health and safety in the workplace.

GERARD INDUSTRIES

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: In reply to the Leader's allegations yesterday in relation to the Clipsal company, I wish to make the following facts clear.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The application was subject to the normal rigorous evaluation and approval process. On 31 March 1994, the CEO of the Economic Development Authority gave 'in principle' support to a proposal from Gerard Industries. On 4 May 1994 the Economic Development Authority prepared a detailed evaluation recommending that the matter be referred to the IDC for consideration. On 20 July 1994 the bipartisan IDC recommended the proposal. On 4 August 1994 approval was granted by the Governor and Executive Council.

It is worth noting that the industry assistance provided to Clipsal to create up to 90 new jobs in Strathalbyn is consistent with but not as attractive as proposals approved for Clipsal at Murray Bridge and Nuriootpa by the former Labor Government. The Clipsal assistance includes a lease-back factory scheme on normal South Australian Housing Trust terms and conditions. Commercial rates apply. The building cost is approximately \$2.5 million.

QUESTION TIME

CATCH TIM LTD

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Is the Premier or the Government negotiating with a Hong Kong company, Catch Tim Ltd, or its directors; if so, has any financial assistance been provided to this company; and what is the nature of its business interests in South Australia? The listing of donations to the South Australian Liberal Party reveals a donation of \$100 000 by a company named Catch Tim Ltd with an address listed as Room 1008, Lane Crawford House, 70 Queens Road Central, Hong Kong. Inquiries at room 1008 have revealed that this company is not known at that address, and there is no telephone listing in Hong Kong for Catch Tim Ltd, the company which made by far the biggest donation to the Liberal Party at its last election campaign.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: To answer the question, no; I know of no negotiations between the State Government (certainly not by me and to my knowledge not by any other Government authority, including the EDA) and that company. I have never heard of that company before.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: As a member of Parliament and of the Liberal Party, I have no details and no access to any financial donation to the Liberal Party. That is a binding rule which has been put down by the Liberal Party and operated within the Party for many years. That is quite different from the Labor Party. There is clear evidence that the Labor Party across Australia was accepting brown paper bags containing tens of thousands of dollars.

We know the sort of thing that has been going on in Western Australia, where two former Premiers have ended up in trouble. I happened to see a summary of the financial information recently released by the Australian Electoral Commission concerning donations to the Labor Party. It indicates that the Labor Party received something like \$400 000 at the last State election from union and membership levies, from the very people who were out there on the steps yesterday protesting over WorkCover. If anyone was out there yesterday protesting their mates over a donation at the last State election, it had to be the Labor Party and the Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: When I saw that \$400 000 donation from the union movement, through membership and donation at the last State election, it became very apparent why the Labor Party in this State in the past 12 months has done a complete back flip on WorkCover. Here it was, immediately prior to the election, promising to bring premium rates down to 1.8 per cent, and then, yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition sold his soul for the sake of that financial contribution from the trade union movement prior to the election. So, if any questions are asked about financial contributions, I suggest that it should be the Leader of the Opposition asking those questions.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ridley is out of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Premier accused the Leader of the Opposition of selling his soul. I am not sure whether or not the Leader of the Opposition has a soul but, if he has, I am sure it is unparliamentary to suggest that he sold it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Leader of the Opposition considers that the comment was unparliamentary, it is for him to object at the time. He did not take that course of action.

NATIVE TITLE

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): My question is directed to the Premier. What role is the South Australian Government taking with respect to seeking amendments to the Commonwealth's native title legislation?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I was delighted to hear this morning the Federal Attorney-General announcing that he now intends to bring in amendments to the native title legislation introduced into the Federal Parliament. This is exactly what I, as Premier of this State, have been arguing for, on behalf of the Liberal Government, for the past 12 to 18 months. I was also delighted to see that Mr Justice French, President of the National Native Title Tribunal, has called for significant amendments to the Federal legislation. South Australia, through its Government, has been seeking amendments which provide certainty and which make the Native Title Act more workable and certainly reduces and removes many of the complexities and the duplication.

We want to remove unreasonable restrictions on the powers of the States to act as they see fit; and we want to remove uncertainty as to who is responsible for payment of compensation for past extinguishment of native title. I point out that, nationally, South Australia has taken the lead on this, and we have been appointed by the other State Governments

of Australia to represent all States and Territories at the Federal level.

It is South Australia that is now compiling the list of what we think are appropriate amendments to the Federal legislation that should be put to the Federal Government. The Federal Government has now acknowledged the leadership that has been shown by South Australia and has asked us to submit those proposed amendments, and we will do that in the very near future. I think it highlights how our position has been vindicated once again by the actions of the Federal Attorney-General, in that there very urgently needs to be amendments to the native title legislation.

HOSPITAL LABORATORY SERVICES

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Following their success in rapidly identifying the cause of the HUS epidemic, does the Minister for Health now recognise the importance of medical scientists to our public health system, and will he reverse his plans to privatise or slash public hospital laboratory services? In a letter to the Premier, the South Australian Medical Scientists Association states:

What would have transpired in the current [HUS] situation if resource had not been available? How long would it have taken to control the outbreak?

The letter goes on to ask:

How do the salaries of our hospital scientists compare to the costs of lifetime dialysis, kidney transplantation and intensive care treatment?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I can see an employee of the UTLC in the Press Gallery, and I understood that there was a restriction on the number of people who could enter that gallery.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has ruled that press secretaries may—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has ruled that only recognised press officers of the political Parties that are represented in this Chamber may hand out copies of questions that are to be asked. They may not converse with or in any way distract people in the gallery. I have given no permission for unauthorised persons to be in the gallery, and I therefore direct that any unauthorised personnel in the Press Gallery be removed forthwith.

Mr Foley: You used to do it all the time when you were in Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker, in relation to the decorum and conduct of people in the precincts of the Chamber. As the gentleman referred to by the Deputy Premier left the Press Gallery, he gave us the 'double jolt salute', and I think that needs to be dealt with by the House, as it was contempt of this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! From this position the Chair cannot see who is in the gallery. I will consider the matter that has been referred to me and provide a firm ruling later today.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am very pleased to address the question from the member for Elizabeth and, once again, to disavow her of a rumour of service alterations that she is spreading, despite being told continually that it is not the case. Clearly, it has been well recognised that the scientists involved in the recent food poisoning dilemmas and difficulties in South Australia performed superbly. Even the honourable member has identified that in her questions to me,

and certainly so have the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Playford, in speaking to a motion, and so on. So, it is a given that they performed superbly. On behalf of the people of South Australia, I thank them for their fantastic effort, and I recognise the world-class services they provide. However, what the member for Elizabeth fails to recognise is that we have absolutely no plans to slash services. We have not done so in any of the things we are doing.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I repeat: we have no plans to slash services. What is important for the people of South Australia to realise is that, because of the directions of the Brown Government, we are actually in the vanguard in the world regarding the provision of services. The member for Elizabeth may not realise that the facts are that around the world Governments are altering their focus from providing services to ensuring that services are provided. That is the role of government—to ensure that the services are provided—not necessarily to provide those services expensively. I reiterate: it is government's responsibility to ensure that services are provided, and that is exactly what we are doing in the health area.

The honourable member continually carps about how privatising will see services slashed. She is refusing to acknowledge that, regarding the Modbury Hospital episodes, we have the same or better services guaranteed contractually, at a \$6 million saving to the South Australian taxpayer. I have asked the member for Elizabeth before, if she thinks that South Australian taxpayers would not want to save \$6 million but have the same or better services provided, to please tell them that. Please let her tell the taxpayers of South Australia that she wants to waste \$6 million of their taxes unnecessarily. It is simply a farce to think that a single taxpayer would support that.

What I will guarantee in relation to scientific services in the health area is that the excellent services that are provided will continue to be provided, because all the contracts we have written or are contemplating writing see exactly the same services, or better, provided. I further guarantee that, on behalf of the taxpayers of South Australia, I will do my level best to ensure that those services are provided as cheaply as possible.

PUBLIC SECTOR OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELFARE

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): What recent initiatives has the Minister for Industrial Affairs taken to ensure that effort is being targeted into the right priorities to protect the occupational health, safety and welfare of South Australian public sector employees?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: When we came to government, we found, as one of the many amazing issues in occupational health and safety, that there was no record or program in place as to how to treat the occupational health and safety aspects in government. We had some \$45.6 million worth of workers' compensation pay out. We have nearly 6 000 claims per year, but not one single department actually had an occupational health and safety program in place to do something about what were fairly obvious needs. It is impossible to design any program in terms of safety in the workplace if you do not know what the problems are, if you do not have any statistical base on which to work and if you do not know the real issues in any particular department.

Let me give an example. There has been much concern about stress in the Education Department. The amount of money paid out for stress claims in the Education Department is too high, but the actual reality is that the claims in the department relate to strains, sprains and lifting—normal back problems. In essence, the problem for the Education Department is no different from those in the private sector in relation to WorkCover, yet there has been no statistical back-up to tell us that that is the case. So, we have put that in place.

One of the important things to come out of that is that, by instructing the departments that we need to be more aware of safety, we already have an estimated 20 per cent reduction in workers' compensation claims within the public sector. By having some targeted method and being able to look at the problems in all the departments, we now have an already perceived, we believe a real, drop in workers' compensation claims and benefit levels to the extent of some 20 per cent. It all gets back to doing it properly, having the proper statistical base and getting on with the job. That is what this Government is about in occupational health and safety—actually targeting occupational health and safety and getting results.

PROSTITUTION

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Has the Minister for Emergency Services received a report from the Commissioner of Police in respect of the Brindal proposals for changes to prostitution law in South Australia and, if so, has the Minister read such a report and will he make it available to members?

Mr MEIER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe this question relates directly to a Bill that is before the House and therefore would be inadmissible.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order, because it is one of those areas which are, one would say, particularly grey. Therefore, I intend to err on the side of allowing the question.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I have received no report from the Police Commissioner relating to the honourable member's Bill.

ELECTRICITY TRUST

Mr VENNING (Custance): With the Hilmer report and COAG placing greater emphasis on a competitive electricity sector, will the Minister for Infrastructure report what efficiency gains have been made by ETSA in the first six months of this financial year?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Last year I reported to the House that ETSA had had its best year on record. On ETSA's current performance through to the end of December, in the current financial year it looks like surpassing last year's record performance. Income is up \$16.4 million over budget principally because of renewed economic activity in South Australia with greater consumption of industrial power supplies. There has also been an increase due to extra pumping costs which, I hasten to add, are being absorbed by the EWS Department this year. Not only is sales revenue up by \$16.4 million to \$458.4 million because of greater economic activity but also total operating expenditure to the end of December is \$24 million below budget. So, revenue is up, expenditure and operating costs are down. That reflects well on the board, the management and the work force in ETSA, who are striving for greater efficiency and productivity gains. I acknowledge their efforts in that regard.

Other important indicators are that lost time through injury has fallen 22 per cent in the six months to the end of December, reliability of supply has improved 29 per cent based on outages, and employee numbers have also fallen through that six month period. For two days this week, ETSA provided South Australians with a record amount of electricity. The average electricity consumption over the half hour ending 5 p.m. on Tuesday reached 2 132 megawatts, 22 megawatts higher than the 2 110 megawatts reached on Monday this week. The previous record occurred on 6 December last year.

ETSA staff have met these higher demands without incident across the organisation. The Torrens Island Power Station was operating near peak capacity. Port Augusta was operating in tandem with Playford Power Station, which was brought back on line to help cope with Tuesday's extra demand and workload. ETSA, the power utility in South Australia, is meeting the challenges presented by Hilmer and the national grid system; it is improving productivity and efficiency so that it can be a low cost utility in the provision of an essential service—power—to industry and consumers in South Australia. It is positioning itself well for the competition that will be upon us as a result of the national grid system early next year.

STATE BUDGET

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Will the Treasurer rule out additional budget cuts and additional increases in taxes and charges in the forthcoming budget? On 8 February the Treasurer advised the House that the Government's previously announced deficit targets remain on track but there would need to be a repositioning to cope with difficulties the following year.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I do not think the Leader of the Opposition reads or listens much because, if he did, he would not need to ask that question. The last question was asked about the 1994-95 budget to which I responded that it is largely on track but next year is a problem. I have been saying consistently—if members opposite will listen—since probably October that there are stresses on the budget caused by Federal Government policies. If I have said it once I have said it five times. That is a fact and everyone is aware of it. Business people are aware of it; householders are aware of it; and I would have thought the Leader of Opposition would be aware of it. Obviously, he needs a lesson in economics. I have said consistently that Federal Government policies have caused us a problem, and the problem has to be fixed—and it has to be fixed at the next budget.

I remind members where the real problems arose: not only in Canberra but from those sitting on the benches across this Chamber. We are paying \$350 million a year for the pleasure of this group opposite. The facts of life are that because of our high debt we are exposed to interest rate rises which have come home to bite because of the Federal Government's policies. I have said consistently that we have to adjust the budget next year, and that means further savings and revenue measures. The Opposition will have to wait until the budget comes down to find out what they are.

DROUGHT DECLARATION

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Can the Minister for Primary Industries advise the House on the progress of the South

Australian Government's application for a declaration of exceptional circumstances drought on Upper Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I thank the honourable member for her question and interest in this subject. I feel sorry for those people on the West Coast of South Australia who are in desperate circumstances because of the downturn in commodity prices, the drought and below average rainfall conditions they have experienced over the past few years. Because of what was happening in New South Wales and Queensland, it was the initiative of this Government to look at how we could get exceptional circumstances drought declared when the Federal Government announced that it would allow some changes to the method of calculating exceptional circumstances drought in New South Wales and Queensland.

Officers from my department and the Federal Primary Industry Minister's department started working last September after discussions I had had with Senator Collins, who agreed—and I thank him for that support—that there was potential in South Australia, particularly on the West Coast, for officers of both departments to look at that matter. We put in a tremendous amount of work, which was completed in November. The RASAC Committee, chaired by Neil Inall, was sent to the area by the Federal Minister for Primary Industries, Bob Collins, and has completed its investigations.

I had hoped that we would have a result of that early in January; however, I received a letter today, after talking to Senator Collins several times on the telephone in the past couple of weeks, advising me that the RASAC submission was given to him last week. He is preparing a Cabinet submission but unfortunately for people on the West Coast it will not be considered by Cabinet until towards the end of this month. I am still confident, as are officers of my department, that every bit of work that is necessary has been done, and I thank Senator Collins for his support all the way through. I urge Federal Cabinet to look at the submission sympathetically for those people who are in dire straits on the West Coast of South Australia.

ASSET SALES

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is directed to the Treasurer. Which Government owned assets proposed for sale will require legislation to be brought before Parliament, and what is the program for this legislation? The Premier's statement on 14 February referred to sale in 1995 of SGIC, for which we have already seen the legislation; the Pipelines Authority of South Australia, which was mooted; Forwood Products; the EWS Ottoway workshops; the *Island Seaway*; the Noarlunga Shopping Centre's surplus land; and the State Clothing Corporation.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: As the member for Playford has rightly pointed out, there will be further legislation on the Bank of South Australia. Some wind-up provisions have to be put in place and there will certainly be some for SGIC, concerning which we were doing the transitional arrangements earlier this week. Certainly, there will be some for the Pipelines Authority to progress the elements of the package that will be available for sale. I imagine there will also be legislative requirements for Forwood, although we are driven very much by the advice provided by the Crown Solicitor's Office as to which matters have to be satisfied in legislation. I have not received any advice on what legals have to be satisfied by legislation for Forwood Products, for example,

but I presume that there will have to be and that I or the Minister concerned will be advised accordingly at the time.

In relation to the other matters, I am not sure that we would need legislation, but again we are ensuring that every avenue is covered correctly so that, if there is any doubt about the sale or any concern or contention regarding the process, we will ensure that there is legislative back-up. I can assure the honourable member that if there is a need for legislation to accomplish any of these sales it will be brought to the House in the normal process.

PUBLIC SECTOR TRAINING

Mrs HALL (Coles): Can the Premier explain how the Senior Officer Development Plan, which he launched today, will help to improve the performance of the South Australian public sector?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: This morning I launched the Senior Officer Development Program within the public sector of South Australia. It is a major initiative so that we can further develop the professional skills, the team capability and the focus on the economic development of the public sector in South Australia. In the 12 months that we have been in Government I have been amazed at how the former Labor Government gave no regard whatsoever to the development of professionalism within the public sector. It had very few, if any, training programs in any area of Government whatsoever, and certainly it had no overall comprehensive training programs.

I will highlight to the member for Coles some of the initiatives within this training program. It will run from now until 1998, and involves a very large number of senior executives within the public sector. It is specifically designed to improve personal, corporate and team skills; for instance, it specifically encourages the learning of second languages and an understanding of other cultures and what is needed to get the South Australian economy going. It also involves encouraging all Government agencies to look at how they can be part of a streamlined economic development program for this State and to understand that it is very much a partnership between the public and private sectors. This morning I was able to outline the work that the State Government has undertaken in preparing benchmarks to compare us not just with other States of Australia but also, very importantly, with other governments of the world.

One of the major initiatives that have been achieved here in South Australia in the past 12 months is the ability to take a whole of Government approach, something which, astoundingly, was not there before and which has been commented on very favourably by some of the big international companies that have come into South Australia. The benefit of that is, for instance, the approach we have taken with EDS in contracting out all of the information technology and showing how in fact South Australia has led the world in that initiative, being the first Government in the world to put together about 150 different agencies all under one contract and ensuring very significant savings and other benefits as a result.

I commend the efforts now being undertaken by the public sector here in South Australia. They complement the Public Sector Management Bill, which has been brought before this Parliament, and they also complement a number of other initiatives that the State Government is taking to make sure that we have a very positive and dynamic role for the public sector in this State as part of the economic recovery.

WATER SUPPLY

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Is the Minister for Infrastructure confident of his department's ability to negotiate effectively with major international corporations tendering for the outsourcing of South Australia's water and sewerage services? One of the criteria to be fulfilled by the successful company is that they be large on the world scale. The Auditor-General's annual report referred to problems with the EDS deal, including vendor lock-in and a consequent dependence on one large international supplier.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The answer to the honourable member's question is 'Yes', but I would go on to say that the resources of EWS have called on Boston Consulting Group, for example, for advice as to the short-listing of the international companies that would be considered to be invited to make a business proposal to the Government in relation to outsourcing of those four functions. In addition, a range of other private sector consulting firms have been brought in to undertake specific tasks, to ensure that the best possible advice is available in the determination of this issue.

Further, as with the EDS deal, the Auditor-General, the Crown Solicitor and other officers of Government are involved in the process to ensure that the outcome is in the best interests of South Australians. That is, whilst we maintain the assets on behalf of the water corporation as owners, shareholders and taxpayers of South Australia, and while we maintain the pricing mechanism for water and sewerage, the operation and maintenance functions, by outsourcing to the private sector, achieve a reduced cost of operation which can be passed on in the form of benefits and lower cost of living to South Australian consumers. This will also assist businesses in expanding in South Australia by keeping their operating costs to an absolute minimum and better than the other States of Australia.

In addition, a key component of this outsourcing proposal will be to use the Government's purchasing and expenditure power to leverage economic development for South Australia, investment in terms of our infrastructure and also the job creation here to build a South Australian based water industry. We want to expand and establish a water based industry using our intellectual capacity, knowledge and past experience to tap into the enormous markets of Asia and the opportunities that present themselves there to ensure that at the end of the day this deal means lower costs to consumers and more jobs for South Australians.

CHRISTIES CREEK

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurana): Is the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources aware of the current local controversy surrounding cement spills into the Christies Creek area and will he explain the involvement of the Environment Protection Authority in this issue?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Yes, I am aware of this situation.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is just as well somebody is on top of the job. As I have said in this House on a number of previous occasions, this Government has inherited a mess with our waterways and in many other respects. Restoring water quality is a major environmental platform of this Government. It means giving life back to not only the Torrens, the Patawalonga and the Onkaparinga but all creeks and watercourses throughout the State. I can assure the

member for Kaurna that people in the south will not be neglected.

Members will be aware that the Government is working towards the proclamation of the Environment Protection Act from 1 May this year. On proclamation of that Act, the Lonsdale premises will need to be licensed under the Act. One of the conditions of licence will relate to the retention, treatment and recycling of waste water on site with no discharge at all into the stormwater system. I remind the House that a breach of a licence condition can lead to prosecution, with fines of up to \$120 000.

This Government is trying to turn around 150 years of waterways mismanagement. We will do it only by fostering community pride and the notion that the community, which includes industry and private citizens, actually owns and is responsible for the environment. All elements of the community need to work together. The bottom line is that councils and the EPA will continue to work closely together in future.

In the case referred to, the EPA and Noarlunga council have been liaising and have decided that the most appropriate way to deal with the issue on this occasion is via the Public and Environmental Health Act administered by local government. Council officers have interviewed plant management and complainants and prepared a case for prosecution based on submissions from witnesses. I understand that the case is being considered further by council executives. I remind the House again that this State desperately needs the teeth that will be provided in the Environment Protection Act, and it will only be on proclamation of the legislation that we will be able to get down to some of these difficult problems that need to be addressed.

WATER RATES

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Minister for Infrastructure rule out further increases to domestic and commercial water and sewerage charges as a result of the future outsourcing of the functions of the EWS? Under the French franchising system, upon which the Government's proposal is based, firms have successfully pressured municipal authorities to agree to above contract prices by claiming extenuating and unforeseen circumstances.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Experience with contracts of this nature in the past will ensure that we put in place a contract that protects South Australians; that is, a level and standard of service will be maintained for South Australians. As a result of going to the private sector, national and international experience has demonstrated that the provision of the same service can be carried out at reduced cost. Those benefits will be passed on to South Australians, as I indicated before.

As with the EDS project, international companies continually strive, year in, year out, for greater efficiency. They have to do so to continue to survive in the industry. The contract, when negotiated and signed towards the end of this year, will, I hope, lock the company into continuing improvement, productivity and efficiency gains which will be passed on to South Australians—not add-ons, as others may have suggested.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: You should ask the member for Hart whether he is going on Concorde, not me, for the first trip that I understand he is doing this year. We will be seeking

to lock in productivity gains and efficiencies for the benefit of South Australians in the future.

POLLUTION LICENCES

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): As industry has now begun to receive draft pollution licences for consultation with the Environment Protection Authority, can the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources explain the role of the new licence and how it will assist industry in South Australia?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I thank the member for Hartley for his continuing interest in these matters. Through the integration of six Acts of Parliament, the legislation governing environmental protection has become streamlined so that the effects on land, air and water can be considered simultaneously. As a result, business will now have to be issued with only one integrated licence. This is something towards which industry has been working for a very long time. This fresh approach will greatly reduce the need for business to chase permits and will allow for a focus on effective environmental outcomes.

The February mail-out to approximately 2 000 licensees of a licensing package incorporating an explanatory letter, application form, draft licence for discussion and information sheets is currently under way. Licensees have until 15 March to complete their application form, and they may call upon the support of the EPA's client coordinator to assist with that process. During the period from 15 March to 30 April the office of the EPA will process applications and forward approved licences to licensees. This period will also be used by the EPA to follow through on late or absent licence applications.

It is important to note that existing licensees are entitled to a licence if operating legally immediately prior to commencement of the Environment Protection Act on 1 May. All actions by the EPA are being coordinated towards the 1 May commencement date. This initiative will provide South Australia with streamlined legislation, matched by a new administrative structure leading to improved environmental protection and a far more responsive service to the business sector in this State.

MITCHAM COUNCIL

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Why has the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations failed to take any action on complaints that Mitcham council has excessively used the secrecy provisions of section 62 of the Local Government Act to avoid open debate on major public issues? The Minister received a written complaint from the Colonel Light Gardens Residents Association on 21 October alleging that Mitcham council had misused secrecy provisions to avoid public debate. In this week's *Courier Messenger* the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education said that there was an element of unnecessary secrecy at Mitcham, and the Treasurer is reported as saying, 'To my belief, they have breached the rules.'

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I thank the member for her question. This is a sensitive issue. It is a matter that is under close observation by me and my agency as regards all councils. I think we have sent a very clear message to local government that the Government and I, as the Minister with responsibility for local government relations, do not encour-

age councils to go behind closed doors to discuss matters which should be within the knowledge of ratepayers. Indeed, many councils are heeding that advice and there is now a reluctance to retire behind closed doors. Some councils still have procedures in place, and they know we are watching them closely.

My advice is that in order to move on this matter it will require a complaint to be lodged in writing to me from someone within the council. I take the point about that letter coming from one of the associations. If the advice that I have received is not correct, I will certainly take new advice and consider whether that letter constitutes sufficient for me to move on the ground of secrecy. As I said, I thank the member for her question and I will look into the matter further.

I think we have to be sensitive as to what constitutes confidential information which should be discussed by councils behind closed doors. The general message to local government is that we believe in open government and councils should go behind closed doors only with respect to matters which may be of a commercially confidential nature or something on which a council makes a decision at the time and then has to live by it.

TECHNOLOGY CONTRACT

Mr WADE (Elder): My question is directed to the Premier. Has the South Australian Government lost a multimillion dollar technology contract to Victoria, as claimed by the Leader of the Opposition on radio this morning?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have heard this report and, in fact, I have an exact transcript of what was said on radio this morning. It shows that the Leader of the Opposition has great difficulty in dealing with the truth. There is nothing new about that, but it highlights again the extent to which the Leader of the Opposition cannot handle the truth when it comes to talking to the public of South Australia. Let us look at the facts, because here was the Leader of the Opposition claiming that South Australia had lost a multimillion dollar technology contract to Victoria. First, the contract is for the contracting out of the Department for Transport of Victoria, not South Australia. We really did not expect that contract to come to South Australia, as it is Victorian Government work. Secondly—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition listens to the facts.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Just listen to the facts—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—before you embarrass yourself even further. Secondly, this contract with Victoria, and the setting up of the \$18 million plant by IBM at Ballarat, was announced last year, before we announced our outsourcing contract here. So, at the time our contract was announced that was well and truly known—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Leader of the Opposition should just listen, because he will then find out the facts—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Unfortunately, the Leader of the Opposition has developed a tendency to continue to interject

on a regular basis, which is completely out of order. I ask him to comply with Standing Orders.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I appreciate your protection, Sir, because we know the extent to which the Leader of the Opposition constantly interjects when he is on very thin ice. Every time he is about to go under, he sits there like a parrot and chirps. Let us contrast the two contracts: one announced in Victoria for one Government department, setting up an \$18 million plant in Ballarat as part of an outsourcing contract in that State—it had nothing to do with the South Australian Government whatsoever. The EDS contract in this State will bring \$500 million of new economic activity to South Australia.

To embarrass the Leader of the Opposition even more, I can announce to the House that IBM is so interested in what the South Australian Government is doing, in terms of information technology development, that it has asked to continue to negotiate with the Government, with the possibility of setting up significant operations here in South Australia—nothing to do with the Victorian contract whatsoever. Those ongoing talks with IBM are taking place between the head of the Information Technology Unit, Ray Dundon, and the head of EDA, John Cambridge.

I highlight the extent to which IBM has appreciated—with a range of other major multinational companies around the world—the extent to which South Australia is now the Australian leader in setting up information technology industry in this State. Before he goes on radio again and makes outrageous claims, as he did this morning, I ask the Leader of the Opposition to at least get his facts right, because he is developing a reputation within the community as someone who has enormous difficulty in handling the truth.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition and the person on my right will come to order. I refer to Standing Order 137, which provides:

If any member

- 1 persistently or wilfully obstructs the business of the House, or
- 2 persistently or wilfully refuses to conform to any Standing Order of the House, or
- 3 refuses to accept the authority of the Chair, or
- 4 having used unparliamentary language refuses either to explain its use to the satisfaction of the Speaker or to withdraw it and, if necessary in the opinion of the Speaker, apologises for its use,

the Speaker names the member—

I think I have made the position very clear. The Chair has been tolerant. I leave it to the wisdom of members as to the next course of action.

TOW TRUCK INDUSTRY

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Is the Minister for Infrastructure, representing the Minister for Transport, aware of allegations that intimidation by unscrupulous tow truck drivers is still occurring at the scene of vehicle accidents? I have been informed by a constituent that a tow truck driver put considerable pressure on that person at the scene of an accident to have the vehicle towed to a particular site, when it was clear that the driver's intention was to have the vehicle towed to her home. This was a case of extreme intimidation. Legislation was introduced to prevent this sort of intimidation at the scene of vehicle accidents.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: If the honourable member would like to give me the details of the incident and the persons and the company involved, I will refer the matter to my colleague the Minister for Transport, seek a reply and bring it back to the House.

CANADAIR FIRE BOMBERS

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister for Emergency Services advise the Parliament what progress has been made following the recommendations of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee that Canadair aircraft should be trialled, in view of the extensive use of water bombing aircraft to control the recent bushfires?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I thank the honourable member for her question, and may I also take this opportunity to commend her on the presiding role she has undertaken with that committee, and the work of members in preparing the report that was submitted to the Parliament. I can advise the House that, on 14 December last year, a meeting of Emergency Management Ministers was held in Sydney. That meeting was chaired by the Federal Defence Minister, Senator Robert Ray. One of the main purposes of the meeting was to reach a resolution on the use of fire bombing aircraft by Australian States.

The outcome of the discussion was that Ministers (a) agreed that the current Australian approaches to the use of fixed wing and rotary wing aircraft for fire suppression appear capable of meeting the majority needs for such capability; (b) agreed there is no conclusive evidence that large fixed wing amphibious fire bombing aircraft, however operationally effective in overseas countries, would be a cost effective means of improving the general fire suppression capabilities in Australia; and (c) noted that South Australia has a contrary view to subparagraphs (a) and (b). In short, therefore, South Australia was a dissenting voice amongst other States and the Commonwealth.

I was particularly disappointed at that meeting to find that, contrary to the understanding that had been reached between this State and the Commonwealth, the Commonwealth had absolutely no intention whatsoever of funding a trial of the Canadair aircraft in this country. We had made it quite clear in this State that, while we supported the trial, it was not possible for South Australia to go it alone. We needed to go in with other States and the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth is in receipt of a report, prepared for it by its research agency, recommending the benefits of such a trial but has decided not to proceed regardless.

Therefore, despite the very good work and the important recommendations of Parliament's committee, this State at this time, without Commonwealth involvement, is unable to trial the Canadair aircraft in South Australia. Having said that, I can advise the House that the Country Fire Service contracted Australian Maritime Resources (AMR) to supply a number of water bombing aircraft to combat bushfires. The contract arrangements provide that an Air Tractor 502 water bombing aircraft, which has a drop capacity of 2 000 litres of either foam or retardant, will be on stand-by at Woodside airstrip during this fire danger season.

A second aircraft is available on request from the CFS controller of operations should a local CFS brigade require extra assistance in combating any fire. Indeed, on days when a fire ban is declared in the Mount Lofty Ranges, the second aircraft is placed on stand-by for immediate use. The CFS has negotiated with AMR to have the first half hour of aircraft

use free of charge, in a bid to encourage local CFS brigades to use the water bombing capacity.

In addition, AMR provides an Air Tractor 502 water bombing aircraft in the South-East of our State to provide an initial air attack response should a fire occur in that important timber region. This arrangement is jointly funded between private forest owners and the Forestry Division of Primary Industries. Both CFS brigades and officers involved in aircraft coordination have reported very favourable results from initial and extended water bombing operations on fires that have occurred to date at Vivonne Bay and Parndana on Kangaroo Island, Echunga, Sturt Gorge, Flagstaff Hill, Black Hill, Heathfield and Kyeema Conservation Park in the Mount Lofty Ranges. So, despite the Federal Government's reluctance to honour its initial negotiations with us, we are still able to have fire fighting capacity through aircraft use, but regrettably we cannot trial the Canadair aircraft.

MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATIONS

Mr De LAINE (Price): My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure, representing the Minister for Transport in another place. Will the Minister investigate the possibility of reviewing the procedure for renewing motor vehicle registrations and, in particular, the procedure for the transfer of ownership of motor vehicles? Under the current system, it is possible for anyone to go into a Motor Registration office and renew registration, therefore being recognised as the registered owner of that vehicle even though that person does not own it. The onus of proof of ownership is then placed on the real owner of the vehicle.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I will take up the matter with the Minister for Transport and ask her to consider the matter and reply to the honourable member. As with all Government departments and agencies under this Government, we are striving to provide better customer service and focus of delivery of those services. However, I will refer the matter to the Minister and bring back a reply.

LANDCARE AND ENVIRONMENT ACTION PROGRAM

Mr BUCKBY (Light): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education provide details of the latest Landcare and Environment Action Program to be conducted during 1995 and how local communities and young people can benefit from the program?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I thank the member for Light for his interest. I know of his strong commitment to assisting young people. It is a good news story again, because we have \$4.3 million to be expended through the LEAP program this year. Some 500 young people will benefit from an extended training and employment program, and in excess of 30 projects are to be tackled. I will mention only four of them, but that will give an indication of the range of projects to be undertaken by young people in the format of accredited training, so it is proper training.

The first one is the refurbishment of the Mount Barker railway station, which will greatly assist the SteamRanger program; a re-vegetation and recycling program at Nepabunna, east of Leigh Creek; the restoration of the Moonta railway station, in which project I am sure the Government Whip is very interested; and a new project called 'Simply Clean' which involves research on domestic green cleaning and which is sponsored by the Adelaide City

Council. That is just four of the more than 30 projects that will be carried out.

This year the focus will be on the very long-term unemployed, so we need to put in a lot of extra effort to giving those young people support. LEAP has been extremely successful in South Australia; the money was won against very strong competition; and I believe that, if it is not the largest amount ever granted, it is very close to it. So, it is very good news again for South Australia and particularly for young unemployed South Australians, who make up one of our target groups in terms of getting the unemployment rate down.

HANSARD MATERIAL

The SPEAKER: Yesterday the member for Torrens asked, in the form of a question, whether I would rule on material allegedly distributed by the member for Newland in the form of a reproduction of *Hansard*. Before addressing the question itself, let me say that seeking a ruling in the form of a question without notice is not the appropriate way of raising such an issue. There are other forms of the House for members to raise issues such as this.

Turning to the substance of the allegation, I indicate that, after perusing the material, I am satisfied that there was no attempt at deception. The material was clearly marked as a grievance debate made by the member. However, I remind members to be careful in the distribution of any remarks made in the House, since an incomplete reproduction of the *Hansard* record may not attract the privilege otherwise accorded to members' speeches.

TAFE STUDENTS

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Ms WHITE: Yesterday in this House, when referring to my attendance at a meeting of the Torrens Valley Institute of TAFE, the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education stated that the member for Taylor 'apparently has copies of documents which were marked confidential, documents which were returned by all other members who attended the meeting on the Monday night'. The Torrens Valley Institute of TAFE has confirmed that all documents referring to the expulsion of a student distributed at the meeting in question were counted both before and after they had been cited and handed back by all members who were in attendance at that meeting.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms WHITE: Before these documents were shredded, it was confirmed that the exact same number of documents—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier and Deputy Premier are out of order. Leave has been granted for a personal explanation.

Ms WHITE: —was returned as was tabled and that no document relating to the expulsion matter had been removed by any member of council.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I recognise and congratulate all those involved in the Riverland and Mallee Apprentice of the Year Awards, which were held last Saturday evening at the Renmark Hotel. About 300 people were gathered at dinner to endorse the achievements of a wide spectrum of young apprentices and trainees, who represented a broad range of vocations. Although I have been involved with these awards over the past couple of years, this was the first occasion on which I came to appreciate that the event is recognised as one of the largest of its kind in rural Australia.

These awards are formally organised by the Rotary Club of Renmark, which has been arranging them for the past 12 years as part of its vocational program. I congratulate the Rotary Club for its historic initiative and enterprise in formulating this event and continuing it over 12 years, and I particularly acknowledge the work of Laurie Wilkinson in the coordination of the event over the past four years. The objective of the event has been to promote the youth of the region, and especially to recognise their worth as future tradespeople. In doing so, the project aims to select and reward outstanding young people in their final year of training. The enthusiasm and support of the apprentices, the trainees and the employers has been a reflection of the value of the event.

Importantly, it offers apprentices in the Riverland and the Mallee areas the opportunity to be recognised for their contribution to the local community. The major prizes for these awards are interstate study trips, and those who were successful on the night of the awards have an unparalleled opportunity to widen their horizons, both vocationally and socially. Undoubtedly, they will meet new people and assist in furthering goodwill with a range of people in a vocational environment that I believe they would otherwise never have experienced.

I congratulate Mr Colin Gordon from Dix Engineering at Renmark in being chosen as the 1994 Riverland-Mallee Apprentice of the Year. Previous winners have been from a wide range of vocations: welder-boiler makers; horticulturalists; electricians; and, as I recall, last year there was a chef. It is also appropriate to recognise that there was a range of successful recipients of the awards relating to 10 specific categories, such as metal workers or workers from the motor trade industry, the building trades or the horticultural arena. Also there was a special incentive award for Trainee of the Year.

What is worth recognising and is very heartening and encouraging from the whole process is that this is a tremendous example of community and corporate employer and employee and Government instrumentality cooperation and achievement. Not only is there significant corporate and local sponsorship ranging from national to local companies but also those who went along to support their fellow workmates highlighted the sense of community. In particular, families and employers gave great support in preparing the applicants for their interview assessment. The pride and appreciation shown by successful nominees as they accepted their recognition was a fine example to apprentices and trainees in the area.

Finally, I highlight that such an event is totally consistent and works in unison with the State Government's objectives of giving high priority and recognition to apprentices and trainees, whether it be through direct involvement by sponsorship at the local TAFE college or through specific incentives, such as the Government's objective of creating jobs via, for example, the Employment Broker Scheme.

The State Government undoubtedly was elected to create jobs. An example of this is the 2 000-odd new places for trainees and apprenticeships, with some 700 in the State public sector under traineeships. So, job creation and the provision of training to meet industry needs has remained and continues to be the cornerstone of the State Government's plan for the economic recovery of this State. This is readily exemplified in the key priority given by DETAFE and recognised in the DETAFE budget.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I refer to the privatisation of pathology services and I cite a letter to me from a senior medical scientist, who says:

The contribution by medical scientists to the public healthcare system has previously gone unrecognised. Medical scientists work quietly behind the scenes without the benefit of the publicity that is so often focussed on their medical colleagues. However, many scientists are involved, not only in the provision and supervision of diagnostic services, they are also involved in first-class research and development. This combination of diagnostic and research skills is vital for the provision of a quality diagnostic pathology service. It is this mix of expertise that enabled the rapid response to the current crisis, thereby saving lives and reducing the economic impact of the outbreak. It is also this mix of expertise that allows medical scientists to make regular, but unnoticed, contributions to patient care, improve diagnostic techniques and introduce new methodologies.

It is unfortunate that current Government health policy is destroying this skills base, particularly cut backs in funding and in the privatisation of hospital laboratories and pathology services. Private pathology providers can play an important role and provide an excellent service. However, private laboratories are not interested in maintaining research and development. Private pathology providers could not and did not play a role in solving the current crisis. The work was done solely in our public hospital laboratories. Only in these laboratories is the relevant expertise available.

When I asked the Minister whether he would give a guarantee about further privatisation of pathology services, he gave us a guarantee that all these extras would be written into the contracts of any provider that was to take on one of these services. We have actually seen the document provided to pathology services in order for them to make a tender for Modbury Hospital. I put on record that it was quite an interesting experience.

There were no quantifiable benchmarks that people had to tender against. There was no specific breakdown of services. There were no quantifiable benchmarks in relation to research and teaching. There were a lot of vague statements. A number of pathology operators have come to us and said how disturbing it was that this was the standard of the document in relation to their tender.

Does the Minister seriously suggest that Gribbles of Modbury could have done the job that the IMVS and the Women's and Children's Hospital did in the recent epidemic? Does he seriously suggest that Gribbles could have turned around its resources and put them to the long task of getting to the bottom of what was causing this epidemic? We know that the test procedure is used in only two places in Australia and certainly not at Gribbles. Does Gribbles have the depth of skills and experience that it could call upon to do such a job when an emergency situation arises? Of course not. Of

course Gribbles could not possibly do it. What the Minister said was absolute bunkum.

Private pathologists cannot do this work because it is not their role. How could they possibly run a profitable operation and be able to respond in the way that those public enterprises responded when the crisis occurred? The Minister should wake up to the fact that the public sector, public pathology, has a role to play and that we as a society value our ability to respond in a crisis, such as the one we have just seen, to be able to pour our resources into solving a problem that is threatening the health of our community. The Minister must wake up that this can only be the role of the public sector: it is not the role of the private sector. He needs to wake up and realise this before we find him selling off the rest of public pathology to private operators and before we discover that we have lost our expertise and research capability so that the next time something like this happens we cannot respond and get ourselves out of the crisis, as we did this time.

Mr KERIN (Frome): I want to report to the House the success of the amalgamation of the two high schools in Port Pirie to form the John Pirie Secondary School. For over 20 years Port Pirie has been well served by two high schools, the Port Pirie High School in the centre of the town and the Risdon Park High School on the southern edge of the town. Three or four years ago the two school councils met and showed enormous courage when they made the decision to amalgamate. It was a courageous decision, because they risked a public backlash to a decision that would see the two existing high schools disappear forever. Knowing the linkages of old scholars, parents and students to their schools, it was courageous that they put the welfare of current and future students to the forefront.

The creation of the larger school with approximately 770 students obviously allows greater curriculum choice, and other advantages result from the greater numbers. The last couple of years have not been without problems for the school councils, because there was some opposition to the amalgamation and the choice of the former Port Pirie High School site as the site for the new school was questioned by many. This was understandable because each site had strengths and weaknesses and the choice would always be difficult. It did take a while to make that decision. It is to the credit of those who favoured the Risdon Park High School site that, after initially voicing some disapproval, they quickly put their disappointment behind them and got on with the job of supporting the amalgamation of the schools.

Much of the credit for the success of the amalgamation must go to the people who served on the two school councils over the period in which the decisions were made. Presidents Julie Harvey from the Port Pirie High School and Geoff Harvey from Risdon Park High School shouldered great responsibility and took the criticisms on the chin. With terrific support from their councils, they took and controlled all the criticisms thrown at them and played a major part in selling to the community the concept and the benefits of amalgamation. In mid 1994, following an extensive selection process, Mr Ken Whalley, the previous Principal of the Port Pirie High School, was appointed Principal of John Pirie Secondary School. This was an excellent choice and I congratulate Ken on doing a magnificent job in ensuring that on 30 January this year John Pirie Secondary School got off to a very good start.

Ken received excellent support from Peter Phillips, Denis Crisp and Rita Blieschke, who in their leadership roles

showed extreme professionalism in going about the difficult task of closing down the two previous schools—never an easy job to do. These leadership people received terrific support from their teaching and ancillary staff, and I admire their professionalism and the constructive manner in which they approached such a difficult task last year.

I have enjoyed and appreciated the considerable contact I have had with many of the staff of the previous two schools and of the new school. An interim school council was set up to oversee the establishment of the new school. The efforts and absolute dedication of Mr Richie Promnitz and his committee have been instrumental in the new school's being such an instant success. The school is grateful to the Department for Education and Children's Services for the support given in achieving the goal of having the school ready for the year, and was thrilled with the \$180 000-plus received only last week through back to school grants.

I am happy to report that student and staff morale at the school is very high and the school is well on the way to living up to its new motto 'Striving for excellence'. I spoke at the initial school council AGM last Thursday night and was thrilled to see such an excellent attendance of parents, teachers and interested community people. To have 28 people nominate for the 14 spots on the school council speaks volumes for the school community. I am sure that under the capable chairmanship of Richie Promnitz the school council will ensure that the John Pirie secondary school will strive for excellence.

I look forward to a long association with the school and share the confidence of the community that it will provide Port Pirie and surrounding areas with an excellent service affording opportunities for the students of the area. It is yet another excellent example of what can be achieved when people work together. The whole community of Port Pirie and surrounds is to be congratulated on achieving a very successful amalgamation.

Mr EVANS (Davenport): I place on record my opposition to the Geographic Names Advisory Committee's proposal to rename part of Coromandel Valley Craighburn Farm. I remind members that this is the Craighburn Farm that the people who live in this area of Coromandel Valley and a considerable area of the Mitcham Hills have now been fighting for over 23 years not to have developed. This is an area where the community gets no new school, no new kindergartens, no new buses, no new child-care facilities, no upgrade of the roads, no new bikeways and no new police station or increased police patrols. Five times over the past 20 years we have been promised the development will not go ahead but ultimately stage 1 is going ahead.

The Geographic Names Advisory Committee suggests that some of those people currently living in Coromandel Valley might now like to be living in the proposed suburb of Craighburn Farm. What a great insult to a community that has fought for 23 years not to have a suburb called Craighburn Farm! The community is now being invited by a committee to live in Craighburn Farm; in other words, to have the name of their suburb changed from Coromandel Valley to Craighburn Farm. That is an absolutely disgraceful proposal, in my view, which I oppose, and I have written to the Minister and the advisory board indicating my opposition. Of the 118 homes involved, I presented a petition today of 175 signatures involving 110 people residing in those homes. As to the remaining eight households doorknocked, no-one was

at home. Out of a possible 111 homes in which people were able to respond, 110 were opposed to this suggestion.

I only hope that ultimately the Minister, who I understand will make the final decision, listens to the local community and leaves the people concerned in their suburb of Coromandel Valley. It is one of the oldest suburbs, and I know that the member for Fisher, who lives in this area and is affected by this matter, has made strong representations similar to my own. I also understand that both Happy Valley and Mitcham councils have made submissions opposing this suggestion. There is already a suburb called Craighburn which adjoins the other side of Sturt Creek, Craighburn Farm being on the northern side and Craighburn (the current suburb) on the southern side. I can see some confusion arising with the proposed new suburb when there is already a suburb called Craighburn and even a Craighburn Primary School. We even get confusion, believe it or not, with a suburb called Craighmore, which is miles away from the area in question.

I am opposed to the idea that the farm land currently called Craighburn Farm be called the suburb of Craighburn Farm: I would much prefer that it be called Blackwood. Therefore, I urge the Minister and the Geographical Names Advisory Committee to consider the community's view very carefully. I repeat that out of 111 homes at which people were able to be contacted 110 homes objected to this proposal, and that strongly indicates the community's view on this matter. I ask the Minister to recognise the community's view that Coromandel Valley should remain as such. The residents of Coromandel Parade, Diosma Drive, Protea Avenue and Craiglee Drive want to live in Coromandel Valley, and I support their view.

Ms HURLEY (Napier): I refer to the way that Mitcham council appears to have been operating, and to the inaction of the current Minister in dealing with this matter. The problem began some time ago and has been the subject of numerous articles in the local newspaper and numerous complaints. Initially, in order to ensure that a lot of its discussions were held in secret, Mitcham council formed working parties rather than subcommittees of the council to discuss matters, and these working parties were, under the Act, not open to the public. When legal advice was obtained on this matter and correspondence between the Minister was exchanged, Mitcham council was eventually forced to abandon this practice of forming working parties, because the advice was that the working parties as they were constituted by Mitcham council had to be open to the public. It therefore appears that Mitcham council is now resorting to a provision in section 62 of the Local Government Act which allows discussions to be held in secret if professional advice is being tendered to the council.

If a minor report from a lawyer, architect or any other professional person is due for discussion, the abuse to which I refer has been occurring by the council simply closing off the meeting to interested outsiders, including members of its own council. Mitcham council has kept secret in this way a long list of matters, including the possible purchase of land at a Westbourne Park oval; redevelopment of its own council chambers, which is linked in with the possible purchase of land in Ayr Avenue in Torrens Park; and a proposed division of land adjoining the Sturt River at Riverside Drive in Darlington. Interested ratepayers' and residents' associations have been unable to be party to these discussions and unable to follow what is happening within their own council even when that matter involves their own local area.

Another matter about which residents are concerned is the amount of power that has been delegated by council members to the chief executive officer. Residents feel that it goes beyond the normal duties of a chief executive officer and impinges on the areas which should in normal circumstances be dealt with by council members. For instance, the city manager is able to approve expenses for elected members, which is specifically denied by the Local Government Act. Another issue that Mitcham council is concealing by use of this secrecy provision is proposals to amalgamate with nearby councils. It has been pointed out that adjoining councils like Unley and Marion, with which Mitcham might be amalgamating, have already developed their council chambers, which are quite substantial. However, Mitcham council's proposed redevelopment, the details of which so far have been hidden from its ratepayers, involves the construction of a large edifice that may become redundant if amalgamation goes ahead.

This is a very serious issue, because we have seen already the three advance amalgamation proposals fall over, and it appears that amalgamations within councils are floundering. There has been little action by the Minister on any of these matters.

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

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): The matters I wish to draw to the attention of the House this afternoon are largely related to the maladministration of the WorkCover organisation in South Australia and associated activities between it and the interface it should or could have with the third party bodily injury unit perhaps in SGIC. In all probability it is a consequence of WorkCover's ineptitude that the problems have arisen.

The first problem is that of a constituent who at this point I will not name but who, late last year, was working for the Education Department as a school bus driver and was hailed to help a motorist whose Volkswagen was stranded on the roadside. Unbeknown to the Volkswagen driver who sought the help of the bus driver, the bus driver was a mechanic. The bus driver got out and in very hot weather rapidly diagnosed the fault as a fuel blockage. In doing roadside temporary repairs to make the car mobile he disconnected the fuel line and attempted to clear the blockage. In doing so he was doused with petrol which at that unfortunate moment ignited, causing severe burns to over 30 per cent of his body. Needless to say, he was admitted to the Royal Adelaide Hospital's burns unit, which as members know is famous for the professional way in which it goes about dealing with patients and which has a high success rate in this regard. He was treated, and then his burns were dressed and he went home.

I recently received a letter from his wife, and it is a brief outline of the conversation she had with me the day before. As she points out, she of course could write a book about this. Had the bus driver been allowed to remain as an inpatient at Royal Adelaide Hospital receiving treatment as a public patient, his problems would not have arisen; but he could not receive treatment as a public patient, because it was considered that he was likely to be the recipient of WorkCover, but WorkCover would not acknowledge that he was.

Certainly, my remarks reflect in no way on anything the Ministers involved could have done but have not done: they are a straight-out reflection on the maladministration and incompetence of people in WorkCover, in my judgment, including their lack of capacity for compassion in the system

they have developed. As an aside, I indicate that, so long as we retain the services of people such as Jan Powning, who really believes that the arrangements between WorkCover and the people it insures ought to be subject to negotiation—between what I heard her describe as the social partners, that is, the employers' representatives and the unions, the mess will continue.

I do not believe that that in any way is either compassionate or sensible. I did not think you could negotiate away occupational health and safety standards in a workplace. I thought they were absolutes: you either decide that it is too much risk or that it is not. Notwithstanding that, in the unfortunate circumstances in which my constituent found himself, he had to go home and could not stay in hospital. His wife points out to me in her letter that her 70 year old father now looks after their shop. She used to work there full time and now she cannot because she has to look after her burnt husband. He has been booked into the Royal Adelaide Hospital and arrived on time to get treatment, been admitted and given a bed, believing that the sort of help he needed was about to begin. However, he was sent home not once but twice.

He has had no physiotherapy to help him regain movement in his shoulders or fingers, and all this has been a consequence of maladministration in WorkCover. It is terrible, to say the least, that this wife, having three children—the eldest in the process of enrolling in university, another in year 12 and the other in year 5—cannot cope with those pressures. It is indeed unfair.

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

VICTIMS OF CRIME

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I lay on the table a ministerial statement by the Attorney-General dealing with the Victims of Crime Service and the Crime Information Prevention to the Elderly Program (CIPE).

CONSENT TO MEDICAL TREATMENT AND PALLIATIVE CARE BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 15 February. Page 1625.)

Clause 19 passed.

Schedule 1—'Medical power of attorney.'

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: For example purposes this schedule has three references to the Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Act 1994. Obviously, that will be altered according to the circumstances at the time of proclamation.

Schedule passed.

Schedule 2 passed.

Schedule 3—'Repeal and transitional provisions and consequential amendments.'

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I move:

Page 16, line 8—Leave out '(being of or over 18 years of age)'.

This is a consequential amendment.

Amendment carried; schedule as amended passed.

Title passed.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

In speaking to the third reading of the Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Bill I wish very briefly to thank all participants in the debates, which have been a feature of the past several years in relation to this matter. I believe it is now an eminently excellent Bill, which I am sure encapsulates many, if not all, of the feelings in the community and indeed of the select committee. I wish to thank everyone within this Chamber who contributed, and I indicate as I did last night that I intend to seek further legal advice, particularly in relation to one matter, and I have spoken to two lawyers today and I have two further legal opinions to take into account.

Without canvassing any new matters, I merely wish to observe that at 10.30 this morning I received notification that a friend of mine, who had gone through medicine with me and with whom I used to spend many Saturday mornings doing pathology and so on, had died in Mary Potter Hos-

pice. I visited him twice in the past four or five days, and I pay tribute to the way he handled his illness in the past few months. When I think of him I think how abhorrent it would have been to have lawyers involved with his demise. With that in mind I signal my intent to press the matters I discussed last night. I thank all contributors to the debate. I now believe that we have world leading and excellent legislation.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I support the Bill's third reading. I am disappointed that the Minister has succeeded in omitting a clause or two from the Bill as it was received from another place and that my amendments were defeated, particularly that on nasogastric feeding. However, on balance I believe that the Bill is for the public good.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.49 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 21 February at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 14 February 1995

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

CRISIS CARE

136. **Mr ATKINSON:**

1. What are Crisis Care's rules as to confidentiality in its dealings on behalf of estranged spouses?

2. What explanation of its procedures does Crisis Care offer an estranged spouse before obtaining and relaying information between spouses?

3. What information is recorded by Crisis Care during telephone contacts with estranged spouses, who may obtain that information and how is it used?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:

1. The principles of confidentiality applying to all public servants is contained in section 67 of the Government Management and Employment Act. These principles apply irrespective of the nature of the dealings with clients. Practice standards have been developed by the department and these are in line with the stipulation of the Australian Association of Social Workers as the professional body.

The objective of confidentiality is to 'ensure that personal information is not disclosed without the permission of the client other than in defined exceptional circumstances'. This is fully consistent with the principles relating to confidentiality that are stipulated by the professional body, the Australian Association of Social Workers.

The disclosure of certain information in exceptional circumstances is contained within the Attorney General's Department privacy principles of individuals, section 10, which states that information should not be disclosed unless 'the person disclosing the information believes on reasonable grounds that the disclosure is necessary to prevent or lessen a serious and imminent threat to the life or health of the record-subject or some other person'.

The confidentiality provisions remain the same as those in place under the previous Government and there are no changes to the arrangements indicated in the Public Sector Management Bill to replace the GME Act.

2. The department's operating principles are detailed as practice guidelines which provide the basis for all professional social work decisions. Procedures governing confidentiality of information is explained where requested or as is necessary to all clients. These arrangements remain the same as those which were in place under the former Government.

3. Every call received at Crisis Care is initially recorded on a log sheet which the worker uses as a working document for the duration of the call. Information of a more serious nature, or where there may be further departmental contact with the caller, is then transferred to the computer based client information system.

This maintains accountability between worker and client, provides information that can be used to evaluate casework, and provides evidence for court proceedings if required, particularly in cases involving child protection. Where this does not occur, information is stored on a data-base and kept within the Crisis Care unit without any information identifying the caller. This statistical information is then available to follow trends in workload and assist in the planning and management of services.

The recording of information at Crisis Care is the same for contacts with estranged spouses as for any other presenting problem.

Any client of the department has the right to request access to recorded information, which relates specifically to them, subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act 1991. All clients have the right to apply for 'access to personal records which affect them.' The freedom of information legislation provides for the protection of the interests of other parties cited in information sought.

There are departmental practice standards concerning the handling of information to meet confidentiality requirements. Again, this Government has made no changes to the departmental practice or the administrative provisions for the Freedom of Information Act 1991.

BUS WINDOWS

152. **Ms GREIG:** How many windows have been replaced since January 1994 on buses from the Lonsdale depot due to rock throwing incidents?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: There have been 54 recorded incidents of windows requiring replacement that can be directly attributed to missiles being thrown at buses from Lonsdale depot since January 1994.

Since the completion on 1 October 1994 of Operation 'Rock', a combined Police/Transit Police operation targeting anti-social behaviour in the southern areas, there have been seven windows requiring replacement due to 'rock throwing incidents'.