

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 6 April 1995

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

CONSENT TO MEDICAL TREATMENT AND PALLIATIVE CARE BILL AND INDUSTRIAL AND EMPLOYEE RELATIONS (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

The **Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Emergency Services)**: I move:

That the sitting of the House be continued during the conferences on the Bills.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON WOMEN IN PARLIAMENT

Ms GREIG (Reynell): I move:

That the interim report of the committee be noted.

Yesterday I tabled in the House the Interim Report of the Joint Committee on Women in Parliament and today I will briefly address the outcome of this report and acknowledge the many hours of work that went into the interim report by all members of the committee: the Hons Angus Redford, Carolyn Pickles and Sandra Kanck, Mr Stewart Leggett, Ms Lea Stevens and myself. I also include our Secretary (Mr Chris Schwarz) and Research Officer (Dr Carol Bradley). On 4 May 1994 a Joint Committee of the South Australian Parliament was established to consider and report upon the extent and reasons of any existing impediments to women standing for Parliament, strategies for increasing both the number and the effectiveness of women in the political and electoral process, and the effect of Parliamentary procedure and practice on women's aspirations to and their participation in the South Australian Parliament.

In presenting this interim report I also acknowledge the 14 witness who appeared before the committee and the 20 people who took the time to present written submissions. There has been considerable discussion on a broad range of issues pertaining to the terms of reference of this report and all of this information will make up the final report. However, due to the timing of the interim report and the current refurbishment of the South Australian Parliament House, the committee decided that it was important that certain pieces of evidence taken to date, and the recommendations that follow, would best be presented to the Parliament before the completion of hearings.

A great deal of the evidence taken so far relates to physical and family constraints which inhibit women in considering a Parliamentary career and therefore these findings are important when addressing facilities that seriously should be considered and incorporated into any structural amendments to this building. With time being of the essence, the committee has focused this report on particular aspects of paragraphs (a) and (c) in the terms of reference. As I mentioned earlier, we received evidence on a broad range of issues, including Party preselection proced-

ures, electoral reform and questions of structural power. These findings will be addressed in the final report.

In our discussions as a committee we felt that it was important to look at the current refurbishment of this building, which we have noted as an infrequent occurrence and therefore it is imperative that, as we approach the twenty-first century, we need to ensure that the building is appropriate and effective in meeting the needs of future members. This means that changes such as the composition of Parliamentary membership, changes in parenting practices of both men and women and the expectations of the community in relation to family responsibilities all need to be taken into account as part of the strategic planning of this building.

In addressing these needs I believe we are highlighting the unique role of members of Parliament, which all members here are more than familiar with. We do not have a nine to five position five days a week. I often tell people that being a member of Parliament is not a job but a way of life: it has a culture all of its own. Most here will relate to my saying that you eat, breathe and sleep your position 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Unfortunately, services in the community cannot adequately meet our needs or the requirements of potential future Parliamentarians unless issues such as child care, facilities to meet with one's family members and/or family friendly sitting hours are given due consideration.

A discussion paper on women in Parliament 1994 quite rightly pointed out that the most commonly stated cost for both women and men Parliamentarians is the toll on family life, where this is generally felt by both genders to be greater for women than men. Working hours are designed to suit the traditional breadwinner family model with many weekend and evening commitments and an expectation to be constantly available. Single parents are rare in Parliaments.

Research also suggests that a key factor in women's decisions about how they will spend their work time is the effect of work activities on their family responsibilities. It is widely recognised that women, particularly mothers, still take the main responsibilities for family matters. For example, a recent survey has shown that two of the most important factors affecting job selection for Australian women are hours of work and nearness to home. For women returning to work after a break in employment, the greatest difficulty is balancing family responsibilities and a job.

In going through the interim report, members will note the references to women's perceptions of Parliamentary life. I highlight the section dealing with procedures and sitting hours. We undertook a survey of the spouses of members to ascertain their views on the system of Parliamentary sessions, sitting hours and other factors that may impact on family life. The findings of this survey are tabled in appendices A and B of the report. I also mention that the vast majority of spouses considered that the sitting hours are too long and there was overwhelming support for an earlier start and earlier finish for Parliamentary sittings. Other factors which members' spouses stated they had experienced negatively were the lack of family facilities in Parliament and an overall feeling of isolation.

Our report addresses the structural impediments and women's negative perceptions of politics as a career, which is a major deterrent to women standing for Parliament. Even if individual women feel attracted to political life, there are structural impediments that work to actively restrict them. Again this section of the report highlights family responsibilities.

The concluding chapter of the interim report addresses two related and specific practical problems in relation to the South Australian Parliament House. The first issue—child care and lack of family facilities—and, secondly, those practices which indirectly mitigate against close involvement for Parliamentarians with their families. This is particularly pertinent for women with the major responsibility for children. This chapter goes on to address geographical problems for country members, the associated problems with the change in lifestyle and the problems of separation from family members.

In conclusion, I commend the interim report to the House. I ask that further consideration be given to the recommendations of the committee. Even though the interim report relates to members of Parliament, many of the problems addressed are shared by the staff of this Parliament. Therefore, where possible the conclusion should be to the benefit of all in this House. I thank again all members of the committee, and in that I include support staff and the members of *Hansard* who assisted during all hearings.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I will speak briefly in support of the report and make some comments following the more comprehensive remarks by the member for Reynell, the Chair of our committee. The report before us is an interim report and the committee put it forward now particularly as it related to renovations in Parliament House and wished to make sure that the comments and considerations contained in this report were able to be taken into consideration while any renovations were occurring.

As the member for Reynell outlined, the committee has looked at a number of impediments in relation to why women do not stand for Parliament. Women's perception of Parliamentary life was the first one and we will investigate that more thoroughly over the time of the committee, but essentially I will quote a couple of comments by people who came before our committee. Few women are interested in politics as a career. If you talk to people conversationally the majority will say, 'Oh my God, I cannot think of anything worse.' That is the first thing we have to change. That has been a fairly constant comment from women who have come before the committee. That is something that we as a Parliament will have to face and certainly the committee as it furthers its considerations along those lines will be making more detailed recommendations. Procedures and sitting hours came up very often as a real impediment for women because we recognise that women in our society still take the major load of looking after families.

Members interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: That is the case, although members next to me are shaking their head. I think it is clear—

Mr EVANS: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member for Elizabeth indicated by a hand movement that the member sitting next to her somehow disagreed with the comment she was making. That is not the case, and I ask her to withdraw that inference.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the member for Davenport that the best way of handling the matter is for him to respond by way of debate on this issue.

Ms STEVENS: I withdraw any inference that might have been taken by members on my left. I heard an interesting comment and I assumed it was related to what I was saying. Obviously, it was not. Parliamentary procedures and sitting hours are very unfriendly. Late nights, sittings that go through school holidays and long debates take up family time and

family energy. It behoves our Parliament to look at the way we do things, to make things faster and more efficient, so that people do not spend here the hours and hours that they do. We should be able to get through what we do in a more efficient manner to enable participation in Parliament of a wider group of people.

Another issue that the committee looked at was the role of women with families and how much that impacts on their decision to take on the burdens of being a politician, and of being available to the community, in many cases seven days a week. As a society, we need to think about how, in terms of the democratic process, we can ensure that a representative group of people make our laws. We need to balance that with our expectation of politicians with respect to their duties in the community, their duties to their families and their duties to Parliament. Those issues will be addressed more fully in later reports. I commend the recommendations and I ask that members consider them carefully.

Another concern is the provision of child care, and the report refers to members being able to meet with their families. Members with young families would be able to use facilities within the House which would enable them to have their children with them for a certain time, in a place that is appropriate. Another recommendation calls on Parliament to reconsider sitting days and sitting hours to make them more suitable for members with family responsibilities. That goes back to the other point that I made, that we need to look at the way we operate here, the way we process our business. We could make it much more efficient, and, by reviewing the way we do our business, we could address the issues in recommendation 4. I have enjoyed the time that the committee has spent, and I look forward to the further work that the committee will produce. I thank all people who have made submissions to the committee, the other members of the committee, the Chairperson and our support staff. I commend the report.

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurua): When the suggestion was made that a joint committee be formed to investigate the reasons why women do not enter Parliament at the same rate as men, I remember making the statement that a committee did not need to be established because these people could simply speak to a couple of women members of Parliament instead. Having read the interim report, I repeat my belief that they did not need to sit down as a committee, that they needed only to speak to a few women and to their member of Parliament. There is nothing in the interim report to suggest that they have come up with anything different than if they had spent a couple of hours speaking to a few members of Parliament.

They were asked to consider the extent of and reasons for any existing impediments to women's standing in Parliament and strategies to increase both the number of women and the effectiveness of women in their political and electoral process. They were asked to consider also the effect of parliamentary procedure and practice on women's aspirations to and participation in the South Australian Parliament. Unfortunately, I have to say on record that I feel they have fallen short in most areas.

Recommendation 3.1 deals with women's perceptions of parliamentary life. The member for Elizabeth quoted from the evidence to the committee of one person who said that she would not think of entering politics. The quote was, 'Oh, my God! I couldn't think of anything worse.' The perception of this place has to do far more with the waste of time, the

inefficiency of the process, the hours that we sit here listening to drivel, the time that we spend considering things that have already been agreed outside the parliamentary process, when we should just pass it and get on with the process. It is a total waste of time. Most women have far too much to do than spend time sitting around listening to a whole lot of rubbish.

Mr Evans: And men.

Mrs ROSENBERG: Yes, and men, but we are talking about women in this issue, and I think that women have far more to do, and that is probably where the perception comes from. That is far more important than the lack of child-care facilities in Parliament House. With respect to issue 3.1(a), procedures and sitting hours, I could not agree more that the hours do not encourage people to enter Parliament, but no more so for women than for men. Men have to be part of the family responsibility and the male members in this place who are single parents—I know there are a couple—have equal responsibility in their family life as do the women members of Parliament.

I do not know why we always assume that parliamentary hours are worse for women than they are for men. I do not accept that. In terms of family responsibility, I would like us to get back to encouraging equal participation in family responsibility. We should get away from society's expectation and from increasing that view that women take the majority part in the upbringing of children. It should be an equal responsibility, and I believe it is so in most families that are successful.

Recommendation 3.3 talks about the need for a 24 hour child-care service to be available to members of Parliament within the parliamentary area. In my opinion, the committee has missed the point entirely. Members of Parliament are not looking for a 24 hour child-care service within Parliament House. They want the security of knowing that, if they are not available to look after their children the way in which they want to, they have adequate child-care facilities available to them somewhere, whether or not that is in their own home. The last place in the world where I would want to have my children looked after 24 hours a day is Parliament House.

The committee has completely missed the point. What parents ought to be looking for are adequate resources to have their children cared for so that they can feel comfortable with the fact that they are in here doing the job, which, I must remind members, they chose to do. They chose to do this job and, as they did choose this job, what they really want are adequate resources to have their children cared for when they are working. That is why I think the committee has missed the point.

A matter of further consideration for the committee should be proper compensation for women and men who need child-care facilities. For goodness sake, local government councillors, who receive next to nothing for the job they do for the community, are allowed to claim for child care on their tax, and I see absolutely no reason why this ought not be the case for State members of Parliament also. As I have said, the Parliament House structure is the last place that I would want to bring my children to be cared for. I have worked all my life and in no other job have I ever come across the issue of having child care within the bounds of where I worked, and no other woman has ever said to me that they could not possibly exist in the work force if they did not have child care within the bounds of where they worked. I think the committee has really missed the point completely.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs ROSENBERG: No; I will leave the cost to the member for Peake. He will be very happy to address that when he speaks. The other issue in terms of the feasibility of the child-care facility idea is that it simply can be made much easier through a more understanding atmosphere for parents—male or female—who need to be released quickly to address issues within their own family situation. If we could address that quickly—and that should be possible—it would relieve the pressure as quickly as it would to talk about building a child-care centre in Parliament House.

I believe that this Government has addressed the issue in relation to the days of sitting and the fact that some days of sitting go into the school holiday period. In this last session of Parliament we ensured that the sitting of Parliament did not coincide with the April holidays and, in fact, it does not, so we have taken that important issue on board.

In terms of the recommendations of this interim report, I ask quite sincerely and without criticism of the report that the committee think about extending its considerations to take on board a couple of the issues which I have mentioned and which could easily be addressed before the report is finalised. It must be stressed that I am not making these statements simply to be critical of the report: I am saying that the issue of child-care facilities, which seems to have taken up a large proportion of the report, is not the answer to the problem. I do not know which country members do and do not have children as I have not researched that, but my own children go to Aldinga Primary School and Willunga High School.

Having child-care facilities in Parliament House would be totally inappropriate. I would have to drive to Willunga, pick them up from school, drive back here with them, have them looked after in this place until 3 a.m. and then take them home. What a disruptive system that would be. It is the most disruptive system I could possibly imagine, and it is the last thing I would want to do. I cannot understand other people wanting to do it either.

Mr EVANS (Davenport): I rise to address the interim report. I do carry some support for the comments of the member for Kaurna, and I take up the point she raised that, if they are seriously looking at child-care facilities for MPs, they really should look more closely at what child-care facilities are available closer to each MP's office. We all know that we spend far less time in the Parliament than we do our electoral offices. Parliament sits for only 60 or 70 days a year, and you are notified well in advance of when you have to attend, whereas you spend every other day in your electoral office. Certainly if you want quality time with your kids, it would be far easier to have that at your electoral office than it would be at Parliament House. I have some sympathy for the argument put forward by the member for Kaurna in that I do not think that, when it is sitting, Parliament House necessarily is the best place to look after children. Certainly, I would not want my four children here as it would be an added distraction.

When I do want my children here, I plan it, I bring them in, the catering staff are excellent and handle our two year old and four year old very well. I think that, if the families plan to visit, we have reasonable facilities here for that now. To say that we are going to set up extra rooms in which families can meet is a fair principle, but the Parliament has to understand that we do not even have enough conference facilities when we want to meet with constituents or when we want to have meetings. We should first of all set a priority to provide better service to the constituents and, once we have

established that within the Parliament, we can worry about providing a better service to the politicians who by their very choice have decided to come into this occupation.

My father was a member of this House for some 26 years, and as a child I would have loved to come down here and spend more time with my father, but his job dictated that that time was not available while he was working at Parliament House. Our family compensated by other means and by planning around my father's time commitment here. I challenge anyone to say that the quality of my family life suffered as a result of my father's involvement in politics. In fact, I think my family life was enhanced by my father's involvement in politics. So I do not see the introduction of full-time child-care facilities necessarily as a great bonus to the Parliament. There are many child-care facilities within the square mile of Adelaide which are available to politicians and, in fact, there are 24-hour child-care facilities available within the centre square of Adelaide in which politicians could put their children.

If you want to bring you children in, you get an hour and a half for dinner; you can walk anywhere within the city and go and see your child at the child-care centre. There are great facilities within the square mile of Adelaide and ample opportunity to take your children for walks to the zoo, around the Torrens or wherever you want. I do not necessarily believe that there needs to be a separate room within the Parliament: there are adequate private and Government run centres within the square mile of Adelaide that can be used. If the Parliament is to upgrade facilities, I would much rather see the money spent on providing better constituent meeting facilities so that when you have a conference with constituents you have somewhere to meet, because at the moment that is not the case.

As far as the system of sitting days is concerned and the number of sitting days, I make the point that if you change the sitting hours then ultimately that will mean that you have a different arrangement of the amount of time you can spend in your electoral office. I do not know about other members but I find that I have to divide my time between the Parliament and my electoral office. For every hour you do not sit at night in the Parliament, that is one or two hours off the time you have available in your electoral office. So you can take your pick: you can either spend your time away from your kids in the Parliament at night or you can spend your time away from your kids in your electoral office doing the work you would have done normally while you were in the Parliament or within the community.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

Mr EVANS: As the member for Elizabeth quite rightly says, if you wish to plan it as you do with every other profession, you can spend time with your kids. It is no different to a surgeon or a doctor on locum service who is called out after hours, or a shift worker who works at night when his or her children are at home: it is a family planning matter. I do not necessarily see the provision by the Parliament of 24-hour child-care facilities as the be all and end all, when those facilities are already available within a 10 minute walk of the Parliament. I do not see necessarily—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

Mr EVANS: I did not say you said that. The member for Elizabeth claims she did not say that. Certainly the report suggests that members need a 24-hour child-care facility. So I tend to favour the arguments put forward by the member for Kaurna. I make the point, as she did, that everything in the report that relates to the women's side of the agenda equally

relates to the male side of the agenda. As the father of four children, I have every right to bring my children into Parliament House and share the facilities, and that would give my wife the freedom to earn more of an income than she does currently in her own business, and I am sure she would appreciate that. However, we made that decision when I entered Parliament; we discussed it; we talked about the time commitment and the family planning matters; and we talked about the time we were going to use together, what holidays we would take together and the use of school holidays together, and we work to a family plan.

I run a business with 15 employees; I am a member of Parliament; and my wife runs a business. We have a busy time schedule and simply we plan around it, and that is really the answer to this question. I support the member for Kaurna in her comments, and I look forward to the outcome of the report.

Ms GREIG (Reynell): I thank members for their comments. However, I think certain people need to look more closely at the report to see what it is about. As we say, the recommendations in the report came from women from various backgrounds and walks of life, and some very learned men also contributed to our findings. These people signified the need for child-care facilities. What everyone is overlooking is that no-one has said that a child-care facility needs to be built in this House. Our recommendation was that something be provided in the vicinity of this building so that not only members of Parliament and staff could use it but also Casino staff, TAFE staff and any other workers who work unusual hours like ourselves.

Yes, we did talk about a family meeting room. That came about as a result of much discussion with spouses and non-custodial parents, who said that they do not have the opportunity to meet with their husband or wife and so on very often when we sit through the week. In fact, some members stated that there were times when they went for weeks on end without seeing their family. They felt that it was important for their family to come in here and have a meal with them and that there be some facility where they can sit and talk with them. I am not talking about a child-minding facility but a room where the member and his or her family can sit together and the children can play and watch television and things like that where they are not annoying other members who do not have family visiting them. It was felt important that family responsibility be a main aspect to be considered.

As most members would be aware, much money was spent on the refurbishing of the Commonwealth Parliament and child-care and family needs were not given any consideration. Now they are having to revisit what they planned back then and start thinking about the needs of their House because there are numerous complaints from members who do not have anywhere to meet properly with their family, and that goes for staff as well. We are trying to save long-term expenses and probably use a bit of vision in planning ahead for the twenty-first century when parenting roles will hopefully take on a different aspect and men and women will share that role and therefore look at those responsibilities and their need to consider their family as No. 1 no matter what industry they are in.

It is also important to note that we are not the only ones looking at this. The Federal Government and various other groups have been looking at industry-based child care for some time. The meetings that have been held at Noarlunga have drawn great crowds from various industries. Workers

have come out to see what can be done nearby or within their own industry to have child-care provided. So, no matter how we look at it, it is an issue that we have to consider now. Even if it is not done now it is something that will be seriously considered in the future.

Motion carried.

**ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: MFP
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I move:

That the fifteenth report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee on the Environment, Resources, Planning, Land Use, Transportation and Development Aspects of the MFP Development Corporation for 1994-95 be noted.

Yesterday I tabled the third report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee into aspects of the operations of the MFP Development Corporation during 1994. Members will be aware that in addition to its normal function of inquiring into matters referred to it by the Parliament and initiated of its own motion, the committee also has a number of important functions imposed upon it by various pieces of legislation, notably the Development Act, the Environment Protection Act and the MFP Development Act.

Section 33 provides that the corporation's role under the MFP Development Act is to report on the environment, resources, planning, land use, transportation and development aspects of the MFP Corporation's operations. The committee is noted for taking its statutory obligations seriously, despite its limited resources. In fact, as this interim report bears witness, it does more than simply observe its minimum statutory obligation to report once a year—where necessary it will report more often in order to bring important matters to the attention of the public.

We feel it necessary to report now to balance the negative publicity that surrounded our last report and to draw attention to more positive aspects currently being undertaken by the MFP Corporation. As members may expect, our report is not free from criticism. However, as always, it is constructive criticism aimed at ensuring that the many benefits that the MFP can bring to our community and to the nation are fully realised. It was evident in previous reports to the committee that many MFP projects have the potential to be of outstanding benefit to the State and the nation and to be of international significance. However, this significance was often obscured by the lack of substance in past reports, which has been a source of frustration for the committee.

We have been forced to focus on the reporting process rather than on the MFP projects themselves. The committee has stressed in the past that in order to comply with its own statutory obligations it relies heavily upon the MFP Corporation to comply with its obligations. The committee simply does not have the resources to conduct its own independent, detailed examination of these major aspects of the corporation's operations. It does indeed rely largely upon an objective assessment of the reports that the corporation is required to provide once a year. In complying with the previous legislative requirement to report twice a year, the corporation reported on 28 February. The committee is pleased to note that there has been a significant improvement this year in both the form and the content of the latest statutory report presented by the corporation. The report shows that the MFP has the potential to provide significant

lasting benefits to the State and that it therefore deserves the wholehearted support of all South Australians.

The corporation's latest report is somewhat overly concise, but it does directly address what it is doing. It contains an excellent summary of the corporation's work in the three progress briefs at the beginning of the report, which are headed: Building Australia's MFP—the urban development; Cleaning up the site—environmental remediation; and Building the economic base for the MFP—business development. The reports on individual projects, which follow this summary, provide a reasonable picture of the corporation's progress in fulfilling the objectives of the MFP Development Act and give a better idea than past reports of the corporation's success in performing its functions.

Now that the fog of verbiage has lifted, it is possible to see precisely what the MFP is achieving and will achieve for our community. However, we point out that the continuing lack of objective indicators or standards against which the corporation's overall performance can be measured or its progress evaluated remains a cause for concern. Particular areas in which the committee expects more detail are briefly set out in our report. As with our last report, we are confident that the corporation will take note of our comments and respond positively to them.

The committee also points out that it expects to be informed of major developments, especially the emergence of unexpected environmental problems at the core site, between the regular reports required by statute. The committee signals that it is prepared, if necessary, to conduct its own independent investigation of these matters in order properly to fulfil its watchdog role. As I have said, the committee takes that role very seriously. We point out in our report that Parliament has given this committee a watching brief in relation to many important aspects of the MFP, and it has given other committees and authorities a similar brief in relation to other aspects of the corporation's activities.

The committee has no wish to be seen as a constant snarling watchdog, but I believe it would be against the interests of good Government to be regarded as a fawning lap dog or the proverbial rubber stamp. As to matters of substance, the committee remains strongly of the view that the Gillman site should be rehabilitated whether or not it remains central to the whole MFP project. We therefore welcome the corporation's obvious commitment to continuing remediation of the core site. A general shift away from involvement in environmental concerns or a downgrading of the emphasis on finding solutions to problems linked to the MFP core site, including waste management problems, would be of major concern to the committee.

The committee looks forward to the report on remediation of the Gillman site, which is due in mid 1995. In the meantime, we wish to congratulate the corporation and the volunteers involved for their innovative and inexpensive solution to the problems that have been caused by the past dumping of tyres on that site.

The corporation's latest report includes an informative project status report on the environmental management plan, which is intended to provide a comprehensive strategic plan for the environmental management of the Gillman-Dry Creek core site. The committee looks forward to distribution of the management plan document and to assessing the response from interested members of the public. During the recent tour of the site, committee members were disturbed to see problems developing in the proposed landward accession of the mangroves. We were also disturbed that the apparently

considerable setback to plans to extend the mangroves, apparent from the damage we saw, had not previously been brought to our attention.

The status of the conservation zone project is outlined in the corporation's latest report, and in our report we urge the corporation to continue to give this project priority and to provide the committee with timely reports on its progress. The committee confirms its continuing interest in the testing being carried out at the core site in preparation for its eventual remediation and development. We were told that geotechnical testing was due to be formally extended at the beginning of the year, and we expect to be kept informed of any change in the original optimistic assessment about the extent of contaminants at the site. Notwithstanding the shift of focus away from the site and the receding likelihood of extensive urban development occurring there, the committee continues to believe that community fears of the effects of toxic waste and soil contamination must be allayed and we will continue to monitor this issue closely.

Last year the committee questioned officers of the corporation closely about the proposed land fill plan being developed for Garden Island at the core site. The proposals for remediation of that land fill, which have been negotiated with the current operator, are intended to demonstrate improved land fill practices, rehabilitation of a degraded environment, revegetation of land fill and the provision of recreational facilities in cooperation with existing users and the local community. The committee commends these aims as being entirely consistent with the core aims of the MFP and looks forward to those aims being demonstrated in practice. Details of the corporation's work with local councils and State agencies to encourage appropriate waste management strategies for the future have been included in the corporation's latest report.

Once again, the committee commends the corporation for becoming involved in these larger issues, which are entirely consistent with the MFP's primary general objective of establishing a model of conservation of the natural environment and resources. The committee looks forward to receiving more detailed reports on the corporation's ongoing contribution to wider waste management issues. The committee was also impressed by progress in the development of the Barker Inlet and other wetlands at the core site. Evidence of the manner in which the area will be transformed by the wetlands is clear both on the ground at the site and in the project status reports provided to the committee. These reports provide detail of the benefits expected from the projects, including objective standards against which actual results of the project can, in time, be measured.

The corporation's involvement in the Patawalonga project is also welcomed by the committee. We strongly support the corporation's continued involvement in this project and, therefore, support the legislative changes that authorise that involvement. The corporation's latest report includes a great deal of valuable detail about the Greater Levels development, which is now well under way. It quite properly features strongly in the latest report and in the corporation's public education programs. In its last report the committee pointed out that the Greater Levels development must be more than simply another housing development. It must also be more than a development that simply incorporates new technology or even the latest technology. It must be a world leader in the application of new technology.

It must not only aspire to but also exceed international standards in the area in which it intends to act as a model and

a focus of national and world attention. The committee expects that objective targets in energy consumption and in environmental, social and other objectives would be clearly established at the outset in relation to this project. However, at present it appears that such targets have not been established. The committee is confident that the corporation will address this issue and looks forward to hearing of the business plan to be produced by the middle of the year and to actual work on the site. Finally, given the strong comments in the committee's last report, we were pleased to see the attention given to transport issues in the MFP's latest report, and the committee also looks forward to hearing about the major conclusions of the vision paper on transport systems, which has been commissioned.

In conclusion, the committee is pleased that in its latest report on the MFP it has been able to concentrate on matters of real substance and not simply on the negative procedural matters. All members of the committee, from across the political spectrum, firmly believe that the MFP has the potential to provide significant, lasting benefits to the State, and we look forward to continuing our constructive interaction with the corporation to help to ensure that the MFP fulfils its great promise.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ORGANS FOR TRANSPLANTATION

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until 1 June 1995.

Motion carried.

ELECTORAL (POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS AND ELECTORAL EXPENDITURE) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 March. Page 2117.)

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I would like to state at the outset that the Government takes this matter very seriously. I cannot say the same for the Leader of the Opposition, I might add, and I will return to that later. We have made quite clear that the Liberal Party supports proper disclosure of the source of political donations to prevent any possibility or suggestion of undue influence or corruption. Equally, I emphasise that in the matter that gave rise to this legislation there is no evidence whatsoever that any law has been broken. At the same time, as the Premier publicly acknowledged two months ago, the Federal legislation relating to disclosures is deficient, and the Federal Government itself has now acknowledged this.

Last year the Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters, an all Party committee of the Federal Parliament, made a series of recommendations to reform the existing law and supplementary procedures. Following this review, amending legislation is currently before the Federal Parliament: amendments are being debated in the Lower House and have been received by the Senate but not yet debated. Various of these amendments will receive bipartisan support, so there is movement at the station, as they say, at the Federal level.

The Federal Government has also now referred to the joint standing committee the specific issue of the ability of the Australian Electoral Commission effectively to supervise

overseas donations. The Federal Government is seeking advice on how the relevant provisions of the Commonwealth Electoral Act might be refined in this important respect as well. The South Australian Government believes that it is important for the Federal legislation to be in its agreed final form prior to the consideration of a State regime for disclosure. To do otherwise would create an unnecessary administrative nightmare, as every member would understand. Parties would have to maintain two sets of books to meet differing requirements of State and Federal laws. It is in the interests of the public, as well as the Parties, that the law be clear, consistent, balanced and as administratively simple as possible—and those principles would be endorsed by all members of this Parliament.

Given that a Federal election is not imminent and a State election is more than 2½ years away, there is no pressing call on this House to finalise the debate on this legislation in the next few weeks. There will be a further substantive response from the South Australian Government when the outcome of the Federal legislation is clear, including on the issue of donations from overseas sources and any areas which State legislation should address which a Federal legislative framework cannot effectively deal with. Quite clearly, if there are matters outside the Federal jurisdiction which have to be addressed within State legislation, there is a commitment that that will be done.

Now that we have set the record straight on what is to happen in this area, I point out—and I am sure that every member would understand—that the Leader's Bill does not represent a serious attempt to address this issue. Instead, it is borne of hypocrisy, cynicism and opportunism. It is a blatant attempt to erode the financial base of the Liberal Party while preserving the finances of the Labor Party. If this were not the motive, why does the Bill seek to prevent the naming of prominent identities in the trade unions while seeking to force the naming of shareholders of companies? Quite clearly, the Leader wishes to limit, as much as possible, political donations to the Liberal Party. He wishes to intimidate company shareholders while protecting his union mates. If the Leader—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Just listen. Everyone listened to the Leader, now the Leader can listen to me. If the Leader wishes to pursue this matter in this spirit, the Government will give very careful consideration to British legislation regulating political donations from trade union sources. I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition get hold of that legislation. It prevents the funds of a trade union being applied to further political objectives without the consent of union members given on an individual basis. I invite the House to consider why this is necessary. Labor members of this House are required to sign a pledge when they take their seats. That pledge requires them to vote on legislation according to Party policy. They have no choice: it is the pledge or coventry, and there have been one or two members who have been sent to coventry on that side of the House, and by the Labor Party, as we would all recall.

In the setting of Labor Party policy, trade unions have absolute and overwhelming influence. Hence, it is clear that trade unions can expect a very high price from the Labor Party for their financial donations to the Party, and they are doing it now with their insistence that Labor members of this House and the other place oppose the WorkCover legislation. Political donations have never spoken louder in South Australia than during the recent demonstration against the

WorkCover Bill, when the Leader pledged that his Party would not have a bar of the legislation. That is why the Leader's approach to this matter is stunning in its hypocrisy. If ever a Party has been influenced by political donations, that Party is the Labor Party.

I give the Leader fair notice that, if he wishes to pursue this matter in the spirit suggested by his second reading speech, the Government will not hesitate to amend this Bill to give each and every member of the trade union movement the right to decide whether his or her membership fees are applied to the political interests of the Labor Party. Currently, trade union members do not have that right. I also make clear to the Leader that the Government will not countenance the provisions of this Bill requiring media organisations to make returns on advertising. This is an unnecessary administrative imposition on media organisations.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: If it is the law of Australia, it can stand as it is. We are not making special provisions in South Australian legislation to require media organisations to create a new set of books for the South Australian Parliament. In considering this legislation, I invite members to look at how the Leader has developed the issue of political donations.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Who is Moriki?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Well, I am going to get to that. His first question about this matter was asked on 14 February, when he alleged that insurance companies that had made donations to the Liberal Party would receive favoured treatment in the award of WorkCover contracts. That allegation was false, because the Government will have no role in the award of these contracts. If he wants to say it outside, he can certainly do so. The next day, the Leader alleged that Gerard Industries had received Government incentives to establish a factory at Strathalbyn because of donations to the Liberal Party. But, what he failed to reveal was that the previous Government had given even greater incentives to Gerard Industries. And so, the previous Government gave more favourable consideration than this Government did to the decentralisation of facilities.

The Leader then turned his attention to the evocative names of Catch Tim and Moriki. Of course, he was mesmerised with them, just as he was mesmerised by another Tim when he was in government. He has attempted to weave all sorts of conspiracy and corruption theories around these names without producing one single piece of evidence. However, he has constantly refused to step outside the privilege of this Parliament to make his allegations. He claims that he has leaked masses of information about these donations. In fact, the Leader in his questions produced little or no information that was not on the public record. The Liberal Party—

Mr Foley: Catch Tim wasn't on the public record.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: It was on the public record.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Well, it obviously was on the public record. The Liberal Party had made all the disclosures about these donations required by the Commonwealth Electoral Act. The disclosure about the donation from Moriki was made public more than 12 months before the Leader raised the matter in this House. The company name was referred to in press reports in February 1994—not new news, old news. The donation has been audited by the Australian Electoral Commission. And Moriki was approached. They know all about Moriki, because they went to them for a donation—and that has now been put on the parliamentary

record. When the Australian Electoral Commission audited these accounts, no query was raised at the time. When the South Australian division of the Liberal Party was subjected to a routine compliance audit late last year on its record keeping and compliance with the Act, no significant query was raised by officials of the Electoral Commission. Indeed, the Party was complimented on the comprehensiveness of its records and the obvious diligence with which it obeyed the law.

Of course, this was not good enough for the Leader. He is a person who sees a scandal or imputes a scandal behind every shadow. Let me close by demonstrating to the House just how hypocritical the Leader has been in pursuing this issue. It was one of Labor's heroes, Gough Whitlam, who sought political donations from Iraq, if the members recall, yet the Leader would now ban donations from any foreign source. It was a former National Secretary of the Labor Party, Bob Hogg, who was convicted of a failure to disclose \$400 000 in political donations. It was a former New South Wales State Secretary of the Labor Party, Stephen Loosley, who failed to disclose a \$10 000 donation from a major forest industry products company. It was the former Labor Premier of Western Australia, Brian Burke, who reduced political donations and corruption to an art form. The Leader himself was a beneficiary of this corruption through the \$95 000 donation by Mr Burke to the 1985 South Australian election campaign, at which the Leader was a candidate.

As part of its shameful history, the Labor Party has always dealt with this issue by seeking partisan advantage under the guise of true accountability. Look at its record—it is absolutely shameful. The enormous resources—staff, capital assets and cash flow—which unions are able to put at the disposal of Labor are largely protected from proper public scrutiny by existing Federal law. It would be really interesting to see the extent to which Federal law will encompass rules and regulations in the union movement to test how much is given in kind and how much is given outside the rules that are currently in place.

Of course, the Leader's Bill perpetuates this protection for the union movement. If the Leader were genuine regarding this matter he would propose that all forms of trade union assistance to the Labor Party be fully disclosed and that the rights of individual union members be protected. In its 1993-94 annual report, the ALP in South Australia lists \$700 000 in income from asset sales via a prominent Sydney stockbroking firm and \$200 000 in transfers from IOOF in Melbourne. The question is: how was Labor able to generate such significant assets? Where did the funds come from? We have had reports previously that the ALP was broke, that it had a huge debt, that it had run down its assets; yet, somehow it has managed to generate an asset that is capable of transferring \$700 000 for a campaign. How were these funds managed? What were the original sources of the moneys? Who approved their transfer to the Labor Party? The suggestion that they arose from chook raffles and Labor Day kegs is ridiculous. Are we seriously expected to believe that the same group of people who sent South Australian almost bankrupt are at the same time brilliant investors? In fact, their union investments over a period suggest quite the opposite.

The Liberal Party has always obeyed the disclosure laws, unlike members Opposite. Throughout its 50 years of existence, the Liberal Party of South Australia has raised and spent its funds ethically. The South Australian division has long complied with its own established procedures, thus ensuring the integrity of the organisation and Liberal

parliamentary representatives. The Government has nothing to hide in this matter and it will continue to treat it seriously.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

VOLUNTARY EUTHANASIA BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 March. Page 2121.)

Mr De LAINE (Price): I support this Bill, and I congratulate the member for Playford on the courage he has shown in introducing it. It seems appropriate that in this the International Year of Tolerance this Bill should be debated in the House to demonstrate that people are tolerant of other people's views—in that respect, it is very appropriate. The personal views and wishes of people whether to live or die should be respected, and in my opinion the laws of this State should reflect those views. People should have the legal and moral right to choose. This Bill seeks to allow the terminally ill to choose whether to continue to live until death comes naturally or to terminate their life when all quality of life is gone.

It has been said that this provision is not necessary because of modern methods of pain management. It is true that giant gains have been made in this area, and I applaud this and all the people who have been involved in such a marvellous achievement in the way of pain management. However, there are factors other than pain which need to be addressed. It is true, as I said, that most pain can be managed these days, but other factors, such as fear, anxiety, discomfort, frustration and loss of dignity, etc., can make the continuation of life intolerable for some people—not all but some. All people are different: what would make life unbearable for one person may be quite tolerable for another and *vice versa*.

Some experts say that there is no difference between bringing about a person's death and just letting a person die. I say that there can be a vast difference, and this is in the time that it takes for a person to die and the associated feelings of fear, anxiety, discomfort, loss of dignity and the pure anguish of being trapped in a life that that person does not want to continue. I have always held the view that every person should have the right to choose whether they live or die. I, personally, extend that beyond the terminal illness situation: I believe that, at any time, people should have the right to decide whether they live or die. We have no say when we come into this world, but I think that, barring accidents, of course, we should have some sort of a say when we leave it.

In the context of a terminal illness, there are three paths or options that can be taken: first, to treat a terminally ill person; secondly, to withdraw or refuse treatment; and, thirdly, to bring about a quick, painless and dignified death. The first option of giving treatment is, of course, putting off the inevitable; the second option of withdrawing or refusing treatment can be very cruel for some people for the reasons I have outlined; and the third option should be legally available to people who wish to choose it. Members of this House may be surprised at my views on this matter, particularly because of my long involvement with the South Australian Parliamentary Christian Fellowship, but despite my religious beliefs I have always held very strong views about the right of people to choose whether they live or die, and I believe that the law should accommodate that choice. I am not prepared to judge people and condemn them to

unwarranted suffering and anguish. None of us knows exactly how we would feel if we were stricken with an incurable terminal illness, and I think that factor should be taken into account.

Human beings are a funny lot. When pets we love are injured or become ill, we put them down very quickly to avoid suffering, yet we go to great lengths to keep our loved ones alive to suffer more pain and anguish, usually for our own selfish reasons. As a human being I understand this, but a terminally ill person should have some choice in the final decision. We also have a strange way of sending our young men and women to war to cause people to be killed. We give them medals and call them heroes when they return. I am not criticising these courageous people who risk their own life and sacrifice everything to fight for our freedom: I am merely saying that the way in which society looks at these people is strange. Yet, quite often, those same people are opposed to this sort of measure which will give a person the right to choose whether they live or die in dignity when confronted with a terminal illness or when, as I say, for any reason they decide to depart this earth.

I value and respect the views of other members who oppose this legislation, so I ask that they also respect my strongly held views on this matter. I applaud the palliative care that is administered by wonderful, compassionate, caring and dedicated people. That is fine for those people who wish to receive it, but there should be a choice for the ones who do not. Mention has been made of doctors' feelings, that society should not put the responsibility on doctors to kill people. I ask the members of this House: what about the frustration and anguish suffered by doctors who constantly administer treatment and care to dying patients, coupled with the helplessness they must feel knowing that, in many cases, the patients wish to die? They request or beg the doctor to end their life, but under our archaic laws this cannot be done.

I believe that this is another reason why we should pass this legislation and give people the right to choose. Four years ago my 16 year old nephew died of leukaemia. In the early stages it was thought that he had picked up a virus, but later they diagnosed him as having leukaemia. Had treatment not been administered, and with a rapidly accelerating white corpuscle count, he would have been dead within three days with almost no suffering. Yet his parents—and I respect this decision and would have taken the same course as well—opted for the various stages of chemotherapy and other treatment. The boy lived for eight months in sheer agony, he went blind and lived through awful fear. That is another reason why I believe that this option should exist.

Also there was the recent death of my very good friend the Hon. Gordon Bruce, who has been mentioned in this House previously. Gordon was a very courageous person. I kept in constant touch with him and saw his demise. As he said before he died and as is recorded in his letters, he supported this legislation. Recently I remember seeing a Dutch video about a person with motor neurone disease, the same illness of which the Hon. Gordon Bruce died. I thought that the way euthanasia was handled in that case was very dignified and compassionate. The video showed the anguish of the doctor and the arrival at the decision to terminate this man's life when he had had enough suffering. The result was that he had time to say his goodbyes and died a very dignified, painless and peaceful death.

Many people would like to take their own lives but, as I said earlier, we do not know how we would feel if we were confronted with a terminal illness. But by the time people get

to the stage where they do know how they feel and want to take their own lives they are too weak and do not have the wherewithal to do so. I think that someone should be able legally to accede to their wishes. For those reasons, I give strong support to the Bill and I hope that other members of the House do likewise.

Mrs KOTZ secured the adjournment of the debate.

PROSTITUTION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lewis:

That this House refers the following additional terms of reference to the Social Development Committee in its consideration of matters related to prostitution—

- (i) the extent of the effect of the occupation and lifestyle of prostitutes (whether male or female) on their families, with particular reference to—
 - (a) children (their birth status) and their social development and relationships with both birth parents and any other familial parent/adult with a view to discovering how the occupation of their prostitute parent affected their life chances compared with the norms of the age group cohort they belong to;
 - (b) the effect on the other birth parent of any children arising from sexual liaisons with the prostitute, whether that birth parent was married to or a *de facto* or a casual acquaintance of the prostitute with particular emphasis on that partner's subjective assessment on the effect of the prostitute's occupation on the partner's health (including STD's), life stress, career path and personal prosperity;
 - (c) the brothers and sisters and the subjective effect the prostitute has had on their life(s);
 - (d) the birth parents, in circumstances where the prostitute is/was a minor; and
 - (e) the number of marriages and/or other live-in relationships which prostitutes have;
- (ii) the cost of caring for and rehabilitating any or all of the people in any of the foregoing categories where they have suffered any adverse consequences to their lives whether subjectively or objectively assessed;
- (iii) inclusion in its consideration of the factors influencing men and women to become prostitutes those reasons influencing the decision where they appear or are admitted to have been taken as the means of financing use of illicit drugs or gambling; and quantify those stated reasons and any other relevant reason discovered by the Committee, by category;
- (iv) inclusion in its examination of the existing law about which it is contemplating making recommendations for change to consider those recommendations in five categories, viz: male to male prostitution, male to female prostitution, female to male prostitution, female to female prostitution and orgies (i.e. any or all of the foregoing in group sex activities which involve prostitution).

(Continued from 23 March. Page 2119.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I believe that the member for Ridley is trying to be helpful to the Social Development Committee in moving these additional terms of reference, but I must say, as a member of the committee, that I do not think their substantive effect would be helpful and, therefore, I oppose the motion. The Social Development Committee has had a reference on prostitution since the Gilfillan Bill.

Mr Brindal: What have you done about it—nothing!

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Unley says, 'What have you done about it', and then answers his own question and says, 'Nothing.' I will come to that in a minute. We had a reference from the other place, upon the defeat of the Gilfillan Bill. Members may recall that the Gilfillan Bill was designed to license brothels in South Australia. It became clear that the Bill would not pass the other place, and as so

often happens when a Chamber of the Parliament cannot resolve a matter or will defeat a proposed law it refers the matter to a committee and feels better about it. The Social Development Committee has been the recipient of many such references (I will not go through them right now) and the Gilfillan Bill was one of them, and we have had that reference for about two years.

In reply to the member for Unley, the Social Development Committee has had a straightforward workload in that two years since the Gilfillan Bill was referred to it. We have brought down a report on HIV/AIDS which, in my opinion, is more important than the prostitution reference. I think the committee's report on the HIV/AIDS reference was a sensible and practical one, and was widely accepted by the public. As a member of the Social Development Committee, I am pleased to say that we gave priority to our inquiry into HIV/AIDS over the inquiry into prostitution.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: As the member for Newland says, our report on HIV/AIDS was recognised internationally and it has led to substantive improvements in universal precautions, particularly in doctors' and dentists' surgeries. The Social Development Committee has also handed down a report on family leave provisions in enterprise agreements and industrial awards, and did so after a lengthy and thorough inquiry.

When this Parliament assembled after the election of 11 December 1993, the House of Assembly submitted to the Social Development Committee a reference on rural poverty. The member for Unley may think that we should have postponed our rural poverty inquiry pending the reference on prostitution, but I point out to the member for Unley that it was this House that referred the rural poverty matter to the Social Development Committee. I do not think he can maintain that it was the mind of the House that we do prostitution before rural poverty: it clearly was not. In response to the rural poverty reference, the Social Development Committee has toured the State, notably Crystal Brook, Jamestown and Peterborough, just to name three places we have been to, plus Karoonda in the Mallee. Our Chairman, the Hon. Bernice Pfitzner, has been to Eyre Peninsula in connection with our rural poverty inquiry. We have issued an interim report on rural poverty. It was the mind of the House that the Social Development Committee inquire into rural poverty before it inquired into prostitution. I point out to the member for Unley—

Mr Brindal: What's that got to do with this?

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Unley asked by way of interjection why the Social Development Committee had not completed its reference on prostitution, and I am now telling the House why it has not completed that reference. During the last Parliament, the Social Development Committee had before it Marcia Neave, who is a well-known advocate for the decriminalisation of prostitution. For some hours we cross-examined Marcia Neave on her proposals.

Once we as a committee cleared the rural poverty interim report, we turned our mind to the prostitution reference. For, I think, six or eight weeks now we have, dutifully on Wednesday mornings from 9.30, been interviewing witnesses before us on the prostitution reference. We have had Stormy Summers, who has acquired from someone a permit to park outside Parliament House. We have interviewed Helen Vicqua from the Prostitutes Association. We have cross-examined—

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe that people who appear before parliamentary select committees are guaranteed a certain amount of confidentiality. I wonder whether the member is not transgressing Standing Orders by naming witnesses who have appeared before that committee.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair questions the wisdom of naming people in the House for whatever reason, but Standing Orders do not cover that specific committee.

Mr ATKINSON: I find it most peculiar that the member for Unley did not take a point of order when I mentioned Marcia Neave but, when I mentioned certain lobbyists in town for legal brothels, the member for Unley jumped to his feet to try to suppress their names. I do not think that either Stormy Summers or Helen Vicqua are the least bit shy about their advocacy of legalised prostitution, and I mention their names for the purpose of informing the House that we are taking evidence from all sides and we are a most open minded and inquiring committee on this matter.

Having answered the questions of the member for Unley I will return to the matter specifically before us, namely, the proposed reference from the member for Ridley. The member for Ridley is trying to help the committee, but in my considered opinion his additional reference would be of no assistance. I say that because I can see the committee hearing the prostitution reference for some months to come—well into the year—and not reporting until very late in the year. So, the reference of the member for Ridley would take us well into next year, and that is one of the reasons why I oppose it. The current reference is adequate.

The member for Ridley wants us to investigate the effect of prostitution as a vocation on the lifestyle of prostitutes and their families. I assure the member for Ridley that that matter is being taken into account by the Social Development Committee. He also calls upon us to take into account the effect on the other birth parent of any children arising from sexual liaisons with a prostitute. We have not directly considered that up until now, but we will take it into account.

The member for Ridley wants us to take into account sexually transmitted diseases. We have done just that in that the head of the Sexually Transmitted Diseases Unit in Adelaide gave evidence before the committee, and very valuable evidence it was. The member for Ridley wants us to take into account factors influencing men and women to become prostitutes. That is a question we ask of all witnesses before the committee.

In paragraph (iv), the member for Ridley asks us to take into account female to female prostitution and orgies. I do not regard that as a helpful reference. We have no evidence that there is such prostitution in South Australia—certainly not female to female prostitution—and I regard the reference as unhelpful. Therefore, I urge the House to oppose the member for Ridley's motion.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I will not detain the House long on this matter except to say that I find the contribution by the member for Spence extraordinary. Last week the member for Ridley stood in this place and moved a motion, at which time you, Sir, invited any member who wished to speak to the motion to do so, and the member for Spence did not choose to rise in his place, as he is entitled to do.

Mr Atkinson: Neither did anyone else.

Mr BRINDAL: Neither did anyone else, which is what I am about to get to. You, Sir, then put the motion and it was

carried on the voices with not one person abstaining. For one reason or another the motion is back before the House.

Mr Atkinson: Not on account of the Opposition.

Mr BRINDAL: I protest most vigorously that he who stands in the Chamber today, and tries to give some sort of reasoned critique of the motion, did not exercise his right as a member of Parliament last week to speak to or oppose the motion. So, he comes to this latterly and somewhat hypocritically. If he wanted to speak he could have spoken last week. He did not speak last week, so I intend to take no notice of what he says and I commend the rest of the House to do the same.

Motion negatived.

PROSTITUTION (DECRIMINALISATION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 9 March. Page 1869.)

Ms GREIG (Reynell): I rise to support the Bill introduced to this House by the member for Unley. I am not supporting the Bill to condone the practices of the sex industry: in fact, I feel that my reasons are completely the opposite. Prostitution, being the oldest trade in the book, will not disappear simply because we as a society do not approve. We cannot keep our heads in the sand. We have a sex industry, it is working, it may not be ethical or uphold any traditional values, but it is there—like it or not. In South Australia it is not an offence to be a prostitute. What is an offence is the activities that surround prostitution and draw the attention of criminal law. We have to acknowledge that the current laws are flawed for many reasons.

Helen Vicqua in her letter dated 7 March 1995 outlined a number of reasons why the current laws controlling prostitution are bad. She spoke about hypocrisy and double standards, where current laws are hypocritical, and institutionalised gender-based double standards. For example, service providers, being prostitutes, are charged with an offence and persons requesting and paying for services, their clients, are not charged. She also talked about health and education, lack of public scrutiny and, in the concluding paragraphs of her letter, she mentioned that some prostitutes, drivers, receptionists, and cleaners are recipients of Social Security benefits. They are reluctant to get off Social Security benefits and pay tax because of constant harassment by the police, unrealistic fines and bail conditions imposed by the courts, long hours kept in the City Watch-house, and the unreliability of an income frequently interrupted by police harassment. The letter went on.

I have covered the main facts, but the member for Unley must be given some credit for the two-step approach he has put before us in addressing the issue and cleaning up the industry. In repealing prostitution laws as they now stand by means addressed in the first Bill we can then look seriously at the second Bill and enforce workable regulations that not only protect the interests of the sex worker but ensure that health and safety issues are addressed, that safe sex becomes a common practice and, most importantly, we can start to look at how and why people enter the industry and what we can do to steer them away. We can look at local planning regulations and, most importantly, address the serious problems of child prostitution.

We have had figures thrown around as to how many known prostitutes are working in South Australia. How accurate are these figures? How many are male and how

many are female? What age groups are involved, how many are of ethnic background and how educated are the people working in the industry? Do they work through an agency or brothel or on their own? We will also be able to investigate and address issues such as health, violence, self-esteem, harassment, drug use and abuse—the list is endless. While draconian laws are in place prostitutes will not come forward but will take their chances and hope for the best.

I have spoken to a number of women in the industry. I have questioned their involvement and asked them how long they intend to remain involved. I have asked why on earth they chose this profession, and whether they intend to stay in the business or look at other career options. I learnt a lot from these women. Most are ashamed of their work, but the money is good. For some with an unemployed partner, a few children and a mortgage, they feel that this is the only way they can survive. They have no skills, jobs are not easy to come by, their problems are immediate and they need money now, so there is no time to think about training courses. For others, again with no skills, it is an easy way to make money—and I use that term loosely because it is not an easy situation to live with. None of the women I have met admit what they do for a job to their friends and neighbours or even their children.

I saw the other side of the industry: young girls who hate men and saw prostitution as a way of getting even. One woman was feeding a drug habit, working under a sleazy pimp. I heard a lot of allegations on police procedures. All of this can be addressed when we realise that prostitution is here and it will not go away.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Ms GREIG: In a letter to my electorate, of which 2 000 copies were sent, I put to the residents of Reynell that the member for Unley had introduced a Bill to decriminalise prostitution. I explained that this does not mean legalisation but involves the removal of criminal sanctions for the protection of certain public interests. I informed the community that the issue is subject to a conscience vote and that I would be guided by the community's view along with my own conscience and the information presented to Parliament. Among other things, I mentioned that the member for Unley's Bill asserts the need for the current legislation to address the issues of HIV/AIDS, continued funding of the Sex Workers Outreach Education Program run by the South Australian Health Commission, controls on the size and location of brothels to protect residents and conform with planning requirements, and other things. The response to date has been good and is still coming in, with all respondents indicating support for decriminalisation for all sorts of reasons.

What I am hearing very clearly from the electorate is that prostitution is an industry that will not go away, no matter what we do. So, let us look at the industry and make it safer and cleaner, and bring in guidelines that we can work with.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): I support the Bill and congratulate the member for Unley on his initiative in having another go at this pretty difficult topic. It was not my intention to speak on this Bill because prostitution is not a topic that particularly interests me. However, I was prompted to speak by the very fine speech that was made by the member for Spence. His speech was very reasonable and, for

the member for Spence, it was non-judgmental. It was a very lucid speech. Most of the points he made are correct.

I do not believe that decriminalisation will bring about any less prostitution. I do not think that any health issues will be solved by it. The people in the industry who have health problems now will continue to do so. The illegal trade will continue, not quite unabated, but not far off, because very many people are engaged in prostitution to feed a drug habit, or whatever, and they will not be employed in legal brothels, anyway. I hope that the problem of public nuisance will be alleviated somewhat. I do not believe that any more condoms will be used than are used at the moment. Drug addicts who engage in prostitution purely to feed their habit will engage in the sex act without condoms if that is the only way they can get the money. I am not hopeful that the problem of crime surrounding prostitution will be ameliorated, because, where there is a dollar to be made in some illegal activity, it will continue. Criminals will manage to turn a dollar out of it, also.

I support the Bill because I do not believe that anyone selling sex or anyone buying sex in almost any circumstance is any of my business. It is simply none of my business. I am not interested in the morals of it. I do not care whether it is immoral or whether it is not immoral. That is of no interest to me whatsoever. People can do as they like. Unlike the member for Spence, I believe that some good will come out of the Bill. At least it will broaden the classification of prostitutes who will no longer be hassled by the law and all the bad consequences, I believe, of that. It will allow more prostitutes to act legally and, for those individual prostitutes, that will be a good thing.

The question of fining customers was mentioned, and the member for Spence said that he would probably support that. I think that would be a great pity. Prostitutes suffer an injustice because they are not allowed to go about their business as they wish, subject to the normal community standards of good order which apply to all of us. To add the further burden on prostitutes of having their clients charged as well as themselves will do some significant damage to their business. That would be a great pity because I do not believe that the business ought to be illegal in the first place. Essentially, that is why I support the Bill, because what people do or want to do in this area is entirely up to them. It is nothing to do with me, nor, I would argue, with anybody else.

However, there is one caveat and that concerns public nuisance. Whilst I do not care what adults do with respect to prostitution, that is, what they do to each other, either singly or collectively, what gender they are, how old they are or anything else, what I am interested in is that they do it quietly.

Mr Caudell: No noise.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: No noise. Once people engage in any activity that makes a noise, whether that be sexual activity, in the hire car area or anything else, it becomes my business. I believe that prostitutes, as with car dealers or any other people engaged in public business—

Mr Caudell: Publicans.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Particularly publicans. Having stayed for a few years close to the Old Lion, I must say that I would much rather stay next door to a brothel because, according to the member for Spence, the most noise a prostitute could make could not be any worse than the noise made at the Old Lion. I believe in reasonable measures being taken to ensure that there is no public nuisance. I do not

believe that the law ought to be so draconian that it ensures that prostitution cannot take place. There is a fine line when giving powers to local councils. If the laws are too strong, local councils can ensure that prostitution does not take place in their council area, and that would be quite wrong. Given reasonable safeguards as regards the public nuisance, as far as I am concerned they can all go about their business as they wish. In terms of the health and other aspects of it, it is buyer beware. If someone is daft enough to expose themselves to sexually transmitted diseases or whatever, again, that is their business: it is nothing whatsoever to do with me.

The member for Spence said that there was nothing progressive in this issue promoted by the member for Unley and others. I disagree with my good friend and colleague: I think it is progressive to lift an unnecessary burden from a group of people, be they prostitutes, people engaged in the retail car hire industry or people engaged in the selling of eggs or bread. I really believe that, where you have unnecessary laws that impact on people and you remove those laws, that is progressive. I am not getting carried away with the notion that this is the most progressive issue that will ever be before Parliament; of course, there are degrees. However, I think it is an advance for society not to have unnecessarily oppressive or regressive laws imposed on any section of our community. Subject to the issue of nuisance, I support the measure.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): Sex and sexuality is one of the most defining issues for each of us as individuals and also in the far wider community. In a cultural sense, despite this fact, sex is one of the least discussed of significant topics in public debate and disclosure. This failure to discuss the issues of sexuality openly, intelligently and frankly has had a negative impact on many of our public policies. This debate is an important step in reversing this trend. Already we have had papers from numerous sources, including the Uniting Church, which has come out in favour of change, and the Catholic Church, which is in favour of change but with the condition that it be through the Social Development Committee. I understand that more papers will be released in the next few months from other community groups.

I have a number of aims in relation to the prostitution debate and they include: an end to child prostitution; an end to and control of criminal involvement in prostitution; an end to soliciting; protection for sex workers and sex users from harassment, intimidation, violence and blackmail; and the stopping of the spread of HIV and AIDS. If that is what the community and members of this Parliament believe in, members should vote for the second reading of these Bills so that in Committee those objectives can be met.

If we are to achieve sensible reform of our prostitution laws, the adequate protection of children must be a big feature of those Bills. This Bill complies accordingly with that aim. In relation to criminal activity, no-one wants to see in South Australia the activities that have occurred in the Eastern States. The provision of protection in law for sex workers will enable them to respond and advise police of intimidation, violence and blackmail from criminal elements. To prohibit prostitution or leave it as it is will only encourage criminal activity. In the area of soliciting, we do not want a Kings Cross or a Darlinghurst Road in Adelaide, and this Bill provides for that protection. In relation to HIV and AIDS, safe sex has to be the message of the 1990s. This Bill provides a positive response regarding safe sex practices. There is sufficient evidence to show that sex workers are

more at risk from their clients. There is a need to back this up with legislation and to insure against the spread of HIV and AIDS.

We have come a long way in the public debate about sex work in South Australia. The stereotype image of a sex worker could be a teenager or a very young person from a deprived, poverty-stricken background affected by drugs and forced into work by pimps. Like all stereotypes, this is utterly misleading. Sex workers and their life outside prostitution are no different from other women. Sex workers are also mothers, partners and responsible carers.

In this debate, we need to understand and to accept the genuine motives of those who oppose reform of prostitution laws. Their views need to be taken seriously and responded to intelligently, not just by knee jerk reaction characterising them as being without substance or legitimacy. By passing this Bill into the Committee stage we can respond to the concerns of those people who have opposed the debate so far with a strengthened and acceptable piece of legislation.

The current law is unenforceable and ignored on a daily basis by respected members of our community. Sex users include the aged and the infirmed, the blue collar worker and the professional, the unemployed and the employed, the single and the married. It is obvious that now is the time for change to those laws. It is no wonder that young people have disregard for the laws today when they see that the laws in place are ignored and unenforceable. The current prostitution laws fall into that category. This is one such law and we must address this issue. I refer to the final page of the response from the Uniting Church, which states:

Decriminalisation must not occur in isolation. The Government should develop a comprehensive social policy.

And I agree with that. It is suggested that such a policy should address the following issues: to eliminate discrimination against women; to address the inadequate levels of income maintenance provided for unemployed people; to enable prostitutes to find other employment; to ensure educational programs; to provide information on sexuality; to promote the value of non-exploitative relationships; to enable parents to take a lead in educating their children in matters of sexuality and the value of non-exploitative relationships; to address the issues as a client problem rather than a prostitution problem; and to provide more support for young people whose self-esteem has been shattered by their abuse as children. I commend the Bills to the House.

Mrs HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

PROSTITUTION REGULATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 9 March. Page 1872.)

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I rise to speak on this Bill but certainly not to support it. The act of prostitution degrades all humanity. The buying and selling of human beings for whatever purpose has long been regarded by society as one of the lowest forms of human behaviour. The Bill before us seeks to license legal brothels where the act of prostitution will be deemed to be legal and acceptable, and the State of South Australia will formally become the pimp for a legally regulated network of organised prostitution. We are also asked to determine this issue without the benefit of moral considerations. To say that public issues of this magnitude should be determined without regard to discussions of

morality is to deny the need for us to have any sense of right or wrong any longer. Those who wish us to define policy on prostitution without reference to any concept of public morality are saying that the concept of right and wrong is irrelevant to Government policy and the law.

I refer members to the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* which defines 'moral sense' as 'the power of recognising the difference between right and wrong', and anyone who seriously suggests that there is nothing wrong with the main characteristics of prostitution or its impact on both the innocent who become embroiled in it and society in general in the matter of public health, protection from violence, exploitation, corrupt and criminal associations, etc, has lost any moral sense of wrong. I have no doubt that prostitution lies clearly in the area of public morality. Over time greater minds than ours have pondered this same problem, and I refer the House to the famous work of Lord Devlin, *The enforcement of morals*. I would like to quote from a portion of his work:

Society is entitled by means of its laws to protect itself from dangers, whether from within or without. . . an established morality is as necessary as good government to the welfare of society. Societies disintegrate from within more frequently than they are broken up by external pressures. There is disintegration when no common morality is observed and history shows that the loosening of moral bonds is often the first stage of disintegration, so that society is justified in taking the same steps to preserve its moral code as it does to preserve its Government and other essential institutions. The suppression of vice is as much the law's business as the suppression of subversive activities. It is no more possible to define a sphere of private morality than it is to define one of private subversive activity.

So, what are we dealing with in the introduction of this Bill, which seeks to assure today's society of all the alleged good reasons why change should occur? We are told that prostitution should be decriminalised, not legalised, and thereby begins the first issue of this debate. What is decriminalisation and what is legalisation? The difference between the terms 'decriminalise' and 'legalise' is a matter of degree and involves an academic distinction. In general terms, the words are assumed to mean the same thing and are, indeed, interchangeable. Putting aside the academic distinction, in simple terms, on this point we are debating the principle of when a crime is not a crime. The power of legislation, in this instance, approval by legislation of prostitution, sanctions the crime of prostitution, and thereby a criminal activity has become a legal activity, and a crime is no longer a crime.

That is the basis of this Bill—to allow legal trade in prostitution. I put on record now that the only aspects of this Bill that I would support would be a provision that the client of a prostitute be equally guilty under law and, therefore, equally charged and that penalties relating to procurement of women and children be increased. I also support clearly defined laws that define police powers to enable a greater efficiency in carrying out their duties prescribed by law. I do not support legal brothels, which this Bill seeks to introduce. I also record my utter revulsion at the prospect of a proposed State appointment of a registrar, paid by taxpayers' funds, to legally encourage women, men and young people to sign on for recognition of legal work in the prostitution trade.

During this debate it has been stated that the police and, in particular, the Police Commissioner, favour reforms of the prostitution law. It would appear to have been used in debate to intimate that the Bill before us is the epitome of reforms called for by the police. This intimation is totally incorrect, and I refer the House to the words of the Police Commission-

er himself less than a year ago, when he stated that any legalisation or decriminalisation of prostitution may result in an increase in the involvement of children and the incidence of rape in children. In an article in the *Advertiser* of 10 April 1993 the Commissioner states:

... tighten up the legislation. . . and give police the tools of trade to be able to carry out their duties in a proper and efficient manner. I don't really see why police officers should be having to put themselves at risk in evidence-gathering because of the lack of clarity of the legislation or judicial interpretations. . . one of the most frightening aspects is the exploitation of children who become ensnared with prostitution rackets. Perpetrated by paedophiles, the sexual involvement of children with adults for money merely becomes an extension of the sexual relationship with the paedophile, who often acts as a pimp.

I refer the members of this House to an article that appears in today's *Advertiser*. There is not enough time to pick up the reference or to indicate the debate that should range about paedophiles in this community at the moment, or their links to the prostitution network. The 1993 article further states:

... such victims were often runaways or missing children, trapped by the need to survive. Most found a means of financial or emotional support in prostitution and pornography. 'They are attractive to clients because of their age and because they usually sell their services far more cheaply than their adult counterparts,' Mr Hunt says. In perhaps his sternest warning on what may happen if prostitution is legalised, Mr Hunt says existing facts concerning the rape of children must be considered. In SA, children under 15 comprised 30 per cent of all reported rape victims and this figure rose to 46 per cent for those under 18.

He finished his comments by stating:

The legalisation or decriminalisation of prostitution may well see an increase in these already unacceptable figures.

I suggest to the House that these comments do not reflect in any way the manner or purpose of the Bill that we are now debating. In 1991 the Criminal Justice Commission of Queensland reviewed prostitution. One of the submissions to that committee was by Professor Eileen Byrne of the University of Queensland. The submission covered the whole range of prostitution and the networks and links with criminal activities. It is something well worth reading, and I hope that members of this Parliament will have time to look at the aspects of this submission. Professor Byrne based her submission against the legalisation of prostitution in any form on several levels: the maintenance of recognisable public standards of decency and basic morality; prostitution's exploitation of children and young persons; the maintenance of a proactive public policy of social welfare and protection; and the need to continue actively to fight against prostitution's encouragement of crime and the spread of corruption.

She also notes the issues that we are asked to consider. The names have been changed from 'prostitute' to 'sex worker' to give a certain amount of respectability. A prostitute is just that: it is degrading to women, and I do not see any reason why the name should be changed. In the area of health there is nothing and never has been anything to prove that any health aspects are increased or, indeed, improved by legalisation or decriminalisation. In fact, in South Australia alone we have the lowest number of STDs recorded in any State. That, I remind this House, is under the current laws. Mention has been made of the Fitzgerald report. Part of the Fitzgerald royal commission report stated:

If prostitution were decriminalised or legalised, there would still be a risk that violence, intimidation and coercion would continue to occur. . . serious criminal misconduct can and does occur in hotels, restaurants, public sport. . . and is dealt with by the normal laws. . . Other offences, such as sexual exploitation of minors,

intimidation, procuring, blackmail and assault of prostitutes are dealt with by the present laws and should remain criminal matters.

There seems to be a great determination by certain people to misinterpret some of the things that have been said. Fitzgerald also acknowledges that brothel customers include drunken and unruly people who come and go at all hours. Prostitution is often associated with other crime. None of the areas we are talking about in this Bill will have any effect other than to increase—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Florey.

Mr BASS secured the adjournment of the debate.

WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION (MENTAL INCAPACITY) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 November. Page 1207.)

Mr BASS (Florey): The Government opposes the Bill introduced into the other place by the Hon. Ron Roberts. That Bill would have the effect of amending the lump sum compensation schedule of the Act (schedule 3) by providing for lump sum non-economic loss payments for total and permanent loss of mental capacity, rather than the existing 'total and incurable loss of intellectual capacity resulting from damage to the brain'. The Bill is opposed by the Government on three primary grounds: first, it is an unjustified extension of the lump sum provisions of the Act into the area of stress claims; secondly, it is likely to compromise or prejudice early and effective rehabilitation of workers suffering stress claims; and, thirdly, it would add to the cost of a scheme which already provides the most generous benefit levels in Australia and compound the national uncompetitive levy rates for South Australian industry.

In the debates of late 1992, it was the clear intention of Parliament that compensation for stress claims was to be restricted, in terms both of eligibility and of compensation. These claims, with little physical demonstration of injury, and the ability to allow individuals to abuse the system by manipulating employers as a result of some dispute at work or grievance at how they perceived their situation, had to be restricted to cases where employees had clearly suffered an injury as a result of an unreasonable action or incident. The WorkCover scheme could not be required to support people who had an industrial dispute with their employer. However, it was also a clear view of Parliament that those people who received an entitlement to weekly income maintenance and medical rehabilitation support as a result of an unreasonable act or incident at work should be treated differently from those who incurred a physical injury such as loss of an arm, a leg or an eye, or who suffered an injury to their back or brain. Parliament quite deliberately removed the word 'mental' from section 43, and so it should have.

This Bill simply opens the door to more compensation for stress claims. It does nothing to recognise the already significant problems which stress claims have caused to the income maintenance and rehabilitation provisions of the Act. It is important to remember that Parliament decided to provide full income maintenance and medical support to stress claims where the situation which caused them was unreasonable. It said these workers would be protected and afforded the support of the scheme: they would not be

neglected and would be provided the normal supports to achieve a full and lasting return to work. The income and medical support were to continue until such time as they achieved a return to work.

It is in no-one's interests, and particularly not in the employee's interests, to be encouraging and implying that these injuries are permanent. They do not need to be. The people concerned should be focused on achieving a normal return to work, not on demonstrating that the mental injury is permanent. It is not brain damage; it is a human reaction which can be controlled, overcome and replaced with positive attitudes to move forward. This Bill would therefore compromise early and effective rehabilitation of stress claims. It would create a facility for workers with stress claims and already in receipt of income based pensions to delay their rehabilitation until non-economic lump sums for stress are assessed. Such an approach also misunderstands a philosophy which underpinned the 1986 Act, a philosophy of compensation by income maintenance pensions in the context of early rehabilitation with limited access to lump sum payments—or pots of gold. It is for these reasons that the Government opposes this Bill.

It is for these reasons that the Opposition, when it was in Government, moved these changes and put in place the provision that the Hon. Ron Roberts now seeks to replace. It is easy to change one's position in Opposition. The impact of the Hon. Ron Roberts' Bill (apart from the significant increase in costs to employers) will be to encourage every worker with a stress claim to adopt behaviour to demonstrate that their stress is permanent. Whilst the Hon. Mr. Roberts may think he is doing these people a favour by arguing for a lump sum, he is in fact committing them to a life of misery. He is encouraging them to adopt the victim mentality to demonstrate to all that they have suffered a permanent loss of mental capacity as a result of an incident at work.

The Bill is also opposed on the grounds of its transparent attempt to increase the costs of the South Australian WorkCover system. This Bill has been estimated by WorkCover to present an annual cost to WorkCover of between \$10 million and \$20 million per year. This estimate does not include the cost payments by exempt employers, which is estimated at up to \$5 million per year. Does the Labor Party not realise that the South Australian scheme is already carrying an unfunded liability, which the Minister for Industrial Affairs advised this Parliament recently is \$187 million and spiralling upwards at the rate of \$12.6 million per month? The Opposition clearly has demonstrated its financial irresponsibility in even proposing this Bill.

In opposing this Bill the South Australian Government notes the support for its opposition from industries in this State. In correspondence received from the South Australian Employers Chamber, dated 11 October 1994, the Government was advised:

The South Australian Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry does not support the Bill. . . we do not believe that such an assessment is possible for loss of a mental capacity which is the result of other than injuries currently described in the third schedule. . . we do not believe that such disabilities are capable of precise medical assessment. . . employers would be concerned that the introduction of lump sum payments for these disabilities would encourage further claims. The management of stress claims is difficult in the present situation and would not be assisted by the introduction of lump sums. . . we believe that the subject matter of this Bill should be dealt with in the total review of the Act and there is no reason to have this issue dealt with on its own.

The amendments of the previous Government in 1992 restricting stress claims in this area were long overdue. It took it almost six years to realise the errors of its way and to fix them. Even then it did so only after a parliamentary select committee and under pressure from the Independent Labor Speaker of the House of Assembly. Now, just one year and four or five months after being in Opposition, members opposite want to return to their previous untenable position. The Government will not allow such hypocrisy to prevail. The Bill is a backward step and will be opposed.

Second reading negatived.

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

A quorum having been formed:

FACTOR VIII

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Greig:

That this House calls on the Federal Government to recognise the need for a national approach to determine the quantity, source and provision of Factor VIII to ensure efficient and equitable allocation and as part of this approach suggests consideration of the cost implication of the supply of recombinant or synthetic Factor VIII as a new product in the treatment of haemophilia.

(Continued from 16 March. Page 1999.)

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I rise to support this motion. We are all aware that haemophiliacs make up a small but significant section of our society. They face life-threatening danger each hour of the day every day. Haemophilia is a hereditary deficiency of Factor VIII, which is a plasma protein that is necessary for normal blood clotting. As the lack of Factor VIII can lead to internal bleeding in the joints and muscles, its continual shortage is a matter of grave concern.

I want to tell members of the difficult path that one haemophiliac has had to follow. This man is, in the true sense of the word, a gentleman whom I have known for a very long time. He is always cheerful and always wears a smile. Mr Bernie Holden, who is now aged 82 years, was first diagnosed with haemophilia in 1917 at the tender age of five years. By the time he had turned eight years his parents were told that he would probably die. Some of the suffering that he and others in the same position have had to endure has been horrendous. In those pre-Factor VIII days, treatment included: blood transfusions, complete bed rest, ice packs, plaster casts and iron splints—not to mention the extreme pain associated with it. It was not until the 1950s that experimentation isolated the protein and Factor VIII became available to sufferers. Mr Holden was one of those who helped in the testing of this product.

These days, haemophiliacs can lead a relatively normal life with the aid of Factor VIII. The problem they face is that there is an insufficient supply and a very real risk of blood contamination. The world supply of Factor VIII is 1.5 billion units per year shared between 200 000 people, and there are 125 000 people who receive no treatment at all. So, when we consider that for a joint replacement operation all the Factor VIII from 1 000 donations of blood is required, the magnitude of the problem is evident. That does not take into account that it is not uncommon for there to be post-operative difficulties that can lead to the need for double the amount of Factor VIII.

Indeed, the lack of supply has resulted in a delay in surgery for many haemophiliacs. The ultimate hope is that synthetic Factor VIII will be freely available for those who

need it. I believe that it should be available so that the suffering of this group in our society is minimised and this protein can be freely administered along the same lines as insulin. I wish to quote the words of Mr Bernie Holden who, when referring to the 1970s when treatment became available, said:

Since those days I have used a few thousand units to nip bleeds in the bud, so to speak. Becoming mobile so much more quickly, not having to put up with the excruciating pain for so long, is a joy in itself. The younger generation that has access to Factor VIII will hopefully have less distorted joints and other handicaps that we of the earlier generation live with, but then that's life, and I have enjoyed the experience.

I support this motion and I urge other members to do so.

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Much has been said on this issue since 25 August. I would like to thank the member for Torrens for supporting my motion and also the member for Florey, who has given it much support. I am pleased to see that we will be able to move this matter along now and get treatment for child and adult haemophiliacs who are in desperate need of this treatment. So, I thank all concerned.

Motion carried.

WINE INDUSTRY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Brokenshire:

That this House condemns the minority recommendations of the Chair Mr Bill Scales as set out in the Interim Report into the Wine and Grape Industry and urges the Federal Government not to adopt those recommendations which would have a devastating effect on jobs growth and economic development in South Australia.

(Continued from 16 March. Page 1997.)

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I rise on behalf of the Opposition to support the motion of the member for Mawson. The South Australian Labor Party (in both Government and Opposition) has worked consistently against the imposition of onerous taxes upon the wine and grape industry over the past decade, and it stands prepared to work constructively with the Government to defeat the minority recommendations of the Industry Commission supported by the Chair of the commission, Bill Scales. I shall be brief in outlining the basis of our opposition to Mr Scales' proposals, as other members have already done a generally adequate job of showing up the adverse impact that adoption of Mr Scales' proposals would have on both this increasingly important industry and the economy of South Australia.

The wine and grape industry is one of increasing significance, and the fortunes of that industry are more than ever a matter of survival for South Australia's vulnerable economy. South Australia produces 60 per cent of the nation's wine. The wine industry is of enormous significance to our State and is of increasing importance to Australia's export performance. Neither the wine and grape industry nor the depressed South Australian economy can afford the tax increases which are proposed in this minority report of the Industry Commission.

I would like to spend a brief time indicating what is wrong with the Scales' proposal. The commission's minority recommendations would lift the tax on wine to the equivalent of a 50 per cent wholesale tax. We know full well what the impact of a tax hike of that magnitude would mean for the industry. We know that such a substantial tax increase on the industry would reduce domestic demand for wine. Costs of production would rise, profits would fall and investment

would be choked off. The development of a flagship South Australian industry would be stopped dead in its tracks.

It needs to be recognised, not only in this place but also in the wider community, that this would be a disaster for our State economy. After all, it is suffering a weak recovery, a recovery which the Centre for Economic Studies described recently as fragile and disappointingly erratic. While South Australia's rate of economic growth stands at less than one-third of the national rate (according to the latest available data) and while our rate of job growth is less than half of that of Australia as a whole, we can less than ever afford the consequences of this tax hike. As the Centre for Economic Studies recently pointed out, the long, slow crawl out of recession for the South Australian economy continues. The centre's report of last week states:

South Australia's case. . . we're talking about an economy which has still not yet managed to restore employment to its pre-recession level.

The centre continues by stating exactly what the Opposition has been telling the House for months and what the Premier has been denying about the fragility of our economic position. The centre's report also states:

. . . is clearly indicated in the fact the whole of the decline in South Australia's recorded trend unemployment between September 1994 and February 1995. . . can be explained by a fall in the participation rate. . . suggesting decreased optimism among those out of work.

The Scales' tax hike proposal would king hit our vulnerable regional economy and the wine industry and would help stall any efforts by the wine industry which, over recent years, have been outstanding in terms of increased production and exports. The Scales' proposal would add insult to injury by punishing one of the State's regions that most needs a hand up not a slap down.

The proposal to increase taxation at the lower end of the wine market would hit the Riverland very hard since that is the region which supplies the bulk of grapes for non-premium and cask wines. The proposal is unfair to the regions which are least able to withstand a further disadvantage and is an example of an iniquitous and regressive policy. People who drink premium wines are less adversely affected by these proposals than people who drink wines which are at the lower end of the market. People on lower incomes who cannot afford to drink the premium wines which are favoured by this policy will pay proportionately more tax for the privilege of drinking cheaper bottled and cask wines. It is a tax on the battlers and the less well off.

The minority recommendations effectively make the less well off pay proportionately more and let the more well to do drinkers of premium or expensive wines off relatively lightly. It is an unjust policy. Regardless of that, we are opposed to any tax increase on wines. However, I must confess to some incredulity when I hear such criticisms coming from my Liberal colleagues. It is a bit breathtaking to hear them complaining about the unfairness of this tax proposal when they supported the election of a Federal Liberal Government that would have placed a regressive tax—the GST—on nearly every basic necessity of life, including a GST on the sale of wines. So, I was incredulous to hear the member for Mawson suggest that the Commonwealth is on about slugging the industry for tax revenue when he actively supported the election of a Federal Liberal Government which would have been the highest taxing Government in Australia's history and would have slugged the wine industry particularly hard.

I have written to the Prime Minister urging the Federal Government to reject the minority report of the Industry

Commission with respect to massive tax increases on wine. In my letter to the Prime Minister I said:

As you would be aware, the South Australian parliamentary Labor Party, in Government as well as in Opposition, has opposed consistently over the past decade major increases in taxation on wine and wine products. We are still of this view, and are concerned that the almost annual spectre of increased taxation is being raised. . . . In addition, the minority report recommendations will have a disproportionately adverse effect on our Riverland district. . . . I would be happy at any time to meet with you to discuss my opposition to increased taxation on wine, as well as proposals for the industry's development. I have also informed representatives of the wine industry I would be pleased to join them in any delegation to meet you or your Ministers to discuss this issue.

This is an opportunity for a united front to fight any further impost on the wine industry. The vintage festival in the Barossa is coming up. We have to make sure that we use every opportunity to punch home the message that there is bipartisan opposition to any further impost on wine in this State.

The issue of the impact of this tax upon our wine industry is no small matter, and all of us should bring credit to this Parliament by adopting a bipartisan stance. The reality is that the domestic market, which is already showing signs of plateauing, is the foundation for a vigorous export effort. The reality is that, while we all support the achievement of the wine industry's target of \$1 billion exports early in the next century, many of the major export markets are still locked up by various tariff and non-tariff measures which fly in the face of textbook free trade.

At a time when the industry faces an enormous investment challenge to achieve its growth potential, it is absolutely vital that measures such as those proposed by the minority report of the Industry Commission are not allowed to stunt investment in an industry which typically takes years to repay that investment. For these reasons and others, the Labor Opposition in this State supports this motion. I have said it before and I shall say it again: this is a patriotic Opposition that will put the interests of South Australia first, and South Australia cannot afford this tax on wine. I have written to the Prime Minister to make him aware of our opposition. I have also written to representatives of the South Australian wine industry underlining my desire to assist, along with the State Government, in persuading the Federal Government to reject the Industry Commission's minority report.

The Opposition makes this undertaking today: we are prepared to work with the South Australian Government in a bipartisan way to defeat this tax. I am prepared to join the Premier in any meetings with the Prime Minister or other Federal Labor colleagues to defend South Australia's interests. I think the public of South Australia would expect nothing less than bipartisan support for this invaluable industry to our State.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

JENNINGS, MR J.J., DEATH

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

That this House expresses its regret at the recent death of Mr John Joseph Jennings (better known to those who knew him as Jack Jennings), former member of the House of Assembly for the seats of Prospect, Enfield and Ross Smith, and places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious service; and that as a mark

of respect to his memory the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

In supporting the motion, I point out that I was one of those members who had a chance to get to know Jack Jennings in his latter period in the House. All of those who knew him would say that he was a real character. He first entered the Parliament in 1953, together with Don Dunstan. They were both seen as young Labor members with a big future. In fact, Jack Jennings was regarded as the better orator of the two and a man with outstanding wit and humour.

Jack served in this Parliament from 1953 through to 1977. I had a chance during a four year period to get to know him. That wit and humour came through in many ways in the Parliament and, as the member for Peake has just reminded me, it was Jack Jennings who gave the shortest speech ever heard in this Parliament. Anyone who can give a short speech in this Parliament achieves great fame in itself. He stood up after the member for Peake, the then member for Hanson, and said 'Ditto' and sat down.

Jack worked very hard for his Party and his electorate. It is well known that during that period he had a lot of ill health. That ill health naturally held him back in terms of his progress in this Parliament and, to a certain extent, although he entered Parliament at the young age of 28 years and was seen as a potential leader of the Party, he never became a Minister because of that unfortunate ill health.

As I have said, Jack had a sense of humour, and that came to the fore when he decided to retire in 1977. Those of us who were here would remember that there was an unexpected election in 1977—in fact, we had a lot of unexpected elections in the 1970s. The only election that went to schedule in the 1970s was that held in 1973. The 1970 election was ahead of schedule, as were the 1975, 1977 and 1979 elections. I assure members opposite that no elections will be called ahead of schedule by this Government.

In a letter that Jack Jennings sent to his then leader, Don Dunstan, prior to the 1977 election, he indicated that he had decided to retire and said:

After my retirement I shall seek a warmer clime for a while before facing up to the inevitable much hotter clime that awaits me later.

That truly reflects Jack Jennings' sense of humour. He was a character. He used to wander around the House and was almost the silent member as he moved around. You would look around the corner and, suddenly, there was Jack Jennings, but always with an appropriate quip or comment and a smile behind it.

To his wife Barbara and his three children—Barry, David and Michael—we pass on the condolences of this Parliament. We thank them for the service he gave and particularly the service the family gave as well. As members of Parliament we understand the huge impact that our career has on family life and, as I said, Jack Jennings was a member for over 24 years. So, Jack's family have also played their part. To Barbara and the family we extend our thanks, but equally at this time our condolences on the loss of Jack Jennings—a fond memory to all of us.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): In seconding the motion I thank the Premier for his remarks and, on behalf of the State Opposition, pay tribute to one of our former members, Jack Jennings. Jack was preselected as the Labor candidate for Enfield in 1952 at the same time that Don Dunstan was preselected as the Labor candidate for Norwood. Following their preselections a couple of older sage members

of the Labor Party grabbed both of them and gave them some advice. I am told that Clyde Cameron took both young men aside and recommended a certain Italian tailor to improve their dress sense. Frank Walsh, who was then Deputy Leader and later Leader of the Opposition, took the two of them aside before the election and said, 'What you both need are two great slogans on a poster to help your election to the Parliament. You want something that will catch the public's eye—something like my own "Walsh for Goodwood"—something pithy and catchy.'

Jack and Don were tireless in their doorknocking in their respective constituencies, both as candidates and then as MPs. In Don Dunstan's book *Felicia* he said that, if there was a meeting of canary fanciers or a knitting circle, Jack Jennings and he would be there. It is probably fair to say that there was little rapport between these two young bloods in the Labor Party and some of the older members on both sides of the House. They tended to be something of an irritation to their elders in their first few years in Parliament, but both were determined to get out of Opposition and into Government where they could do things to improve the lot of working people.

I will quote from Jack Jennings' maiden speech, because it illustrates the theme that came through his whole time in Parliament: a belief in essential democracy. On 23 July in his maiden speech he said:

Every thinking person who appreciates the electoral arrangement which allows this Government to maintain office—and the number of such people is growing daily—realises that when members opposite speak pious platitudes about democracy they are speaking hypocritically and paying lip service to something which they do not believe. To members of the Labor Party, all of whom genuinely believe in democracy, it is nauseating to have to take part in the traditions and procedures of the Parliament, knowing that this Parliament is only a masquerade of representative Parliament and that the traditions and procedures which were born with the origins of representative Parliament are here in South Australia only a facade to hide behind the suppression of democratic representation which only existed on a certain side of the iron curtain.

So, right throughout he was part of the process of trying to achieve a fair electoral system in South Australia. All of us owe both Jack Jennings and Don Dunstan an enormous debt for their pioneering efforts in the 1950s.

Certainly both Jack and Don Dunstan were frustrated by the lack of imagination of some of their elders, and MPs on both sides of the House were often content to give what were described as deathless, boring speeches. They hoped that their words of wisdom would somehow percolate out to the masses. No-one these days ever expects that. Jack Jennings and Don Dunstan invented the press release in South Australia and took their issues, causes and campaigns to the media and not just to the Parliament.

On Saturday night Don Dunstan was reminiscing to me about Jack Jennings and said that Jack was a brilliant speaker, a great wit and a person who, by way of interjection (which I know that you, Mr Speaker, do not tolerate in this Parliament—and quite rightly), often used to prick the pomposity of Ministers, particularly those who were self-satisfied.

The Premier is right in saying that Jack Jennings was tipped to be the eventual Leader of the Labor Party with probably Don Dunstan as his deputy. That was not to be the case, but it was Jack Jennings, along with Hugh Hudson and Ron Loveday, who led the campaign in 1967 to have Don Dunstan elected leader of the Labor Party. There is no doubt that Jack Jennings was an important force in bringing true

democracy to South Australia. We remember that in 1968 Labor lost with 53.9 per cent of the vote, and in Enfield Jack Jennings represented more electors than seven Liberal MPs combined.

Although never holding a ministerial position, Jack nevertheless had a distinguished parliamentary career, including duty as Government Whip and membership of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. However, it was probably as a member of the Public Works Committee for over 19 years where Jack made his greatest mark. Certainly as a local MP no task was too hard and no duty too small for Jack. He often created controversy, and he was often ahead of his time. He certainly tried desperately to make this place more lively than was sometimes the case. I want to ensure that all of us recognise Jack's contribution to reforming the procedures of the House and how we are elected.

Other members of Jack's family have also made a huge contribution to South Australia, not least of whom is Jack's son, Barry, who for many years was Crown Prosecutor. I am sure that all of us here should like to place on record to Barbara and the three children our very fond memories of Jack Jennings, who will always be held in great affection in this place.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I, too, should like to place on record my condolences to Jack Jennings' wife Barbara and his three children and to record briefly my appreciation for the work that he did as member for Ross Smith, the district that I now have the honour to represent. For very many years, Jack was the Returning Officer of the Clerks Union, my former union. He was an active member of the union at the time he entered Parliament, having served on the branch council of the union and having been a member of the union when he worked for one of the major wool broking companies of this State, when to be a member of the Clerks Union in one of the establishment companies was very much frowned upon. I must say that Jack was an outstanding returning officer. In each of the hotly contested battles for which he was the returning officer, the officer's team never lost. That had nothing to do with his being the returning officer because he carried out his duties diligently, forthrightly and with all propriety.

I met Jack some years ago, particularly when I was working on Chris Hurford's campaign for the Federal seat of Adelaide. Whilst he had a somewhat brusque exterior, those of us who got to know him realised that he was very soft underneath that exterior. Only the other day I spoke to Joan Wilson, who was his first electorate secretary and who is still a member of the Ross Smith sub-branch. She recounted how, out of his own pocket, Jack would help the underprivileged in his electorate through the purchasing of food parcels, clothing, shoes and the like, particularly for children. He did so only on condition that the recipients of his generosity did not know that it was he who made the donation to make their life that little bit better.

As has been commented on by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition, Jack Jennings was extremely witty. Joan Wilson also told me that the Leader of *Hansard* at the time commented to her that, whenever Jack rose to his feet to make a speech, all of the *Hansard* reporters would come into the gallery to hear him because he was regarded by all the reporters as the outstanding orator of his time. He also had an amazing knowledge of constitutional law. With those closing comments, I join with both the Premier and the Leader of the

Opposition in extending my condolences to his family. We will all cherish the memory of Jack Jennings.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 2.14 to 2.25 p.m.]

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD (Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations):

I wish to make a ministerial statement. I refer to a report in this morning's *Advertiser* about the proposed shipment of some radioactive waste from St Marys in Sydney to Woomera. The report is inaccurate in some aspects of the facts. First, it refers to this material being high level waste. This is not the advice that the South Australian Government has received from the Commonwealth and to place the reference to high level waste in the first paragraph of the article in the *Advertiser* this morning is both inflammatory and misleading. The Federal Minister for Industry, Science and Technology (Senator Cook) has advised South Australia that 'radioactivity levels in the waste are generally very low'.

This morning's report also claims my involvement in the matter has amounted to an endorsement of the shipment. This is certainly not true. I do not have the power to either approve or reject the proposed shipment for storage in South Australia. As the Premier advised the House in his ministerial statement of 21 March, an officer of my department received a facsimile from the Commonwealth's Environment Protection Authority dated 11 January 1995. That facsimile did not request my department to give any approval to the shipment. It was merely a request for information about conditions which may apply to any shipment.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I responded to the Commonwealth EPA by letter dated 20 February. In my letter I advised that in my opinion the proposal for shipment would not require the preparation of an environmental impact statement nor a public environmental report provided certain conditions were met. This was an expression of an interpretation of the law, and that was all that was asked for. It cannot be construed in any way as an approval for the transfer and storage in South Australia. I fully explained this point in answer to a question in this House on 23 March.

My letter referred to the need for any transport and storage of the waste to be carried out in accordance with the code of practice for the safe transport of radioactive substances, which in South Australia is implemented by the Radiation Protection and Control (Transport of Radioactive Substance) Regulations.

To highlight the fact that my letter did not in any way constitute an approval of the shipment, I point out that South Australia has not yet certified that the proposed shipment will comply with this code. This is the responsibility of the Radiation Protection Control Branch of the South Australian Health Commission. I was specifically advised at the time of signing the letter that the transport still required Health Commission approval as the relevant authority.

The House should also be aware that in summary advice to me on this matter attention was not drawn to the fact that the proposed shipment contained plutonium traces. In considering whether an EIS would be required, I was mindful

of the fact that the shipment and storage is a Commonwealth Government responsibility. The South Australian Government is still seeking a complete inventory of waste from the Commonwealth. The South Australian Government's current position remains as stated by the Premier in his letter to the Prime Minister of 28 February, that is:

The South Australian Government has considered the proposed method of transport and storage of the St Marys waste. My Government does not accept the Commonwealth's decision to store the waste at Woomera Rangehead until certain assurances are given and uncertainties clarified.

MEAT HYGIENE

The Hon. D.S. BAKER (Minister for Primary Industries): I wish to make a ministerial statement. Smallgoods producers in South Australia are now operating under new regulations aimed at eliminating the risk of food-borne illnesses such as the recent HUS tragedy. The new South Australian Meat Hygiene Act came into force for all meat processors, including smallgoods manufacturers, on 1 March 1995. Under the new regulations smallgoods producers will be required to comply with the Australian code of practice for smallgoods factories and other meat manufacturing premises. Processors will also be required to demonstrate through the quality assurance programs processing methods consistent with the AQIS Guidelines for Good Manufacturing Practice in the Smallgoods Industry and other reference documents.

These changes have been supported by the industry itself, which is now beginning to recover consumer confidence following the tragedy earlier this year. A further initiative has now been developed which includes specific clauses relating to the production of uncooked fermented smallgoods. This amendment to the Food Code has been endorsed by the Federal Department of Health and all State and Territory health authorities and will become law by proclamation next Wednesday 12 April 1995. It will have the following effect:

1. The use of starter cultures will be compulsory and must be carried out according to directions.
2. The use of fermented material from previous product batches to seed new batches will not be permitted.
3. Direct acidification without fermentation and without the use of a starter culture will be illegal.
4. Strategic recording of the temperature of raw material storage, temperature and pH during fermentation, water activity and other measurements will be mandatory.

In addition, processors will be required to develop quality assurance based on the principles of hazard analysis critical control points.

After the changes are introduced next Wednesday, processors will be given a period of about four weeks during which clarification of the new requirements can be sought from the National Food Authority. Importantly, I assure the smallgoods industry that quality assurance officers from the Department of Primary Industry Meat Hygiene Unit will assist with the implementation of the new programs. In the longer term, staff from my department are working to produce a consolidated code of hygiene production for all smallgoods which will combine the information published currently in several publications into a single document which will form the basis of the regulations.

The smallgoods industry, particularly in South Australia, has undergone a traumatic three months with substantial economic loss and a dramatic slump in consumer confidence.

Despite these difficulties, the industry is to be commended for the way in which it has worked to develop and implement these new standards that will enable its products to return to the high standard of consumer confidence and support they previously enjoyed.

PAEDOPHILES

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources): I wish to make a ministerial statement about public revelations that a small number of young boys under the care of the Department for Family and Community Services have been liaising with paedophiles. From the outset, I would like to say that the whole issue of adults preying on vulnerable and insecure young people is sickening. But there are a number of facts I wish to point out to create a context for this issue. First, this whole dilemma surrounds a handful of youths, if that, who come from fragmented, disadvantaged and insecure backgrounds that involve long-term emotional and psychological scarring and rejection. Unfortunately for this group, the attention, the care and the feeling of being wanted is what some psychiatrists say has lured these youngsters into this activity.

We know who these youths are and we do closely monitor them. We must remember that they are not ordinary young people. Society owes them all the support we can give them. These youngsters are not foster children and they are not young offenders or criminals who have been sentenced to terms in detention. These youngsters are not institutionalised. The only fault, if we can call it that, in many cases is that they have been rejected or have behavioural problems.

The dilemma is a perennial one for which there is no easy solution. To be able to protect these young people from themselves—from their own actions when they continually put their health and safety at risk—could require measures that cross well beyond the bounds of civil liberties and human rights. It could, in fact, do more damage than good, given their pattern of social dysfunctioning and severe behavioural problems. I suggest that detaining these children, for which at present there is no legislative base or reason, could actually deprive them of a last chance of hope of eventually being able to mature and take a place in society, and that must be our ultimate aim and where we focus our energy for the longer term good of these young people. The state in which children who are placed in residential care come to us in the first place saddens me tremendously. This issue crosses many community and Government spheres: not just welfare but into health and police. We have all been looking at the potential for legislative change to be able to legally intervene in this habitual-type behaviour.

The Attorney-General also has been looking at changes to help halt paedophilia and laws that will provide us with clout. I believe this is one issue that requires an across the board community approach. Finally, I would like to refute allegations that the department has directly placed young people into the care of known paedophiles. This is far from the truth. Placements and backgrounds are thoroughly checked. However, I must point out that, as any parent or Government knows, you cannot control whom people might associate with after they have been placed.

QUESTION TIME

EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Given today's employment figures, does he still maintain that South Australia is leading the national jobs recovery and will he now agree to convene a recovery summit involving large and small business representatives, unions, community representatives, including those from rural areas, local and Federal Government, and representatives of the State Government, Opposition and Australian Democrats? Today's ABS labour force statistics reveal that in South Australia the unemployment rate has risen to the highest in the nation; that employment fell by 11 400 last month; that the trend in jobs growth is completely flat; and that, since the Liberal Government came to power, employment has risen by only 3 300 since December 1993, according to ABS statistics.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, again the Leader of the Opposition is commenting.

The SPEAKER: I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that he be aware of the Standing Orders; that he knows that commenting is not permissible under Standing Orders.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, Sir. I was just revealing that the Australian Bureau of Statistics has shown that jobs have risen by only 3 300 since December 1993 compared with a national growth in jobs of over 359 000, almost 10 times the rate of jobs growth in this State.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: How does the Leader of the Opposition have any credibility at all to stand in this House and ask any question about unemployment or employment levels when his Party has said that it flatly opposes any amendment whatsoever to WorkCover legislation? There can be no credibility whatsoever coming from the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has asked his question, and he will not continue to ask further questions. Otherwise, he knows the consequences. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I stress again that there can be absolutely no credibility from the Leader of the Opposition on any issue to do with employment and jobs in this State while he and his Party flatly refuse to agree to the Government's amendments on WorkCover. I will make him an offer: I will come to a deal with him. I will sit down around the same table and talk to the Leader of the Opposition about jobs if he agrees at the same time to support our WorkCover legislation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: There is a flat deal in terms of how to create over 4 000 jobs here in South Australia straight away. If the Labor Party here in South Australia is willing to agree—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Listen to him once again squealing! If the Labor Party in South Australia is willing to agree to our amendments to WorkCover so that we can create 4 000 jobs, I am willing to sit down with the Leader of the Opposition and talk about job creation in this State.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is out of order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Leader of the Opposition makes his claim on very spurious grounds. Government after Government in this House has argued that you should look at the trend lines on this issue. Those trend lines are continuing to improve here in South Australia.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition for the last time that he has been asked not to interject. He was warned earlier this morning by the Deputy Speaker. He knows the Standing Orders and he just continues to fire question after question. If he wants to ask further questions, it is within his power to organise that matter with his Whip. I do not want any further interjections. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The point is that to base any claim on just one month's results when they fluctuate to the extent that they have—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Last month and the month before the trend lines were continuing to be extremely strong and, if the honourable member has any credibility on this, the first thing he would do is stand and say that last month we had created 22 500 jobs in the last year alone. But I did not hear him in this House at any stage cite last month's figures and make those sorts of claims. The point is that, based on a whole range of economic parameters that I gave to the House only yesterday, South Australia is performing ahead of the national average. Whether it comes to retail sales, where once again on the latest figures we are 2 per cent ahead of the national average; whether it comes to new car sales, where we are well ahead of the national average; whether it comes to investment and new equipment by private industry in this State—34 per cent on the last figures—we are well ahead of the national average.

You can take a whole range of parameters from the Chamber of Commerce quarterly surveys, which again show that we are well ahead of the national average. A very significant fluctuation in just one month is hardly the sort of ground on which you would stand. Taking even the most recent figures that came out today and comparing them with February of 1994, we are in fact about 13 000 jobs up in that 12 or 13 month period. So, I am not quite sure what the honourable Leader is trying to get at, except to say once again that he and the Deputy Leader are proving well and truly that they are Mr Gloom and Mr Doom, that they jump on any evidence they have whatsoever, no matter how spurious the figures might be and make a big song and dance about it.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): My question is directed to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What were the trends identified for South Australia in the monthly labour force figures released today?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: This is an important issue that the Opposition needs to focus on. Instead of running a negative knocking campaign, trying to undermine worthwhile projects in South Australia like Wirrina and even having a shot at Clipsal, the Opposition should get behind South Australia in promoting employment and growth. One of the significant factors in the employment figures today is the rise in interest rates that has been generated by the Opposition's colleagues in Canberra. We are now seeing the flow-through effects of those hikes in interest rates that are putting a dampener on investment and employment. The people who have much to

answer for are their colleagues in Canberra: the members of their Party. The threat of further interest rate hikes puts a further cloud across the whole of Australia.

I quote from the briefing, which is written not by me but by people within the Public Service, as follows:

In the coming months the main issue for South Australians appears to be the growing threat of higher interest rates.

That is from the experts within the department: that is not a political assessment.

Let us have a look at some of the positive aspects of today's figures. Youth unemployment has fallen since last month, and it is down 8 per cent on the equivalent month of last year. We did not hear the Leader of the Opposition refer to that significant development. It is a very positive move forward and one that we are going to accelerate through our KickStart for Youth program which will be in full flight within a few months. Other figures out today from the Industrial Training and Commercial Commission indicate that new apprenticeships and new traineeships are up this month over last year—an increase in the order of 7 per cent. So, employers have confidence, despite the interest rate hikes.

Despite the negatives from Canberra and the Opposition in this State, there is still an indication on the part of employers to take on young people as apprentices and trainees. Those people have a commitment to South Australia, as has the Government of this State. When we have the Motorola project, EDS and Australis in full flight, we will see further growth in employment and a greater spin off to smaller industries. The Government is working flat out to get South Australia fully recovered from the disaster that the previous Government created. But it would be appreciated if the Opposition got behind and supported us, instead of knocking whenever it gets the opportunity.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is again directed to the Premier. When did the Premier learn that the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations had personally responded to a request from the Federal Government concerning the transport of nuclear waste to Woomera; and why did the Premier fail to tell the Parliament on 21 March, 22 March, or subsequently, that the request had been answered by the Minister himself and not by a junior departmental officer?

On 21 March the Premier said the Department of Housing and Urban Development had received a Federal communication and that several aspects of that communication seriously concerned him. He said the fax was not even sent to the chief executive officer, and the Premier's statement made no reference to the Government's response. On 22 March the Premier told the House:

The correspondence was sent to HUD. I have named the person in HUD; and, in fact, a response went back from HUD indicating that no environmental impact statement was required.

That response was in fact signed by the Minister, not by a HUD officer.

An honourable member: What's the point?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Exactly, what's the point? The Leader of the Opposition or another member opposite asked the Minister questions on this issue just after my ministerial statement about his response. This House was told then. So, this House has known for two weeks—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Not that he was involved.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes, the Minister indicated in answer to a question. The Leader of the Opposition is obviously making an absolute fool of himself here today because he should go back and read *Hansard* concerning what was said in this Parliament two weeks ago. The Minister himself acknowledged the fact that he had sent the response back.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No, the Minister indicated he had sent the response back.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Minister referred to the letter he had signed. So, it would appear that the Leader of the Opposition has got up and asked a question here—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—this afternoon without even knowing what the facts are. The facts are these. For the past two weeks the Leader of the Opposition and his staff have been trying to find someone to take up that letter and they have been flaunting that letter around the Adelaide media saying, 'Please take it up. Someone listen to our story and take it up and run a headline,' thinking that they were out there supporting their Labor colleagues in the campaign that those colleagues have been trying to run against the State Government. I am amazed that the Leader of the Opposition, on the one hand, makes out that he is against storing this radioactive waste in South Australia and then goes to such enormous lengths out there trying to protect and support his Labor colleagues in using South Australia as a dump for radioactive material. The hypocrisy of the Leader of the Opposition on this matter is an absolute disgrace. Where does he stand? Does he support the Federal Labor Government in using South Australia as a radioactive dump for the whole of Australia, or will he stand up for South Australians and oppose what his Labor colleagues are currently doing?

The Hon. M.D. Rann: I have.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Why has the Leader been so quiet in his criticism of his Federal Labor colleagues? Why has he allowed himself to be used by his Federal colleagues in such a manner to be out there trying to protect their case? It was the Labor members of this Parliament who stood up and made the accusation across the House that my department was told in February or March—in fact in a briefing—about the plutonium. The fact is that we were not told at all.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: That fax did not come to my department.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: There are two key Government agencies involved in negotiating this matter with the Federal Government. The first is the Premier's Department—and letters have come to me from the Ministers and the Prime Minister—and also the Health Commission, because it is the Health Commission that signs off on this issue. I point out that, despite numerous letters from the Prime Minister and Minister Cook, neither of them at any stage has mentioned to me the presence of plutonium in the St Marys radioactive waste.

Ms Hurley: They told him.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: They did not tell him. A junior officer of the Federal department sent a fax to a junior officer in the Department of HUD and said, 'Do we need an

environmental impact statement on this issue?' That is not about notifying me that plutonium is involved.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Here they are again—out there defending the actions of their Federal colleagues. Members opposite have been put in this embarrassing situation where their Labor colleagues in Canberra have been prepared to use South Australia as a radioactive waste, and they keep asking questions about it. One might ask why. The answer is that it was the Labor Government of South Australia in October 1991 that sent a letter to the Hon. Simon Crean clearly indicating that the South Australian Labor Government was willing to negotiate—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, you sat around the Cabinet table. The Leader of the Opposition sat around exactly the same Cabinet table at which it was agreed to send this letter off to Canberra, and here we have the now Leader of the Opposition, who sat around that Cabinet table and said, 'We are willing to look for temporary storage facilities including in South Australia. We will participate in the whole campaign.' That is the embarrassment for the Leader of the Opposition and the Labor Party in this State, because as far back as 1991 they have been part of this plan to use Woomera as the dumping ground on a short term basis for the radioactive waste of Australia. It is a disgrace, and the credibility of the Labor Party on this issue in this State is zero.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): My question is directed to the Premier. What action has he taken to seek the support of other States to protect and improve the future of the Murray River?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: This week I have sent a detailed proposal to the Premiers of Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria, and to the Prime Minister, outlining a program that the South Australian Government would like to undertake as we approach the centenary of Federation. At the COAG meeting on Tuesday and Wednesday of next week one of the issues for discussion is the centenary of Federation. I have now made a detailed submission to each head of those respective Governments to participate, as part of the COAG meeting's considerations next week, in advancing the cleaning up of the Murray River system as the national project for the whole of Australia for the year 2001.

It was the former Premier of Victoria, Joan Kirner (who is Chair of the committee looking at the centenary of Federation), who described this particular project as the best project put forward and the one that should be adopted for the centenary of Federation. She was full of praise for it: not just once, but constantly she has praised the South Australian Government for its initiative in this regard. I have now submitted this proposal to the Premiers of New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland, the Prime Minister and, of course, the other Premiers as well, because they will be there for the discussion.

I have also indicated to them that the South Australian Government is willing to establish a Murray River catchment authority under the proposed legislation which is now before Parliament. That catchment authority will ensure that the works program, which needs to be carried out in South Australia, is funded and carried out within this State. By carrying out the work in this State, we will put our money and our legislative support where it is needed.

My submission to the other Premiers and the Prime Minister also proposes strongly the interstate transfer of irrigation waters. I will touch on that for one moment, because this is one of the most important initiatives that this State can undertake. Under the proposal, if there is the interstate transfer of irrigation waters, we will see the relocation of very significant quantities of water away from the lower Riverina area where significant environmental damage is occurring into better irrigation areas further down the river, particularly in South Australia. We have the potential as a State Government to increase irrigation in South Australia by up to 50 per cent if we can secure the interstate transfer of water. I hope that all members of this House—indeed, all members of this Parliament—will get behind the State Government regarding this important initiative.

I also highlight the fact that it will mean the transfer of water away from the irrigation of cotton and rice, providing an increased irrigation allocation for vineyards in South Australia. It means that Australia will increase significantly the value adding that we get out of each volume of water used for irrigation. In fact, the value added component for Australia, if we put one equivalent volume of water onto a vineyard compared with rice or cotton, will be eight times greater. We in this State should strongly support this initiative.

The honourable member who raised this issue and whose electorate includes the Murray River is a great supporter of this program. I was delighted to visit the area with him last week and to meet many of his constituents. An encouraging change has been occurring in the Riverland over the past 10 months. When I was there 10 months ago, it seemed that in many ways there was a very depressed economy, which had flowed from the actions of the previous Government. The change that has occurred in the past 10 months is unbelievable. In fact, they are so short of labour at present that they cannot find enough workers to pick the grapes off the vines. During my visit I received numerous complaints about that shortage of labour.

It is also encouraging to see a company such as Moore Bros of Loxton which, this year, is increasing its export of carrot juice to Japan from \$3 million to \$9 million and a new operation, such as Almondco, which is doubling its throughput from 2 000 tonnes to 4 000 tonnes, adding value to it and now starting to move into export markets. There has certainly been a very dramatic change, and that is why the upgrade of the Murray River is so important to this State.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier still have full confidence in the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations following his failure to inform the Premier prior to his statement to this House of his letter to the Federal Government about the transport and storage of nuclear waste and his admission that he did not even read the Federal Government's communication on such an important and sensitive issue to which he nevertheless replied personally saying that there was no need for an environmental impact report?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Minister has my full support, because in fact the Minister dealt—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is not looking too good at present.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I say to the Deputy Leader that, at times, I think it would be better if he participated in some of the activities of his brother, next to whom I happened to sit at the Rolling Stones concert last night. He enjoyed the concert. In fact, I think that it would put the Deputy Leader of the Opposition a little more in touch with reality and what the community is saying if he went to such concerts.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I must admit that I have had a little difficulty in hearing today as a consequence of the concert last night, but it was enjoyed by the 30 000 South Australians who were there.

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier is out of order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Deputy Premier passed the comment: 'What do they think of him?' I thought that the theme song about him last night was 'I Can't Get No Satisfaction'! Returning to the question, I point out that the Minister was asked specifically whether an environmental impact statement was required. Of course, the very fact that this nuclear waste was stored on Commonwealth land should have been enough, because all the Minister was doing was dealing with whether or not an environmental impact statement is required under planning legislation. Of course, as it is Federal land, one is not required at all. As the Federal authorities have known throughout this episode, all their discussions in terms of a permit to transport these goods across South Australian roads lies with the Health Commission. The Health Commission has not given that approval, I have not given that approval, and Cabinet has not given that approval.

STATE CLOTHING CORPORATION

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): Will the Treasurer inform the House of progress in the sale of the State Clothing Corporation?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I announce that the State Clothing Corporation will no longer be a part of Government and that there is a willing participant in the sales process to the extent that an agreement has been reached regarding its disposal and purchase. As an aside, I was interested to read a news release by the Leader of the Opposition who said that he wants a firm guarantee from Premier Dean Brown that, while the State Clothing factory will be sold off, it will not be moved away from the region. He said that this privatisation (as he called it) is a significant blow to regional development and, after all, it was Don Dunstan who put it in place. I will make one or two observations about the State Clothing Corporation and the fact that Don Dunstan was the initiator—that probably was the start of its demise from day one. But, importantly, the State Clothing—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Well, have there been any ventures in South Australia under a Labor Government? Have there been any? I am waiting for them.

The Hon. Dean Brown: The Leader of the Opposition has adopted Don Dunstan as his mascot.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think that the Deputy Premier needs assistance by way of interjections.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I am reminded by the Premier that the Leader of the Opposition adopted Don Dunstan as his mascot—I find that quite appropriate. State Clothing was a Dunstan initiative, but I have not seen any Dunstan initiatives in terms of economic development that have worked in this State. I saw nothing during the period 1970 to 1979 that assisted the economic development of this State, and between 1982 and 1993 we certainly had nothing to assist this State. So the record of Labor is appalling.

The State Clothing Corporation has virtually never made a profit: it has cost the taxpayers millions of dollars, it has never returned a dividend and, even worse, it has been propped up and subsidised by the Police Department or the Central Linen Service by their paying more than the market price for linen and clothing. So the great experiment did not work. When this Government came into power, I said that State Clothing should not be part of government. We have spent the past 15 months looking for a proposal to shore up the proposition in Whyalla, looking for people who would take the enterprise as it stands today. In fact, we were willing to give away some of the assets simply to get an enterprise up and running in Whyalla. The buyer of the establishment, Dixon Clothing, has put down a deposit. The buyer will go through a due diligence on Whyalla. He has paid a deposit, which is non-refundable, on the basis that he believes that the establishment has potential, but it will be up to him to decide that.

The Ridleyton operation will proceed, and it will be signed off at the end of May. For the past 12 months we had hoped that we would have something quite spectacular or at least something that would generate jobs in Whyalla. Obviously, the member for Giles is vitally interested in the future of Whyalla, and we have his interests at heart, too. Whether or not it pans out at the end of the day and is a success, all that I can say is that we have made every endeavour over the past 15 months to make it a success.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Why did the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations tell the Parliament on 23 March that his department had responded to the request from the Federal Government concerning the transport of nuclear waste containing plutonium when he now admits that he personally signed the letter on 20 February? On 23 March the Minister told the House:

Let us make it quite clear what officers in my department were asked for.

He also said:

On that basis they gave a technical reply and in that technical reply they set down certain provisions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Interjections will cease. Members are aware of the warnings that I have given.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I will commence by explaining what happens in the Public Service. Officers in the Public Service provide technical information—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: There are people who would like to hear this reply. Officers provide technical information and then put it in the form of correspondence which comes to Ministers to sign. So, when they provide that technical information it is in the form of a letter. I will go back and describe the events that are behind this series of

questions today. I refer to an article which appeared in the *Advertiser* this morning in which the lead paragraph is intended to set the scene for the article. It begins:

A State Government Minister endorsed plans for high level radioactive waste to be trucked into South Australia.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles is out of order.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: That has to be one of the most grossly misleading, dishonest and untrue statements that I have read in the *Advertiser* for many years, and unfortunately it refers to me as the Minister. I hope that the retraction receives equal prominence in the *Advertiser* tomorrow. Never has there been a more inflammatory statement which, I believe, is meant to create a false perception. Let me be clear about a few other things.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is warned for the last time: he knows the consequences.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I go back to my reply to the member for Torrens when this matter was last raised. My officers were asked to provide technical information on a matter of law for the EPA in Canberra. They provided that information after consulting other agencies. They came to me with a briefing note—which is the normal procedure—explaining that they had prepared a letter for my signature—which is perfectly normal in the Public Service—and said that they had prepared it from the information. The briefing note set out exactly what had been requested of us as an agency, and the recommendation was there with the accompanying letter.

At no stage was I told that plutonium was mentioned in this 11 page fax. Anyone who has been a Minister would know that you read your briefing notes but do not necessarily read every piece of paper that comes across your desk. On this occasion it was not a request for permission to transport any substance but a request for information on a point of law—nothing more and nothing less. My agency responded to its Commonwealth counterpart, and that is the beginning and end of the matter.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Torrens is out of order.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: It was a request from a Commonwealth agency to a State agency for information on a point of law, and that information was provided. As was raised earlier today, we are still waiting for the Commonwealth to come forward with a schedule or whatever of what is to be transported. By no stretch of the longest bow can our response on a point of law be interpreted as permission to transport anything across South Australia. That permission still has to be applied for and granted.

WATER SUPPLY

Mr BUCKBY (Light): Will the Minister for Infrastructure provide a reassurance to country users about the extent of EWS contracting out following statements on an ABC radio program last night by the former Premier, Mr Don Dunstan, that contracting out would affect country water prices?

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: As the Premier interjected, the mascot has been brought out. We see a man of the 1960s coming out to look after the problems of the 1990s. He had a great deal of difficulty looking after the 1960s and the 1970s without worrying about the 1990s. He does not put on

a bad act, and former Premier Dunstan has never worried about facts getting in the way of a good political yarn, and that is exactly what has happened. There he was on radio repeating what the member for Hart said—that we are about to privatise our water and sewerage system in the metropolitan area.

Don, you got it wrong. That is the first point that he got wrong. He went on to say that country people would be disadvantaged by this scheme, that their water prices would rise. Well, Don, if you had not noticed, we are talking about the metropolitan area of Adelaide, not the whole of South Australia. That is the second point he got wrong. Then he talked about water pricing and said that outsourcing would cause an escalation in the price of water and sewerage for the Adelaide metropolitan area. That is the third point that he got wrong.

I will repeat the facts for the benefit of members opposite. Water pricing, quality and management and the program for maintenance will be controlled by the Government and not by any private sector company, unlike the United Kingdom experience. Don got it fundamentally wrong on every occasion. He summarised his interview by saying that Hilmer was about competition and not privatisation. Well, he got that right, because that is exactly what we are doing with outsourcing our water and sewerage.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: When the member for Giles stops interjecting I will call the member for Torrens.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections on my right, and that includes the member for Peake and the member for Wright.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Why did the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations inform the Federal Government that no Public Environment Report was required to transport nuclear waste containing plutonium to South Australia when he did not know what a Public Environment Report was? Yesterday the Minister told the media that he did not know what a Public Environment Report was and said 'that part was handled by the Health Commission'.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is of the view that a number of these questions are similar. The same question cannot be asked again. Therefore, I ask the Minister to answer only that part of the question which is different.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: With regard to the environmental report to which the honourable member refers and which the reporter asked me about, I said to the reporter in question, 'We don't know about those sorts of things because we don't deal in them.' We do not prepare the environment report; that is at Commonwealth level. As I understand it, it is stage two of the EIS. They come in underneath the EIS at Commonwealth level. They do not have the legal status of an EIS. They are not a report in South Australia that we as a department get involved in, but we can give advice to the Commonwealth on its PERs, and that advice is usually heeded.

My comment to the reporter, which again was taken out of context in the course of a question and answer series, was that the EIS is of interest to us (and we know all about them) but we do not know much about the PERs because they are

a Commonwealth matter. That is not to say that I do not know what is a PER. Everyone in this place who follows planning knows what is a PER and knows that it applies outside South Australia. Our main interest here is the EIS. State assessment authorities comment on PERs to the Federal counterpart and the Federal counterpart will take them into account.

WATER MAINS

Mrs HALL (Coles): Will the Minister for Infrastructure undertake an urgent review of the water mains in the north-east quadrant, as defined by the EWS, with a specific focus on: first, the condition and age of the mains; secondly, the current infrastructure maintenance and replacement program; and, thirdly, the number of bursts in the north-east quadrant comparative to the number in the remainder of the metropolitan area? Recent graphic television coverage showing gushing water cascading over roads and into business premises in the Newton-Paradise area, interviews on radio and a variety of media reports about the damage bills have left a number of residents and people working in the business areas—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is getting very close to comment.

Mrs HALL:—feeling very threatened about the area.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting. The Minister.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: In response to the two specific questions by the member for Coles as they relate to the condition and age of the mains, I point out that, as a part of the outsourcing procedures on which the Government is currently embarking, a complete stocktake will be undertaken and the prime contractors are looking at the age profile and the condition of our water and sewerage mains in the metropolitan area of Adelaide.

In relation to the current infrastructure maintenance and replacement program, I advise the member for Coles that this financial year the EWS will spend \$1 million on replacing larger water mains and the Millbank trunk main at Rostrevor where pipes are old and in poor condition. That is part of the upgrade proposed. In fact, a major tender is to be let next week which will accommodate this project.

There is no denying that the excessive dry weather conditions, combined with the soil type present, exaggerates the normal load on pipes. There is certainly no denying that about 47 per cent of bursts in Adelaide occur in the north-eastern area. Further, there is no denying that those burst mains make very good and spectacular news stories for television.

In defence of the EWS Department, I put at least this point: the number of bursts in South Australia compared with the number in other States of Australia is relatively low. However, in the north-eastern area of South Australia, the soil types—Bay of Biscay and black clay—and movement are affecting the pipes. We hope, as a result of the outsourcing proposals, to achieve savings in the order of 20 per cent plus, and some have been 40 per cent. Regarding Melbourne Water, for example, by outsourcing there were savings of some 30 per cent, and an outsource contract in New South Wales has secured savings of 25 per cent. My point in highlighting that is that, if we can generate savings of 25 to 30 per cent in the annual bill, we can do 25 and 30 per cent more replacement upgrade of our water and sewerage pipes in metropolitan Adelaide. This outsourcing proposal will enable us to accelerate some of the programs to upgrade our

water and sewerage pipes. That is the benefit of outsourcing to consumers in South Australia.

This problem has been there for many years. Our predecessors did not seem to tackle it. I take on board the representations of the member for Coles and will certainly be looking at ways in which we can assist the people in the north-eastern suburbs to minimise burst water mains.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): My question is directed to the Premier. Has the Government decided to trade nuclear waste dumps for the world heritage listing of the Lake Eyre region?

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs GERAGHTY: In his letter to the Prime Minister dated 28 February, the Premier said:

Finally, the South Australian Government believes the prerequisite to establishing radioactive waste storage sites or repositories in the Woomera region is that the adjacent Lake Eyre region should not be considered for world heritage listing. It therefore seeks an agreement from the Commonwealth that it will not proceed with world heritage listing of the Lake Eyre region on the grounds that such listing is inconsistent with the location of storage sites for radioactive waste on the edge of that region.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The answer to the question is, 'No, there was no trade whatsoever.' I pointed out to the Prime Minister, and rightly so, that 10 000 tonnes of radioactive waste from around Australia is stored at Woomera, right on the edge of the area on which they are undertaking a study for world heritage listing. The two just do not sit together. How can the Prime Minister and the Federal Government continue to take 10 000 barrels of radioactive waste—whether low, medium or high grade—and certainly plutonium (although a very small quantity indeed) out of New South Wales and store it in an area at which they are currently looking for world heritage listing? I have had long discussions with the Prime Minister.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I suggest that the honourable member sit back and listen, because I have had long discussions with the Prime Minister about world heritage listing of the Lake Eyre Basin region. It covers 25 per cent of South Australia. Where does the Labor Party sit on this issue? Are members opposite willing to have their Federal colleagues impose on South Australia, against the will of the South Australian people, world heritage listing covering 25 per cent of this State? The Labor Party initially said 'Yes.' Before the 1993 Federal election, the Labor Government of South Australia gave its blessing to the study going ahead as part of the election gimmick. Then it had second thoughts in the run-up to the State election and came out opposing world heritage listing for the Lake Eyre Basin area. Where do members opposite stand now, because they have been very silent on that issue?

I pointed out to the Prime Minister that it is absolutely incompatible to store 10 000 drums of low-grade radioactive waste, plus a small quantity of plutonium, in the very area at which they are looking for world heritage listing. The hypocrisy of the Labor Party at the Federal and State level of Australia is clearly showing through. It is using this State as a scapegoat to improve its electoral chances in New South Wales, both before the recent State election and before the forthcoming Federal election. It is simply wanting to get the radioactive material out of marginal Labor seats and dump it

here in South Australia at our expense as a South Australian community.

At the same time, it is not prepared to store the very small quantity of waste from South Australia up there. In other words, we have to be the radioactive dump for the rest of Australia but it is not prepared to put our radioactive material there, even though it is very small in volume and quantity. It shows the extent to which the Labor Party at the Federal and State level has become so hypocritical on this issue.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources explain the involvement of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources in the field of spatial information technology and how it will assist in the management of South Australia's natural resources? The Government is promoting South Australia as the smart State of Australia and is actively encouraging the development of industries focused on information technology. Part of the Government's strategy is to ensure that the public sector takes a lead and exhibits best practice in this field.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I thank the member for Hartley for his question, because I am very pleased with the leadership that the department is showing this State and nation just what can be done in the area of high-tech spatial information. The many reforms in data accessibility and quality undertaken by the department positions this State well for the years ahead. I am delighted to be able to inform the House of a spatial information coup for South Australia, and that is good for this State.

The Commonwealth Government, through its Technology in Government Committee, annually presents awards for outstanding achievements in productivity through the use of technology. Recently, the Department of Environment and Natural Resources received a prestigious gold award in the environment category for its cooperative work with the Murray-Darling Basin Commission in compiling a CD ROM set of author photo maps of the Murray River. The CD ROM set provides scale-correct photographs of the Murray River from the source to its mouth at Lake Alexandrina.

This is the first time that mapping of the Murray has been provided in such an accurate, consistent and up-to-date format. As well as being an excellent example of cooperation between all tiers of government, the work demonstrates that technology can be harnessed for the improvement and betterment of the environment. The mapping now underpins management of the region and makes this invaluable information readily accessible to the general public.

It is interesting to note that, Australia-wide, this was the only award in the environment category. It was also one of the few awards that was based on meeting the needs of external clients. The department is striving towards further spatial information developments over the next 12 months which will further assist both the public and the private sector to better understand and work with the environment in an economically and ecologically sustainable manner. I am confident that the list of achievements of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources in the field of information technology will continue to grow as South Australia develops its technology base.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Why did the Premier claim in his ministerial statement to the House on 21 March this year that the request from the Federal Government—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to speak up. I am having difficulty hearing her.

Mrs GERAGHTY: I will start again. My question is directed to the Premier. Is that louder?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections. That is one of the reasons why we cannot hear.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Why did the Premier claim in his ministerial statement to the House on 21 March 1995 that the request from the Federal Government concerning the storage of nuclear waste was handled by the wrong South Australian Government department? In his statement to the House, the Premier said that the Federal request had been sent to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, notwithstanding that South Australia has 'clearly established lines of communication for these matters involving the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the Health Commission'. Yesterday the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations confirmed that several State Government departments, including the Health Commission, were involved in analysing the request.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The honourable member has just read out my answer as to why. We know that the honourable member can read, she has just shown that, but she cannot comprehend. I invite her to read out again what I said in my ministerial statement. It was because it was sent to the wrong department. There has been a clear understanding with the Federal Government that all communications in relation to the transport of radioactive waste are to go through the Premier's Department and through me as Premier unless they deal with specific approvals for transportation, in which case there needs to be specific negotiations with the Health Commission. That has been understood. Until that time, all the letters had come to me. Indeed, for the past three years, all letters have come to the Premier's Department.

The Federal Minister, Mr Cook, wrote to me and the Prime Minister wrote to me. Suddenly, halfway through a 22-page document, one mention is made about plutonium and the Federal Government sent it to the wrong agency. One has to ask: what was the motivation of the Federal Government in doing that? Why did it not do it up front in a letter to me, to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, or to the Health Commission, the department handling it?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Torrens.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Quite clearly, the member for Torrens has not bothered to comprehend what she just read out to the House.

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Will the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development report to the House—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: —you are a clown—on any initiative which may—

Mr CLARKE: Mr Speaker, I ask the honourable member to withdraw the words, 'You are a clown', because I find them offensive.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There was considerable interjection and the Chair did not hear the comments that were made. I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to advise what the comment was.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: I did call the Deputy Leader a clown. I have reflected on the matter and, in deference to the fact that some of my good friends are clowns, I apologise.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is completely out of order. I suggest that the member for Unley ask his question as briefly as possible.

Mr BRINDAL: I will, Sir. Will the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development report to the House on any initiative which may help to further boost the competitive nature of South Australia's vital manufacturing centre, which has already increased substantially in size and activity in the past 12 months?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: There have been some encouraging signs in the economy. Over the year to January 1995, the level of South Australian exports of manufactured goods grew by a staggering 23.5 per cent. Indeed, 41 per cent of our manufacturers are now successful exporters in the export market, and that is a higher percentage than in any State in Australia. The ratio of research and development expenditure to GSP is also higher here than elsewhere. There are over 500 companies from South Australia involved in the development and manufacture of high technology.

New manufacturing technologies cannot be effectively utilised without well-trained staff and a strong education and training program at the CRC for material welding and joining will ensure that the welding engineers and technologists employed in this State's industry are as up-to-date as those anywhere in the world. Australian welding engineers can now obtain an internationally recognised qualification right here in Adelaide. That will give overseas customers greater confidence in products out of South Australia.

This week, the CSIRO, which is one of the partners in that CRC program, has committed \$2.6 million towards upgrading its facilities at Woodville, where the centre is located. That is another significant infrastructure investment project. That is on top of the now 80 projects either under way or on the drawing board worth more than \$4 billion. Compared with October last year, that is an increase of 25 per cent in the value and 33 per cent in the number of projects. In summary, South Australia is cementing its place as a national leader in advanced manufacturing, broadening the economic base, achieving greater exports than the other States of Australia and therefore creating a better future for South Australians.

ABORIGINAL DEATHS IN CUSTODY

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): What action has the Minister for Correctional Services taken to ensure that recommendations 122 to 187 of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody are being followed by all management and officers of the Department for Correctional Services? Last week there was another tragic death of an Aboriginal person in custody at Port Augusta Prison. Despite a known history of acute mental illness, it is alleged that the person was left in his cell alone without having taken his medication, with permission having been refused for him to see his *de facto* wife and with his belt on.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I thank the honourable member for finally raising this question. Of course, the honourable member raised this question publicly on 29 March 1995 with a press release headed 'Serious questions raised after Aboriginal death in prison'. The honourable member said that immediately on coming back into Parliament he would raise the issue, but he did not. I raised the issue publicly on radio the next day, and I will now repeat what I said on that occasion. My colleague the State Minister for Aboriginal Affairs released in Parliament late last year details of the Government's response at that time to the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody. If members are not already aware, a considerable number of recommendations on deaths in custody have been put forward. Those recommendations—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: If the honourable member cares to listen he will get the answer. There were 339 recommendations put forward by that royal commission. Those recommendations cross all manner of portfolios and levels of Government, both Commonwealth and State. In so far as those that relate specifically to my portfolios are concerned, I invite the honourable member to read the report tabled by my ministerial colleague. If he does not have a copy I am happy to ensure that he is provided with one.

As far as the particular incident itself is concerned, obviously that matter is being investigated by the Coroner. That investigation in itself is consistent with the royal commission recommendations to which the honourable member refers. Further, consistent with those recommendations, the findings of the Coroner's report will be made public. The honourable member would also be aware that the Coroner has the opportunity in his report to refer to the instances and events surrounding the death of a prisoner, including the meeting of duty of care obligations by correctional service officers.

I can advise the House, without going across the Coroner's investigation, that as Minister I obviously raised a number of questions with my department about that incident. The honourable member in his press release highlighted that, in his view, the Port Augusta Prison had been redesigned especially to deal with Aboriginal deaths in custody. My particular concern relates to cell design. The prisoner was in a cell rebuilt by the Labor Government—the Government that the honourable member claims rebuilt cells adequately. It would appear that the prisoner was able to hang himself after smashing a grill above the cell door. My department is advising me as to the appropriateness of that structure in the cell—work that was undertaken by the previous Government. If the previous Government had been concerned about ensuring that cells were constructed in a hang-proof manner, what it might have done—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: If the honourable member sits back and listens he will get the answer.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair wants to hear the rest of the answer.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: What the previous Government might have done is ensure that capital works moneys were appropriately targeted at cell construction and design. In the 11 years of Labor Government in this State we saw \$180 million spent on prison capital works. We can look at Port Augusta as an example and we see that \$1 406 000 was spent on a gymnasium, complete with feature pine wall panelling, \$58 000 was spent on a swimming pool, and

\$38 000 was spent on colour-top tennis courts. At Mobilong \$1 185 000 was spent on a gymnasium, \$56 000 on a swimming pool and \$24 000 on a tennis court. The Adelaide Remand Centre was provided with a heated indoor swimming pool, a basketball court-size gymnasium hall, a squash court and a weight training area. If the Labor Government were serious about tackling cell design that is where it would have put its money.

OUTBACK WORK CAMPS

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Gordon): Will the Minister for Correctional Services advise the House of the progress that has been made in establishing outback work camps for prisoners?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Last week I was pleased to launch publicly the first of a series of new private sector partnerships aimed at putting prisoners back to work. The announced partnership on that occasion was with Curia Pty Ltd, a mud brick manufacturing company that is now operating from Yatala Prison. Today I am pleased to advise the House that prisoners are now being put to work in the outback. The Department for Correctional Services has established a pilot mobile outback work camp, known in short as MOWCAMP, from Port Augusta Prison. This prison was chosen for the pilot scheme due to the number of low security prisoners that it accommodates and its ready access to remote northern areas of the State.

Mr Speaker, I take this opportunity to place on the record in this House my thanks to you and acknowledge your support for this particular program from Port Augusta Prison where prisoners have been working in your electorate. Ultimately, prisoners will be placed in camps for four-week periods with correctional officers changing every two weeks. Prisoners are then returned to prison for a two-week period to enable their visits to be facilitated.

The first MOWCAMP commenced on 19 March 1995. I am now happy to share with the House the success of that project. Eight prisoners and two correctional service officers commenced the trial with a variety of tasks being completed in the Gammon Ranges National Park. The work included repairing the roof, windows, plumbing and telephone aerial for Grindell's Hut, rejuvenating the tourist information bay, repairing windows, scrubbing walls and repairing doors at the shearing quarters and erecting and repairing fences around the park.

From Saturday the number of prisoners involved in this project will be expanded to 12, and progressively expansions in the project will occur until there are some 20 prisoners working in this camp, with multiple camps coming into operation throughout the State. One particular highlight of this first camp was that the participants erected fencing to prevent goats and rabbits destroying a rare population of Swainsona plant—a type of native pea. With this site now being protected, it can be used for a research project to ensure that the full effect of grazing by rabbits and goats becomes known to research scientists in that region.

The Port Augusta Prison has also been actively involved, in conjunction with the Pichi Richi Preservation Society, in restoration of the Quorn railway station and extension to its workshops. In short, this Government is now putting prisoners back to work again.

RAILWAY STATIONS

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): What savings to the budget does the Deputy Premier estimate will come from the Government's decision to close Millswood, Hawthorn and Clapham railway stations?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I am delighted that the member for Spence has got off his bike after riding around my electorate and actually come into the Parliament and asked a question. He has been promising on radio for a few days that this will be the No. 1 question in this place. However, he has not been able to get it up to No. 1 and I can understand why. I can also understand why the member for Giles left early: he must have known that this question was on the agenda. Let us be quite clear about this. In 1991, the then Minister for Transport, the now member for Giles, said, 'We are closing the stations along the Belair line.'

An honourable member: No he didn't.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: He said exactly that. I said that I would not countenance that because I want my constituents to have a fair chance of getting some passengers back on those trains. I could agree with the member for Giles that the passenger service was not being utilised; indeed, empty trains are drawing up at stations. For example, for the three stations that have been mentioned (Clapham, Hawthorn and Millswood) the best lighting we have for 23 services during the day is 56.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is out of order.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The Minister lost his Bridgewater line: the Labor Government closed that down. It had a lot more passengers on the Bridgewater section than are getting off at most stations, yet the Labor Government closed it down. In 1991 when the Minister for Transport expressed his intention to close most stations I said—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Spence.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I suggest that the member for—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Unley.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I suggest that, when the member for Spence gets on his bike and distributes this answer, the facts of life are that the Labor Government wanted to close them down and another one as well, making four stations closed down, in 1991. I said, 'No. I will make every attempt to make sure that my constituents are aware of the need to use the train services.' I letterboxed my electorate telling people of the need to support the train services. At public meetings I have consistently said we have to get more passengers on the train. In fact—and members can reflect on how good I was at that process—the numbers have been going down.

If you want a fast turnaround service on one line (remembering that the train has to come up and back) or the normal services of morning and evening, we will need to use the cut-offs to get the two trains running back and forth. The issue is that we want an efficient service: the fastest service we can have. We want people on those trains, and we have not been achieving that.

LIBERAL PARTY PRESIDENT

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is again directed to the Premier. Is he lending his support to the campaign by Liberal fundraiser Rob Gerard to

be elected this year as President of the Liberal Party, and did he as Premier participate—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When the House comes to order—

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Wright.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There could be a couple of members on my right who will be dealt with under Standing Order 137. The Chair points out to the Leader of the Opposition that the election of the President of the Liberal Party is not a matter of Government responsibility of the Premier; therefore, the Chair believes the question is out of order. The member for Frome.

COUNTRY BOOK

Mr KERIN (Frome): Will the Minister for Primary Industries explain to the House the advantages of the new edition of the *Country Book*, which will be distributed around the State this week?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: We had the pleasure this week of updating the *Country Book*, which explains services to country people. The book was first produced in 1991 after considerable agitation by the then Opposition, and became quite well known and valuable for country members. It has now been updated and is being used especially by the task force looking at strategy for Eyre Peninsula. *Country Book*, which was launched at Kimba last weekend, is something that is available free of charge and will be of great benefit to all country people in knowing what Government services are available to them.

YORKE PENINSULA VISIT

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education outline the benefits of his recent extensive visit to Yorke Peninsula and the Spencer Gulf region?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I thank my colleague for that unsolicited question. Last week I spent four days visiting Yorke Peninsula and the Spencer Gulf region in the electorates of three of our distinguished members: the members for Frome, Goyder and the well-known member for Eyre. I visited TAFE facilities and spoke to youth workers and council representatives. Many positive things are happening in that region, including LEAP programs, which are transforming the lives of young people. One young person who, when starting the program, had an interest in very negative things, very hostile towards the community (in fact, was focused on killing rather than on other more civilised things), was transformed by one of those programs and now has employment and gained a driver's licence. That is just one example of the positives achieved through those youth programs.

The Spencer Institute of TAFE is also a success story. Enrolments are up, particularly in the areas of aquaculture, tourism, hospitality and engineering, and moving to develop greater links with the mining industry, which is so important in the electorate of Eyre. One of the most exciting developments in that region is the number of not only young but older Aboriginal people graduating through TAFE. I spoke

at two ceremonies, along with my colleague the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development, who was at the Kadina ceremony, the first time a ceremony for the whole of Yorke Peninsula has been held at Kadina. It was a packed house. Of the people graduating, a significant number were Aboriginal people from Narrunga, from Point Pearce, and that is very encouraging.

I also visited Narrunga to talk to the people there and to assist them in the development of some programs focused on Aboriginal arts and crafts training. At the Port Augusta graduation, which the honourable Speaker attended, out of the 210 graduates, 40 were Aboriginal people, which is a significant achievement and reflects very highly on the commitment of the institute Director Maureen Morton and the dedicated staff of TAFE. It is a tremendous development to find that the Aboriginal community is regarding TAFE as an avenue for advancement in terms of education and training. So, it was a worthwhile visit and part of this Government's commitment to making sure we get out among country people; that we do not overlook them as happened under the previous Government.

We recognise that the one-third of South Australians who live outside the metropolitan area are a vital part of the community and it is our intention that they not be overlooked, whether it be in training or in the provision of other services. So, it was a very successful visit, and I enjoyed the support of the other three members of this House.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr BECKER (Peake): I would like to place on record my disappointment that the sporting arrangements in South Australia are such that 10 year old athletes do not have the opportunity to be recognised for outstanding performances. A young constituent, Scott Rolinski, recently competed in an open swimming event at the age of 10 years and set a record for the best swim for anybody under the age of 10. I believe that someone has held this record for a number of years but, because Scott swam in an open swimming event, his record achievement was not recognised officially. I understand that the South Australian Amateur Swimming Association is unable to recognise his achievement because it only has qualifying times for 13 year olds and under and is, therefore, unable officially to recognise young Scott's performance.

Certainly, it speaks extremely well of a young person who is prepared to enter an open swimming event and break a record that has stood for many years. Unfortunately, Scott will have to wait until he can go into an under 13 year old or under 15 year old event where there are specific qualifying times in order to have the opportunity to break records.

We encourage young people to participate in sport, to become active and to accept the discipline of sport so that they can compete in an open event where the standards and the competition are much stronger. Forced on by that competition he was able to break the record. The junior sports policy needs to be looked at. The Amateur Swimming Association, and perhaps all sporting organisations, should do more to encourage the achievements of these young

people. I hope that Scott will not be put off by this incident and that he will continue to put all his efforts into swimming—which is a great sport—and we hope that one day we will see him go from strength to strength. In fact, by the time he is 15 or 16 years of age he could well be one of our leading swimmers seeking selection for the 2000 Olympics. It would be a wonderful opportunity for this young boy, and I hope that we can encourage him in that field.

This is the second time in 25 years that my Party has been in Government. It seems that no sooner do we get into Government and start putting projects forward than those projects are sabotaged, and I become somewhat annoyed at that. The type of political sabotage that is occurring in the community at the moment is nothing short of disgraceful. The Henley Rate Residents Association has been around for a long time, and over the years it has enjoyed very high regard within the community. The person who is running the association now, Bridget Bannear, is a member of the Labor Party. She is using the association for purely political purposes and is stirring up a small group of people to oppose everything that the Government does. It is making things very uncomfortable for the local council. In my opinion this little group of troublemakers and saboteurs is out to oppose everything the Government is doing to improve the environment.

Mr Quirke interjecting:

Mr BECKER: They tried to set me up at an airport meeting, but I was a wake-up. I will not go along to anything that is organised by the Labor Party, or anybody else, to try to assist their effort. It is all associated with the upcoming council elections. We know that the clean-up of the Patawalonga is vital to any new developments in the western suburbs, but the clean-up of the Patawalonga will be done responsibly. The Minister for Local Government has put out another pamphlet through the Department of Housing and Urban Development explaining to the residents what is happening with the Glenelg-West Beach development project. I urge people to study the contents of the pamphlet and to appreciate the promise that the Government will look after the environment and that the heavy silt build-up in the Patawalonga will be removed shortly.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired. The Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): This afternoon we heard some fairly extraordinary statements by both the Premier and the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. It is quite clear that the Minister did not answer the three most important questions put to him. First, he did not read the letter, which he responded to in person on such an important and sensitive issue. Secondly, he did not inform the Premier of his own personal involvement. Thirdly, and worst of all, he sought, along with the Premier, to blame a junior officer in the department for the response when the Minister himself was involved.

The Premier today clearly misled the House when he said that the Minister had said before in this Parliament that he wrote the letter. On 23 March the Minister said that they were asked whether an environmental impact statement would be required to transport the waste across South Australia. They were not asked to give permission for the waste to be transported or anything else. On that basis 'they' gave a technical reply, and in that technical reply they set down certain provisions. The Minister did not reveal to this House

that it was he who was involved, and so his attack on the *Advertiser* journalist is as cowardly as his attack on the junior officer in his department.

Also, the Premier today said that the former Labor Government had supported the use of South Australia as a nuclear waste dump. In fact I have a copy of the *Advertiser* of 8 October 1992. I refer to an article headed 'Arnold pledge on waste dump', as follows:

A national nuclear waste dump would not be set up in South Australia, the Premier, Mr Arnold, said yesterday. . . Mr Arnold ruled out yesterday any sites within South Australia being used for mostly Eastern States-based industries to dump low and medium level nuclear waste. 'I think South Australians would be very concerned about that and I don't imagine they will support it and I can tell you the Government will not be supporting it. . .'

They were the comments of the Premier of the day. I mentioned today in a question that was ruled out of order the dilemma facing the Premier over the question of Mr Rob Gerard's desire to be President of the Liberal Party. It is a dilemma for the Premier because Mr Gerard is persisting in wanting to be President of the Liberal Party in this State when Ms Vickie Chapman steps down from the role in the middle of this year.

I am aware that the Premier participated in the most recent meeting last week of the State Executive of the Liberal Party at which Vickie Chapman was criticised for her role in the Catch Tim and Moriki scandals. The Opposition has been informed that attempts to persuade Mr Gerard not to run for the presidency of the Liberal Party have not yet been successful, even though factions are talking about a possible compromise candidate such as Mr Peter Anderson, as they believe Mr Gerard's elevation to the presidency could be misconstrued as him leading as well as owning the South Australian branch of the Liberal Party.

Certainly there needs to be a reshuffle. I support the comment of the member for Coles that she should join the State Cabinet in a pre-budget reshuffle. Certainly, persistent rumours of a reshuffle have been growing with talk of two Ministers being replaced. The Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations and the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education are quite clearly out of their depth and should be replaced. Certainly that was reinforced today with today's revelations about the Minister's role in backing moves to dump radioactive waste containing plutonium. That can only add to speculation that he should return to the back bench and to lesser duties. The Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education should also go. His department is leaking like a sieve, and it has now been revealed that he has reneged on an agreement with the Federal Government that will cost the South Australian TAFE system many millions of dollars.

A reshuffle now would help distract attention away from the Government's poor parliamentary performance this session and the Catch Tim and Moriki scandals. I certainly would like to see some fresh blood like the ambitious member for Coles being added to the front bench line-up to reinvigorate a lack-lustre team. Following the election of the Premier he was in a difficult position because he had to reward his personal supporters and those MPs who had spent years in opposition. He did not have a free hand to pick his best team, and it is quite clear that a number of Ministers are not coping with the rigours of ministerial office.

The elevation of the member for Coles could help relieve the restlessness of the Premier's backbench and help staunch the flow of leaks from a large and unhappy Liberal Party

room. However, if that occurs and the member for Coles is elevated, certainly they would need to satisfy the restive Olsen camp, which would need to be guaranteed a new frontbench position. I would like to take the extraordinary step today, as Leader of the Opposition, of supporting the member for Coles in her bid for the ministry.

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

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): I have not had such a good laugh in years. I raise two issues of concern in relation to my electorate and the local council of the City of Marion. These issues highlight the need for change to the Local Government Act, not only to sections 62 and 64 dealing with confidentiality that have been bandied around in the Messenger Press and also in the *Advertiser* but also section 197 of the Local Government Act which deals with the spending of money on projects and also section 200 in relation to authorities. My first concern involves possible tender abuse, and the other relates to section 197 of the Local Government Act.

In relation to the tender abuse, I have been advised that Councillor Bruce Hull of the City of Marion tried to influence the tender process when, having received information which had been supplied to him and other council members on a confidential basis, he offered that confidential information to one of the tenderers, Envirolink, so that Envirolink would obtain an unfair advantage over the other two tenderers, Sola and Pacific Waste.

Fortunately for the CEO of Envirolink he refused that information. I understand that Mr David Hope, a director of Skilmar, has provided a report to the Chief Executive Officer of the City of Marion. The report gives details of the offer and confirms that it was made to Envirolink by the counsellor and that information was provided that would enable it to gain an unfair advantage. Having received that information, I contacted the Mayor and requested that he advise me of the action he intends to take. The time line for that advice was last Thursday, but, as yet, the Mayor has not advised me of what action he intends to take. I have written formally to the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations highlighting all the information and requesting that he look at sections 62 and 64 of the Local Government Act and that, if any person has breached those sections, some form of action be taken.

My other area of concern relates to section 197 of the Local Government Act, which provides that spending on projects in excess of 20 per cent of recurrent expenditure requires ministerial approval. Unfortunately, that section of the Act is open to a number of interpretations. Crown Law has advised the Minister that that expenditure of 20 per cent must occur in the same financial year and it cannot be spread over several years, and nor can it be the total expenditure associated with a project. Therefore, councils can do what the Marion council has done. Twenty per cent of its recurrent expenditure is \$4 million. In 1991-92, the council spent \$1.2 million on the one project; in 1994-95, it spent \$3.8 million; and in 1995-96 it will spend \$2.2 million on that same project associated with capital expenditure.

Just the other day the Marion council signed a contract to purchase a further \$200 000 worth of land with a settlement date after 30 June 1995 in order to avoid ministerial scrutiny of the project. When I asked the Mayor to provide financial details of that project, he said that there were still two months to go before he would be able to provide any financial details or plans associated with the purchase of the land. It is

somewhat strange that State Governments are open to scrutiny in respect of the total expenditure on a project irrespective of when it occurs and whether or not it is in excess of \$4 million, yet local government can continuously avoid scrutiny.

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

Mr KERIN (Frome): I have previously spoken during the grievance debate about the success of the John Pirie Secondary School amalgamation at Port Pirie, which was formed by the merging of the Risdon Park High School with the Port Pirie High School. I would like to report further that this amalgamation has been an enormous success and further congratulate the leadership of the school, the staff, the interim school council and the current school council and the parents and students for making it work. It is widely recognised throughout the community that this amalgamation has been a major success within the city. However, a very small group of people—you could just about count them on one hand—has been critical and tried to harm the health, success and harmony of the amalgamation.

Many of those who were involved in the success of the amalgamation are extremely upset at the efforts of the Hon. Ron Roberts in another place to stir up trouble. His contributions in the Council and misleading stories in the media have caused quite an angry reaction from those people who are working hard in the community for the John Pirie Secondary School. Many question whether this is misplaced concern for student welfare or a bit of political grandstanding more to do with Labor pre-selections than with education.

In the media, the Hon. Mr Roberts is quoted as saying that the buildings used for the new school had been on sites in country areas and that we do not see similar buildings in Adelaide because they would not be tolerated by people in the metropolitan area. I would like say, first, that the buildings that were shifted to the site came from the Risdon Park High School and not from around the State, so they were all in use last year by the same school community. Secondly, there are plenty of these buildings in the metropolitan area: to say there is not ignores reality. The honourable member forgets to mention which Party left us these buildings and who is responsible for the sorry state of our schools. In my electorate, there are at least a dozen schools that need a lot of work. We have moved on a couple of those—Peterborough is in the planning stage, and it will have new facilities by the end of the year.

The Hon. Mr Roberts said that the temporary buildings were the flotsam and jetsam of educational excesses and were fire traps. The only educational excess in my area is the fact that we have been ignored for an excessively long time. He also said that we are giving the kids worse conditions than before the amalgamation, and that this is a backward step. As I said, all the buildings were in use in the Port Pirie school community last year. Those comments ignore the fact that the quality of the buildings is only one thing to do with education and that the activities in the classroom are more important. The honourable member's comments have upset quite a few of the staff and downvalued the terrific work they are doing at the school for the students.

The honourable member also claimed that half the buildings lack air-conditioning. Every classroom was air-conditioned before the school year started, so that is completely incorrect, and that has been refuted by the school itself. This really brings to mind the neglect of the infrastruc-

ture that this Government has taken over. I agree that we must work hard to improve the quality of the John Pirie Secondary School, and I am constantly talking to those responsible for the facilities and also the Minister. Planning for the future is proceeding very well, and the school was given a \$180 000 back to school grant this year, which has been used to upgrade a few of the buildings on site.

I suggest that the actions taken by the Hon. Mr Roberts and this small group are putting the harmony of the amalgamation under some pressure at the moment. Not only is such action not useful but it is very harmful, particularly when one considers that education is about a lot more than buildings. Attempting to stir up trouble within the school is of no use to anyone. In conclusion, I congratulate the Principal, Ken Walley, his staff and the school council for the terrific job they are doing. If people will get off its back, the John Pirie Secondary School will provide an excellent educational standard for Port Pirie.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): During the past month or so I have raised the issue of the lack of recombinant synthetic Factor VIII which has been in short supply across Australia and which has been denied to young and older patients undergoing preventive treatment. I am pleased to say that my electorate office has informed me that a number of people have telephoned to say that there has been a change in the situation at long last. That has been partially confirmed by a doctor who treats children and who says that all children are now back on the program, not to the extent that they need it but at least they are back on the program, and that the situation is being reviewed on a weekly basis. So I congratulate the Minister for his action at last, bearing in mind that he had the ability to do this at the end of November last year. It has taken several months, a couple of questions in Parliament and press coverage on television and radio; however, he has acted at last, and I am grateful, as are the parents and children.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: Yes, it should have happened in the first place. I want to relate to the House some information that the Haemophilia Foundation of South Australia has sent to me in relation to the Commonwealth Government's position on this matter. I quote from its April 1995 Australian newsletter *National Haemophilia*, as follows:

A senior Commonwealth Health Department representative has clarified the Federal Government's stance as follows:

Towards the relief of short-term supply problems the Federal Government will cost share enough rFVIII to ensure the maintenance of treatment previously given.

- Emergency or 'on-demand' treatment of bleeds, including previously untreated patients; and
- Maintenance of existing prophylactic regimens, but no new prophylaxis or tolerisation treatment is to be introduced;

That certainly was an offer to maintain treatment, which is what was removed by this Government. It continues:

- 'On-demand' treatment also includes appropriate elective surgery.

The Commonwealth has made it clear that this cost-sharing mechanism for short-term supplies of rFVIII should not be seen as a precedent for the funding of ongoing supplies of rFVIII which (we hope)—

and I hope, too, and will be working for—

will result from the Factor VIII working party recommendations being agreed to and funded by Federal and/or State Health Ministers.

This is the important bit:

In this knowledge no children should have prophylaxis withdrawn, no 'normal' treatment should be reduced, and reasonable elective surgery should take place.

That is not what has happened in South Australia. It continues:

We are aware of individuals in a number of States who have had their treatment reduced or withheld in these areas.

We are one of those States. It continues:

This is not necessary if your State joins the Commonwealth in purchasing adequate rFVIII. HFA has notified all directors of Haemophilia Treatment Centres and HFA delegates regarding this, encouraging them to press their Government into action.

As I say, we found out today that our Government at last has swung into action—at least partially. I make the point again that it is a pity that it took so long. It is a pity that kids had to suffer. I will now quote briefly from a letter that the Haemophilia Foundation of South Australia wrote to me a couple of weeks ago, because I have not yet had the chance to read it to the House. It states:

I write on behalf of the management committee of HFSA Inc to thank you for asking a question in the House on Thursday last. We have written to the Minister asking why South Australia has not yet purchased a quantity of recombinant Factor VIII. . . Can you imagine the amount of frustration our parents are experiencing as they have their children's treatment started and stopped? The young boy is just nicely into his routine of having a needle into his vein three times a week to receive his treatment. This keeps him relatively free of the painful spontaneous bleeds which so disrupt his and his family's life. Then, because of a lack of FVIII, he is let off the 'needle'. How can parents justify to a small boy the need for that regular needle? How do they start the process up again when there is enough FVIII to treat?

It finishes by saying:

The Health Department will, in the long run, save money—that very important thing—by adequately treating these boys now.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Unley.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): In the brief time available to me today, I take the unusual step of paying due credit to a number of my opponents for the help that they are giving me to retain and continue to win the seat of Unley. The first is the member for Spence, who has been working tirelessly bicycling around my electorate in the dead of night, in the cold and rain, delivering pamphlets on the closure of the Millswood station. I can assure the member for Spence that I am quite capable of representing my electors and perhaps better able than he of making representations to my Minister and colleague, the Hon. Di Laidlaw. But I would like to thank the member for Spence. He saved me considerable postage in that he has alerted my electors to the closure of the station—something which I had fully intended to do.

What is more, I think that he has enhanced my chances at the next election on the law and order issue. I have to tell you, Sir, that old ladies in Unley get quite terrified by mysterious men bicycling around in the dead of night dropping things in their letter box and claiming that they are responsible members of Parliament only doing their job. So, on the law and order issue alone I think I am way in front. I assure the member for Spence that I am capable of making representations on behalf of my electorate to the Minister for Transport, the Minister for Health or anyone else. If he wants to spend his time doing something, he should research the number of brothels in Spence. He seems most confused. He told this

House that there was one: it now turns out that there were four.

Mr Cummins interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, instead of searching for them, as my friend and colleague the member for Norwood says, in Unley, he would do better to keep his own house in order and tidy and confine himself to Spence. He likes to go on about the leafy suburbs of Kings Park and Unley Park, and I like to consider the neighbourhood in general. I say to the member for Spence that he does not add to its dignity by his presence, so he is better off staying in his own electorate.

The other person to whom I would like to pay due credit is somebody who is giving me, and I suggest every member on this side of the House, great help, and that is the President of the Institute of Teachers, Clare McCarty. I hope that she retains the presidency of the Institute of Teachers for many years to come, because we could have no greater advocate for this Government than Clare McCarty. If one listens—

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Unfortunately, the members who interject are correct.

Mr Kerin: What about the teachers?

Mr BRINDAL: That is a good question, because in doing well by this Government, in perpetrating the erroneous falsehoods that she does, she is selling short the teachers of South Australia. One thing that concerned me this morning was the absolutely outrageous lies which were told on ABC radio. She claimed publicly that the Minister for Education and Children's Services had \$10 million hidden away for the purpose of bolstering private schools as soon as he was able to get away with it—money squirreled away in logs. I have to tell all members in this House, although members on this side need no telling at all, that, if the Treasurer found that there was any money squirreled away anywhere, he would have his hands on it before you could cough. We are not any longer in the Dunstan years of money hidden in stockings, and the education lobby is no different example.

What she is doing is putting teacher against teacher and student against student. We have had a long and good relationship between the independent school segment and the public school segment. The Minister is responsible for all students and all teachers in this State, regardless of whether they go to a public or a non-public school. The Minister is doing his best for all students. Any person from the education community who tries to spread trouble, who tries to divide teacher against teacher, student against student or system against system, is doing more to destroy an excellent system, one that has stood as a model of cooperation in South Australia, and should be deplored.

MINING (NATIVE TITLE) AMENDMENT BILL

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference, to be held in the Legislative Council first floor conference room at 6 p.m. today.

PARLIAMENTARY REMUNERATION (BASIC SALARY) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Minister for Tourism) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Parliamentary Remuneration Act 1990. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Bill to pass through the remaining stages without delay.

Motion carried.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to set salaries payable to members of the South Australian Parliament from 1 July 1995. It will mean a \$1 000 reduction in the basic salary for a member of this Parliament compared with what would have applied if the previous parity with the Federal Parliament had been fully restored.

Members will recall that the Parliament legislated last year to impose a freeze on parliamentary salaries. This action reflected the Government's concern that it wanted to be able to establish salary levels in the public sector free from any suggestion that MPs themselves were not willing to set an example in wage restraint. The effect of that decision was to maintain the basic salary for a member of this Parliament at \$68 693 per annum for the whole of this financial year. Had the Parliament not acted to impose this freeze, members of this Parliament would have been entitled to a basic salary of \$73 460 since 15 December last year because of the automatic parity arrangements which had previously applied.

Accordingly, the salary freeze has amounted to a cut of more than \$91 a week on the basic salary for a member of Parliament. Members of the State Parliaments of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia, and the Northern Territory Legislature, also received salary increases last December. The result has been that salaries payable to members of this Parliament are lower than for every other State Parliament, except Tasmania. Even with this Bill introduced today, that situation will continue to prevail. This is because the Government has decided that the previous parity with the salaries of Federal MPs will not be fully restored. Rather than \$1 000 below the Federal Parliament, the parity will now be \$2 000 less.

The result is that the basic salary of a member of this Parliament will be \$72 460 per annum from 1 July. This will be \$1 500 less than the basic salary since 15 December 1994 for the New South Wales, Victorian and Queensland Parliaments, and \$1 450 below Western Australia. In percentage terms, the increase embodied in this Bill is just under 5.5 per cent. This compares with the recent rise in judicial salaries in this State of more than 6 per cent.

The Government's offer to the public sector of a \$35 a week phased-in increase represents a rise of about 6 per cent on the average public sector salary. I should point out to the House that, in comparing the salaries of members of this Parliament with those of the Federal Parliament, account also needs to be taken of the provision of motor vehicles to Federal MPs. Federal senators and members can elect to have a vehicle for a payment of \$700 per annum. As the true cost of the provision of a vehicle exceeds \$8 000 per annum, the real differential between the basic salary of a member of this Parliament and a member of the Federal Parliament will be about \$10 000, even after the passage of this Bill.

The decision of the Government to return to a level of automatic parity with Federal MPs will remove the public concern which inevitably applies to salary movements for parliamentarians that there is no independent benchmark against which increases can be measured. In making this decision, the Government has had to balance the need for continuing wage restraint with what is fair and reasonable in providing a level of remuneration for parliamentarians consistent with their responsibilities, duties and hours of work.

Another consideration is the extent to which the level of salary will encourage people with a contribution to make to the community to put themselves forward for election to this Parliament. In this context, the highest private sector executive salaries paid in South Australia are about nine to ten times the basic salary payable to a member of Parliament under this Bill.

Finally, there has been consultation with members of the Opposition about this Bill and I understand it has the Opposition's support. I commend the Bill to the House and insert the explanation of the clauses into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

The legislation will come into operation on July 1 1995.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation

The clause amends the definition of 'Basic salary' so that it is fixed at \$2 000 less than the rate from time to time of the basic salary of a member of the Federal Parliament.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): The Opposition supports this measure. I will make a few remarks, but I do not wish to unduly take up the time of the House on this issue. I can confirm to members of the media and other interested persons that members of Parliament do have various obligations and they need a salary with which to pay those obligations. That is the first point I make here this afternoon. Consequent upon that, you have to have a wage fixing mechanism.

The mechanism that was brought in here some four or so years ago has been a reasonable way in which this matter has been handled. I give full marks to the former member for Davenport and others in this Parliament who supported the measure to establish the nexus between the Federal salary level and the basic salary determined here in South Australia for members of Parliament. The legislation that went through, which I think from memory was in 1991, although much criticised at the time, solved the problem of the wage fixing mechanism for members of Parliament.

Clearly, members in this place do not want to sit here time in and time out and determine their own levels of salary. We are in a unique position. Our ability to do that in many respects has probably led to more problems where this is concerned; for every suggested pay rise that came through the Remuneration Tribunal, there were at least five media stories and everybody saw their photograph in the paper and a series of what can only be described as inflated plastic figures next to them.

As every member knows, the obligations of being a member of Parliament are so considerable that the Minister's comments about the basic level and the difference between that and senior executive positions in South Australia is such that I suggest that the disparity is even greater than nine and 10 times because of the other obligations. One of those obligations is not only the question of superannuation but also the level of expenditure that a member is expected to have in each of their own constituencies.

A couple of other remarks need to be made. On behalf of the Opposition, I accept this Bill. As to the parity with the Federal award for members of Parliament being \$2 000 less than was the case before, the only comment I make is that the Deputy Leader said in this House at the time the wage freeze was suggested that we would probably be the only workers in the Government sector in relation to whom the wage freeze would work because we were the ones who had the absolute power to ensure that it would or would not work. We made

further predictions that no-one would get any credit from it and that, as soon as we came out of that period, there would be a number of hassles, not the least of which would be a media campaign that really was totally unnecessary.

I hope that a reasonably mature debate ensues on this question. The Minister pointed out that there has been a lengthy wage freeze for politicians here and that it will continue until 1 July. In fact, as I understand it, the difference in salary levels will not flow through to members until the end of July. We are now moving back to the wage fixing mechanism that was found to be the most successful of all the mechanisms that have been in place to determine salaries in South Australia.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I note that the clock says that it is 4.30. I note, therefore, that it is not the dead of night and that we are not debating this Bill in the secret time before the dawn, out of the scrutiny of the public or in any other clandestine way. This Bill will not pass in three minutes. No members of the media are apparently present. For a Bill as vital as this one, about a subject that so preoccupies their attention, even when we get so much as a postage stamp, I find it remarkable that they are not in this Chamber to listen to the considered debate and the contributions of members. I hope that I am wrong in thinking that they have made up their mind or have already determined that it is a good issue, one that they always win on, one that they can always get cheap headlines on, because everyone likes to belt a politician. I hope that such a gross assumption on my part is wrong because it would not be conducive to a belief in a free, independent and fearless press that we all know we have in this country.

Having said that, I rise to support this measure. I do so unapologetically and conscious of the furore that will result from the media's reporting of this debate. Quite simply, as one of my colleagues said recently, there is no good time to increase the salaries for politicians. Yesterday, tomorrow or whenever an increment comes through, we as politicians will be on a hiding to nothing in the media. Neither the size nor mechanism by which the rise is taken will be given any serious attention at all. I vaguely remember some years ago when there was a very modest increase in parliamentary salaries—I think it was something like \$2 a week—even the South Australian media were hard pushed to rant, rave and scream about such an increase. So, it created something of a dilemma. However, one enterprising journalist, I am told, discovered that pensioners had received only \$1.60 a week increase, so there was their headline. Their ingenuity came to the fore and, in the end, the headlined screamed, 'MPs grant themselves 33 per cent more than pensioners'. They had a story, despite themselves.

Because we are always on a hiding to nothing on this matter, it is unfortunate that some members in this place have always been reticent to stand up and say what we believe and to stick up for what we deserve. As members opposite will know, that has gone from Premiers down. Members opposite will be aware that, for nearly a 10 year period, because of the terror with which parliamentary increases were greeted, this Parliament fell further and further behind until it was by far and away the worst paid of all mainland Parliaments. The point was reached at which we were the worst paid legislators in Australia.

Members such as myself and the member for Playford, who came in five years ago, and others who have been here longer, recall that it was time for a massive catch-up. That is

all it was—a catch-up. I pay credit to the former member for Davenport, the member for Light and the Hon. Dale Baker, the then Leader of the Opposition, who worked very hard to establish the concept of nexus to depoliticise this issue. I believe that this Parliament acted responsibly. It said that, because we have a massive catch-up, we will do it incrementally in three steps, and we will fix a nexus that is \$1 000 below our Federal counterparts. Did any of that get reported? What was reported was each time we got a bit of the increase. The media went berserk and made main fare of the fact that politicians had received increases as if they were three separate increases and that we were falling over ourselves in our race to the trough.

I learnt a lesson from that. Never again will I consider good public relations in this matter of policy. If I believe we deserve something, I will stand up in this place and say so, and I will vote exactly that way. When we have tried to show restraint, when we have tried to act in the most responsible way, conducive to the dignity of this Chamber and to the wellbeing of all South Australians, all we ever get is a belting. For one, I believe that it is about time we stood up, tell them exactly what we think and tell them to get lost and to examine their own salaries.

As the Minister put it very well, we are fixing our salaries, not irresponsibly but in line with an arbitration process that stems from Canberra and in line with every other Parliament in this country. Members will recall that, last year, as a Parliament we took a most responsible action and that was to break a nexus, which had taken 20 years to establish, and forgo any wage increase for 12 months as a sign of restraint. We announced then that we would now be catching up. We announced then what we were going to do. As the Minister said, we have not only recommitted ourselves to that nexus, we have doubled the gap. We have gone from \$1 000 below to \$2 000 below, which still makes us the lowest paid mainland Parliament in this country.

Do we get any credit for the 12 months of salary forgone, for the \$5 000 that each and every member could have had in his pocket and has not? Do we get any credit for doubling the gap between us and Federal members? I refer, of course, to the apparent gap, not to the real gap, as the member for Playford and the Minister pointed out. No, we got a belting, and from the very people who want a \$58 increase. If they get it, they will not apologise. They will say that they deserve it. In the meantime, they say that we do not deserve it. What of the judges who got a good increase and every Uncle Tom Cobley and all who get increases?

Ms Stevens interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: In this case, lest the member for Elizabeth worry, I am not knocking the teachers, nurses or anyone else. I believe in the system of arbitration and that the labourer deserves his or her hire, whatever it is. If this is the hire we deserve, it is what we deserve. It is not more, it is not less. As teachers must get what they deserve, as nurses must get what they deserve, and as the judiciary must get what they deserve, it is not any more or any less. We should not apologise in this place to people who want to make cheap headlines and who go on the radio saying that some of them earn it and others do not. That might be true. We might know some members who work harder than others. That is our own judgment.

There is a more important judgment, and that is the judgment of the electors of South Australia. I say to those idiot commentators who suggest that the good ones deserve it and the bad ones do not: let the electors fix it up and vote

into this place only people who deserve the money. If there are people in here who do not deserve the money that the Legislature pays, who are the fools—the people occupying the seats or the electors who elect them? If we do not deserve to be here, let people of better quality stand, let them run for the seats and, if they want to, drop the salary.

Let me make a prediction to members of this House that the salaries of members of Parliament will never drop because, when people get in here and actually do the work, they quickly realise that the remuneration is perhaps less rather than more than we deserve for the job that we do. I am not complaining about the remuneration; I am not making a claim for any more. I am just saying that members in this place earn every cent they get and more. The sooner we stop apologising for it, the better.

This place comes at a cost. There would be no member here who does not understand that. There is a cost in terms of time, family and loss of privacy and in many cases a loss of dignity. That deserves some sort of compensation. In this case, with our salaries, it is certainly not compensation by way of money. I am here because I want to do this job and I want to remain in this job. I am sure every other member is here for the same reason. However, I am not going to apologise for getting a salary that I do not consider is anything great by any standards that anyone wants to put up for the work that we do.

The Minister has pointed out that the increase for the Judiciary was something like 6 per cent—and I hope he will correct me if I am wrong, because I just took notes while he was talking. The average claim for the average public sector is about 6 per cent and our projected rise is somewhat less than that. I cannot see that we are not by this measure behaving in any way other than responsibly.

I would also like to point out something the media never bothers to say, which is simply this: this is the one job in South Australia that is absolutely freely and unequivocally available to every person in this State over the age of 18 years. I do not think I could have applied for Tim Marcus Clark's job; I do not think I could have applied for the Premier's chief of staff job.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I doubt that the Premier would employ me as his chief of staff; I doubt that the Minister for Infrastructure would employ me to run ETSA. Those jobs pay considerably more money than backbenchers in this place receive. This job is freely available to all; anyone can apply for it and anyone can win. There is no breach of contract; there is no redundancy. We simply are or are not elected.

Mr Becker: Or long service leave.

Mr BRINDAL: There is no sick leave, no long service leave, no workers compensation. There is a whole host of absolute benefits for which members opposite will know trade unions have fought over the decades and which we do not get. I am not advocating that we should get them, but they are not considered by anyone else. I make no apology for the measure that the Minister has introduced, because it is his measure. However, I accept it fully and, like every member in this House, I take total responsibility for it. If any member of the press wants to interview me on radio, television or in the press and ask whether we deserve this increase, I will tell them unequivocally 'Yes'. I will also tell them that, if they do not think we do, let them stir up my electors and get someone else to run against me and, hopefully, if it is a better person who wins, at least the salary will attract a better calibre of person to this place.

They all whinge about how bad we are and the standard of our politicians—that we are not good enough, that we do not do a good enough job and that we cannot attract the right people. However, the minute there is any change in salary, they grizzle about that, too. It is a real catch 22 situation. People like the Minister must have rocks in their head even to be here.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: No, I'm being serious. He was a successful businessman before he came in here. I do not know his private affairs, but I would bet that he could be making more money out there than he would be in here. Yet, he is here—probably because he believes in the job that he is doing and undoubtedly because he believes in the public service that he is contributing. Yet, he is expected almost to apologise for a level of pay that he could exceed elsewhere. I am not saying that I could earn that amount elsewhere and I am not saying that everyone else could earn it elsewhere; it does not matter. All that matters is whether it is a salary commensurate with the work that we do here. It is that and it is no more; in fact, as I said, it is rather less.

I fully support the Minister in this measure, which I commend to the House, and I hope that every member in this Chamber will have the courage to tell the media to get lost and to mind their own business. Perhaps we should start exposing the salaries of chiefs of staff and senior political journalists who daily sit in the gallery for an hour a day, who in some sort of blood sport carve us up every night on television and who I suggest would take home rather more than any person in this Chamber earns. Perhaps if we want to start examining salaries publicly we should start with some of those people and measure them against the hypocrisy that they express when they so busily tell us that we are not worthy of the salaries that we are now granting ourselves. We are linking ourselves to the Federal Parliament and back to every other Parliament. The labourer deserves his hire, and I think every person in this Chamber deserves what we are now voting ourselves. I commend the measure to the House.

Mr BECKER (Peake): Mr Deputy Speaker, as you and I well remember, back in 1979 the Tonkin Liberal Government froze the basic salary of members of Parliament. Those salaries were frozen until 1992, when the member for Davenport successfully moved in this House that a nexus be established to set our salary \$1 000 lower than the Federal backbenchers' base salary. Of course, the reason behind that was to show that we in South Australia, whilst attaching our salaries to Federal salaries, were prepared to take a slightly lower salary simply because of the difference in the costs between South Australia and the Eastern States.

South Australia has always been known as a lower wage-cost State. During my years as the President of the Bank Officials' Association we fought very hard for our basic and classified salaries to be brought up to the same level as those in the Eastern States. We always argued that in a smaller State you had to have a much broader practical and theoretical knowledge of banking than those in the larger Eastern States banks. I maintain that if anyone from South Australia went to the Eastern States they did extremely well, because their services and skills were sought after by the other banks. In South Australia, because of the price of land and the opportunity to enjoy a very good standard of living, we can get away with establishing a nexus with the main benchmark.

Of course, we have now decided that after the freeze for 12 months of members' salaries we will now accept a nexus

of \$2 000, which roughly mirrors the difference between the average wage in South Australia and that in the Eastern States. There is no argument that we in South Australia are lining our pockets or doing anything we should not be doing.

I feel very sorry for those in the Tasmanian Parliament. This must be a lesson to all new members of Parliament as well as all future Governments. There is a danger in freezing wages. I have never been in favour of freezing wages for any austerity measures, because it always comes back to haunt you. Many years ago in Tasmania they agreed to hold their wages at a much lower level. They then established a parliamentary committee which travelled throughout Australia to look at all committee allowances and salaries, etc. That committee suggested a 40 per cent increase to try to catch up to some extent. That increased salary was only a proportion of salaries of our parliamentarians and those in other States. However, because sections of the media decided to run a campaign and continuously belted the Tasmanian politicians they decided to call off that salary increase.

At some stage in the future that will have to be reviewed, but a tremendous amount of time and effort went into reviewing and interviewing committees. We here in South Australia spent quite a few hours with committee representatives from the Tasmanian Parliament, advising and assisting them in respect of salaries for members of Parliament. Mr Deputy Speaker, we all know that there is no security in this position. In the early 1970s we faced elections every two years, which meant that every year we had to stand for Party preselection and the following year we had to face the people. So, we were continuously campaigning in the 1970s as the Dunstan Government kept holding elections at the very first opportunity, which was about every two years.

From a security point of view, there was none. That was taken away from us. Of course, Dunstan was one of the first who started doorknocking. He changed the whole face and tenure of politics in South Australia, and I was only in a month when I started doorknocking for the next election. It became a full-time professional job of doorknocking, issuing newsletters and communicating with the electorate. I had a lot of fun, because I was able to raise many issues that ordinary people never realised could be raised in Parliament. It would be nothing to ask five or six questions in a two hour Question Time. I would go out doorknocking of a morning, come into the House of an afternoon and ask the questions that were suggested to me during my doorknocking, and then next day I would send copies of *Hansard* to the people. For the first time, people were getting direct representation in the House and virtually a direct response.

It got me into a lot of trouble at times, but it changed the whole approach to politics. Before that, the older members of the Party did not believe that you should take someone around to the Community Welfare Department, introduce them to the Director and get them assistance. They did not believe that you should have to bother getting involved in helping these people. But, by golly, this approach changed the lifestyle of these people and helped them improve their standard of living and quality of life. In fact, that approach set a standard that every politician is now following, and everyone improves on it as time goes by.

It makes for long hours. Involvement in shadow Cabinet, of course, brings you into the area of policy decisions, and there is no remuneration whatsoever for the additional work created in shadow Cabinet, and that can be immense. God only knows how the current Opposition members put up with it, because it has insufficient numbers to share the work

around. At least in my day we had double the numbers and it was not quite so difficult. But we did not have the staff, the research facilities or the opportunities in the Leader's office that there are now. At least Opposition members can be grateful that the same number of support staff are on hand in the Leader's office as was the case when we were in opposition with 23 members.

During that period from 1979 to 1992 it is estimated that the average backbench politician lost somewhere in the vicinity of \$23 000 net. That freeze on salaries was extremely expensive, and I would like to remind Jan McMahon, Clare McCarty and the Council of Social Security that they are employed on very attractive packages. Jan McMahon has other business interests: I am aware that she used to have a business on Jetty Road, Glenelg. None of those organisations employs surplus staff, but none of them would put up with having only one staff member to help them in their 60 hour working week.

I believe that what the Government has done is correct this time. It has been a courageous move to announce that the legislation would be brought into Parliament, then bring it in the next day and debate it, instead of the previous practice where we would slip it in at about 11.30 at night on the day before Easter and it would go through before anyone realised what happened. Let us have a little openness in the debate and discussion on the whole issue. I checked with my office a few minutes ago: we have not had one phone call complaining about the salary increase. Mind you, it would be a waste of time, because I am in that wonderful position now to be able to say, 'Are you prepared to take a pay increase and see 61.5 per cent of it disappear in Federal taxes, in superannuation (which is no benefit to me at all; I have reached my 20 years and one month) and in the Medibank levy?'

For every \$1 000 we get, which equates to about \$20 a week, we are lucky to net \$7.50. Okay, it is a lot of money to a pensioner and to people who are on fixed incomes and who have seen interest rates drop dramatically over the years since they retired and invested their money. There are people out there hurting, and I realise that. At the same time you have to have legislators. I just cannot believe the salaries that we have to pay today to people who run organisations such as the MFP Corporation, the Special Events Corporation, and various statutory authorities such as the Electricity Trust, the Health Department and some of our medical staff.

Some of our medical staff in hospitals (and the Minister is here at the moment) know they are terribly underpaid for the hours they work, but that is part and parcel of life and it is up to them to establish their salary levels and be satisfied with what they earn. I am about to put out a pamphlet in my electorate calling for volunteers to join the Liberal Party to seek endorsement to replace me at the next election. Until now the salary level has not attracted anyone, nor has the media comment, the media criticism and the media intimidation. That is a pity, because I would dearly love to see a woman with legal qualifications come in to replace me, or someone with the much higher qualifications that we seek in the Party, but at this stage there is nobody, because it is just—

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I assure the honourable member that it is most unusual for me to adopt that attitude. I believe that we have to offer a package that is attractive.

Mr BUCKBY (Light): I rise to support the Bill. I wish to reiterate quickly a couple of points mentioned by other members who have spoken. Prior to the decision of this

Parliament to link the salaries of members of Parliament in this State to those of Federal members of Parliament, whenever a pay increase occurred there was great derision in the press and within the community that this Parliament was again voting itself another pay rise. The linkage to the Federal Parliament takes that out of our hands. A Federal body makes the decision on the level of remuneration that a Federal member of Parliament should receive, and we have now linked ourselves to that system. It is interesting to note that most of the other States, for instance New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland, have all linked their rate of pay to a level of \$500 below that of a Federal parliamentary backbencher.

Our decision previously was to have a \$1 000 nexus, as has already been mentioned, and the decision now to extend that nexus to \$2 000 I believe shows responsibility. There is one thing that we and the public of South Australia have to keep in mind when assessing the remuneration that politicians receive, that is, it should be compared with the sorts of salaries that are offered in the private sector. The member for Peake referred to the MFP. Most MFP executives receive salaries in excess of \$150 000. To attract the quality of candidate and the quality of member of Parliament we wish to have in this place we must offer an attractive salary.

When I look around this Chamber, I am reminded that the vast majority of members have tertiary qualifications and could go elsewhere and seek a far higher rate of pay in management positions than they currently do here. It is because they wish to serve in this place and serve their community that they are here. Certainly, that is the case for me. The magnitude of this increase is not out of line with the magnitude of other increases for judges and the Public Service. When the freeze was adopted last year it was said openly at that stage that after 12 months the situation would be assessed and then somewhere towards the average of the Public Service rise would flow on to State parliamentarians. We are below that and, as I said, in increasing the nexus to \$2 000 it has made us \$1 000 worse off than we were.

The member for Unley referred to the impact on members' families. I receive extremely good support from my wife, Kathryn, and I am sure all other members' partners give them similar support. Because long hours are served in this place to do the job properly, a member's partner must provide support, and they must ensure that the family receives the attention that they should. It requires great commitment on the part of a member's partner. As the member for Unley also said, it does not matter when you take a pay rise, it will always be contentious. It is a free ride for the press to be able to belt us around the ears, but I consider that this is a responsible decision by this Parliament and I support the Bill.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Minister for Tourism): I thank all the members for their contribution. It is important that this sort of issue is publicly aired and the comments of those who wish to speak are put on the record. I make two brief points in summing up. First, very few people comprehend the pressure that is placed on the family. Whilst money is no compensation for the pressure, the understanding of the community generally of the role of all members of Parliament in this place and the effect that it has on their families and their friends or people who are close to them is an issue that no money can compensate for, but it is a very important issue. Secondly, there is no correct time for any increase in salary for members of Parliament.

Now that we have decided to come back to a nexus with the Federal position I hope that will remain. Once a year we will be fair game for the media, and that will be the beginning and the end of it, because we will not have to continually come back to this place and pass a formal Act of Parliament to achieve what ought to be an unreasoned and undebated issue. I would hope that on 1 July the media will regard it as just another change in salary, but I suspect that that will not be the case. I thank all those who made a contribution and thank all members.

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

CONSENT TO MEDICAL TREATMENT AND PALLIATIVE CARE BILL

At 5.10 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

As to Amendments Nos 1 to 3—

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on these Amendments.

As to Amendment No. 5—

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its Amendment but make the following consequential amendment—

Clause 10, page 7, after line 18—Insert—

(7) A person must not publish by newspaper, radio or television a statement or representation—

(a) by which the identity of a person who is, or has been, the subject of proceedings under this section (the 'patient') is revealed; or

(b) from which the identity of a person who is, or has been, the subject of proceedings under this section (the 'patient') might be inferred.

Penalty: \$10 000.

(8) Subsection (7)—

(a) ceases to apply if or when the patient recovers and then gives his or her consent to the publication of the information; or

(b) ceases to apply after the death of the patient.

(9) In subsection (7)—

'newspaper' includes any journal, magazine or other publication that is published daily or at periodic intervals.

and that the Legislative Council agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 6—

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its Amendment but make the following consequential amendments—

Clause 2, page 1, line 19—After 'this Act' insert ', other than section 14,'.

Clause 2, page 1, after line 19—Insert—

(3) Section 14 may be brought into operation after the other provisions of this Act except that if it has not been brought into operation sooner, it will, by force of this provision, come into operation six months after the commencement of this Act.

Clause 14, page 9, lines 6 and 7—Leave out subclause (2) and insert—

(2) The Minister must appoint a suitable person (referred to below as the 'Registrar') to administer the register.

Clause 14, page 9, line 9—Leave out 'accompanied by a fee prescribed by regulation'.

Clause 14, page 9, after line 10—Insert—

(3a) An application under subsection (3) must be accompanied by—

(a) a copy of the direction or power of attorney (to be held by the Registrar for the purposes of this section); and

(b) a fee prescribed by regulation.

and that the Legislative Council agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 9—

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its Amendment.

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

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

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

I signal to members that the House of Assembly managers strived valiantly to change the mind of the Legislative Council managers in relation to three matters. Those three matters focused on the fact that, first, the Legislative Council insisted that the age of relevance in the Bill be 18, whereas the majority of members in the Lower House insisted that it be 16. Secondly, the Legislative Council wanted a review process of the medical power of attorney's decision by the Supreme Court. The Lower House was definitively not of the view that that was a good idea, given that the power of attorney is appointed to act, if you like, clearly for the agent of the patient.

The third matter of significant disagreement in relation to the conference was the matter of the register of powers of attorney. Despite the fact that the House of Assembly managers fought what could be described as a good fight on behalf of the majority of members in this place who recommended that the age be 16, that the Supreme Court be removed from having the power of review and that the voluntary register, as it was thus formed, was not a good idea, I have to report, disappointingly, that we lost. However, change is incremental and, as managers on behalf of the Lower House, we were able to ensure that the Legislative Council did not take the option of disagreeing with the resolutions of the conference. As a result, we gave the Legislative Council no option but to ensure that the Bill was passed into legislation. There were some dilemmas in the conference because it is a conscience Bill. I am not sure whether in parliamentary history there has ever been a conference in relation to a conscience Bill, but it certainly made the workings of the conference quite difficult.

Despite our original attempt to persuade the Legislative Council that its insistence upon a number of changes was not a good idea, we did make some small progress on behalf of the members of the Lower House. Those changes include a tightening up of the review by the Supreme Court so that the patient is unable to be identified in any published information and so that there is some degree of care to ensure non-invasion of the privacy of that person. Whilst that is a minor change, it is certainly a change in the right direction.

As I said before, we were not able to make any change in relation to age. As far as the register is concerned, we believe that some of the changes are quite significant, and for those we thank the Legislative Council. We must thank the Legislative Council for something, so we will thank it for that. Those changes will ensure that the register will be set up within six months after the Bill is proclaimed rather than immediately, and that will allow some flexibility in the proclamation of the Act. The Registrar will no longer necessarily be a GME Act appointee, there will no fee for utilising the register and, very importantly, whilst the register remains voluntary, if a voluntary decision is made to utilise the register, it is compulsory that a copy of the power of attorney be registered. For instance, if someone is in hospital, if the register is accessed and if it is identified that they have formulated a power of attorney, as the Bill stood before the conference, that was the only information that could be made available. Obviously, what is important is not whether the power of attorney has been registered but the information contained in that power of attorney, and we felt it reasonable to insist on that.

It is with mixed emotions that I report the resolutions of the conference, and it is with great pleasure that I indicate that

I believe the managers from the Lower House through their agreement have assured the passage of the Bill. However, it is with some heaviness of heart that I say that I believe the Bill is not everything which the majority of members of the Lower House wished. I repeat: change is incremental, and I believe we have made a large increment towards better care of those people who require palliative care and consent to medical treatment.

Motion carried.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH SERVICES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 March. Page 2146.)

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): The Opposition is in favour of constructive reform of the health system but only after full consultation and debate. We accept that the Government has a mandate to replace the Health Commission with a department and to introduce regional organisations. We also accept that the Minister will need increased powers to provide better coordination of health services. However, this Government does not have a mandate to claim unfettered powers to do what it likes with the people and community assets which make up our health system. Every South Australian should be alarmed at what the South Australian Health Services Bill contains—or what it does not contain. Many hospitals and health services—that is, those which have had the opportunity to study the Bill—are alarmed at what they see. I will cite some of their protests later. It is outrageous that the Minister wanted to have this Bill introduced, debated and passed through the House by the end of this afternoon. I note that—

The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: The Minister interjects that that is not true, but on the Notice Paper at the beginning of the week this Bill was scheduled for complete debate. I note that it has now been extended—

The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: Well, 40 minutes would have been too much to ask. The Minister is embarking on an exercise in megalomania, in my view, and in his typical arrogant style he is showing complete contempt for the parliamentary process. The Bill seeks to change the entire administrative structure of the health system by abolishing the Health Commission and disarming any dissenting voice regarding the massive cost cutting that is about to occur within the hospital system. I believe that we ain't seen nothing yet in that regard.

This Bill will give the Minister power to close or amalgamate any hospital or health service at will and without reason. It will give the Minister the power to determine the number of beds in any hospital and allow him to make a decision on the basis of political expediency more than community need. It will allow him to keep the most fundamental planning document which outlines policy strategies and guidelines secret and changed without any public consultation or parliamentary approval. It will allow him to dissolve hospital boards, to sack all or any member of a hospital board of directors. It will allow him to remove Health Commission staff from security of tenure by placing a good number of them on contract employment. It will enable him to take hospital assets by closing down country hospitals and handing over the buildings and equipment to any 'appropriate community organisation or public body'.

However much the Minister may seek to assure the public that it is not his intention to abuse these absolute and unqualified powers that will be given to him under this Bill, it is a fact that these powers exist in the Bill and may be used at any time in the future if he or any successive Minister wishes to do so. This Bill has far reaching ramifications. One country hospital chief executive who, like many others, has only just received a copy of the Bill—

Mr Wade: Who sent it to him?

Ms STEVENS: Wait until you hear the rest later.

The Hon. M.H. Armitage: Who sent it to him?

Ms STEVENS: I am not going to name that person. One country hospital chief executive who, like many others, has only just received a copy of the Bill summed up this legislation by saying—I will quote him because I wrote it down as he said it—'It is the most rampant, centralist piece of legislation that I have ever seen.' And the Minister wanted all this to slip through the House of Assembly in a couple of hours. The Opposition will strenuously oppose this attempt at railroading the Bill through Parliament. It will seek to do what the Minister refuses to do and ensure that the progress of the Bill through Parliament is done properly with plenty of time for public consultation and community discussion.

Mrs Kotz: What arrogance!

Ms STEVENS: What arrogance, suggests the member for Newland. Arrogance is what the people in the community are saying about this Minister. Why does the Minister want to rush the Bill through the Parliament without any discussion? What is the panic? We have every reason to believe that the Minister wants this legislation passed urgently so that he can impose further funding cuts at a rapid rate free from any interference from independent hospital boards. This will leave the community powerless to prevent the mayhem that is about to begin.

Apart from the total lack of checks and balances on the Minister's powers under the new Bill, the Opposition believes that there are many other deficiencies in the legislation. There is a total lack of consultative processes in the management of hospitals and the health system. While the Minister gives himself and his chief executive the power to intervene in every aspect of hospital and health service management, there is no requirement for consultation with boards and local communities in the exercise of these powers.

The Bill does not guarantee that major undertakings given by the Minister to the health sector in discussions leading up to this Bill will be implemented. We are left with 'trust me' promises from the Minister, and his track record for honouring promises is not good—and I will illustrate that later, too. Nor is his record on balancing health imperatives against economic imperatives good.

The right of the Minister to dissolve hospitals, especially country hospitals, and dispose of the assets without the consent of the local communities and boards that may have raised the funds to provide the assets in the first place is unacceptable. The Bill does not provide adequate accountability by the Minister, his new department and chief executive to the Parliament and the public. The Bill is silent on access and equity objectives, and the requirement of high quality health care comes a poor second to the economic and efficiency considerations required of health units.

The Bill lacks adequate legislative protection for the existing employees of the system. It contains some outdated and offensive terminology, such as the reference to 'mental handicap' in clause 5. Hospitals become 'incorporated service units' and people become 'human resources'. A person could

be forgiven for reading the legislation and wondering what it had to do with health.

There is no mention in the Bill of advisory committees, which are provided for in the Health Commission Act and which signal a Government's intention and commitment to community involvement, debate and participation. Aboriginal health is not mentioned in the Bill. There is no provision for a body to deal with health complaints—a requirement under the Commonwealth-State Medicare agreement—which this Government has strenuously avoided since it came into office. The interests of health consumers generally are ignored in the Bill. It is almost as if this Government finds patients a nuisance and an impediment to running our hospitals.

Extensive amendments following wide consultation on the Bill are required to overcome these deficiencies, and unless substantial change is made the Opposition cannot ultimately support the Bill. The Bill is so far from acceptable that it is almost at the stage where it ought to be withdrawn and redrafted. It was released two weeks ago and is only now being considered by health units. The reaction from many of those units, which are now examining the Bill for the first time, is one of shock at the unfettered powers now given to the Minister, horror that the guarantees provided by the Minister have not been enshrined in the Bill, anger at the speed with which the Bill is being forced through the Parliament and fear for the future of the community assets now under the control of local hospital boards. The Bill contains the most radical changes to the South Australian health system in 20 years. It deserves—

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: All the more. It deserves proper and adequate community debate. It requires extensive amendment and deserves a less arrogant and autocratic Minister to administer it. I will now develop what I have just said and I will start with a brief look at history and where we started in 1975 with the South Australian Health Commission Bill. Before we look at where we are heading to, we ought to take a look at where we have been, see what the good things were, see where the deficiencies were—

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: Well, you will hear some and, if you had read the second reading explanation of the Minister, which you probably have not, you would have noted that he also pays tribute to that.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: I will get to that. I will start by referring to some of the features in the second reading explanation which was given in Parliament on 12 November 1975, nearly 20 years ago, when the South Australian Health Commission Bill was tabled. I will cite not the whole lot but only the parts I have highlighted, which I believe are important because they indicate features that were valuable. I think that they are worth listening to because they are features of the other Bill which have moulded our health system in a particular way. The explanation states:

In 1974 the Government appointed a steering committee—and this was the Bright committee to which I will refer later—

with terms of reference to plan for the establishment of a health commission with the primary responsibility of coordinating health services in South Australia.

So there was at that time a recognition that there was a need to coordinate health services across the State, and it is

obvious that that needed to happen in that legislation and needs to happen in this Bill. It continues:

The powers and functions of the commission listed in the Bill are wide ranging in the health field and the health system of South Australia and cover well-being as well as health.

I highlight that, because these are features of this legislation and this second reading explanation, which talks about health as a human condition rather than being much more focused on business, saving money and economics. While I am not saying that that is unimportant, I think that the main feature of a health Bill ought to be health. Further, it states:

The object is to ensure, in terms of the health and well-being of the people of South Australia, the largest dividend—that is a bit economic—

possible from the total investment in health services.

The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: No, I do not think so. I can see some of your point of view but not all of what you put forward. It continues:

The Bill requires the commission 'to promote and encourage voluntary participation in the provision of health services' so as to ensure the continuance of the valuable contribution to the health services in this State by voluntary health organisations and the public.

None of us could disagree that the contribution of voluntary organisations in the community is a central plank of a successful health system. I see that this particular factor is not missing. In fact, the sector that is to be encouraged in the present Bill is the private sector—a completely different shade of meaning. The second reading explanation further states:

The aim here is to ensure that the administration and control of health services is located as close to the delivery point as possible.

The Minister would probably say that this is what he is doing with his regionalisation. However, in this Bill that is not the case at all. While it seems as though it is, this Bill is an instrument of centralism and takes the power back to the department, the bureaucracy, through to the Minister. Finally, another section of the second reading explanation states:

However, the commission will accord greater priority to those positive areas of the health services which, in the long run, lead to better health for individuals, families and communities. Our state of health results from the interaction between our genetic inheritance and the environment in which we live, play and work. Health is influenced not only by the physical, chemical and biological environments but also by the social environment; that is, relationships between people. Economic and educational status, housing, occupation and many other factors influence health. A health problem often has roots in the environment or way of life of a person. The commission will have this broad view of health, which requires the working together of health and welfare personnel and a health team approach to the problems of clients.

The point I am making is that in the original Bill in 1975 issues such as well-being, holistic health, community participation, working in teams, working with the voluntary sector of the community and involving people, were strong planks.

So, the Bright report in 1973 was the report that heralded the Health Commission. For nearly 20 years the overall structure and operation of the health system were a reflection of the findings and recommendations of Sir Charles Bright who, in 1973, chaired the committee of inquiry into health services in South Australia. In essence the Bright report argued that decision making about the planning and delivery of health services should be depoliticised by appointing an independent statutory body—the Health Commission—to

make such decisions in the best interests of the State as a whole; and, secondly, that the day to day operation of health units would be more efficient and cost effective if managed as largely autonomous, separately incorporated bodies, free from the constraints imposed by a highly centralised Hospitals Department.

Bright's recommendations were subsequently embodied in the South Australian Health Commission Act 1976. Since then the South Australian health system has evolved into its current form—a loosely coordinated conglomerate of about 200 *quasi*-autonomous health units, each with its own board of directors. It has been said that this is now an out-dated structure, and I agree in part with that. It has been said that the existence of the commission has failed to depoliticise the decision-making processes for the planning and delivery of health services. Indeed, it was apparent almost immediately after the commission was created that no Minister for Health could afford to allow a totally objective decision-making process. It is true that when you have operating a whole group of boards you can in fact politicise the decision-making process, and we have seen that.

The creation of *quasi*-autonomous, separately incorporated health units, while eradicating the worst bureaucratic excesses of the old Hospitals Department, has tended to promote the development of a poorly coordinated and fragmented health service delivery system. Some people have likened it to a loose coalition of independent fiefdoms where the interests of individual institutions are the dominant consideration. While I do not hold to the extreme of that view, I can see that 20 years on we need to revisit the structure in terms of what is needed today. However, here the Minister and the bureaucracy have gone way past the mid point to the opposite extreme. It is very clear from reading this legislation and the Minister's explanation that the central agencies now believe that only if they have significantly increased legislative powers to manage and coordinate the system can they successfully introduce necessary and desirable strategic changes. I do not hold with that view.

This Minister has taken the situation from one part to the other extreme and we have to get back somewhere in the middle. While we agree on the one hand that the Minister obviously needs to have the power and ability to implement policy and provide direction and overall planning, on the other hand he needs to do it in a system that works with communities, which allows communities participation, a say, a share or a partnership in the act. That is entirely missing in this Bill.

From where does this new Bill come? I will quote some of the things the present Minister said in May 1991. One could call it a major policy, and it is titled 'Managing the State—a key issues statement of health'. In coming forward we need to consider from where this Minister and Government are coming, because obviously that will affect, and would have informed, this Bill. I will take some sections, and it will be interesting for members to think about what this Minister said in 1991 in his major policy plank released 18 months before the last election. He said:

The State health budgets need to be maximised to reduce the public hospital waiting lists.

He further stated:

The administration of much of the health delivery services should be regionalised, transferring many of the Health Commission's duties to individual or regional hospital centres.

He then stated:

Centralist control necessarily breeds antagonism and, in turn, a breakdown in communication and loss of direction.

I think that is what we are seeing now. Further, under a heading referring to country hospitals suffering from three major impediments, the document states:

(c) Centralist control in Adelaide which ignores community interest and makes decisions on availability of services too often from a distant and distorted point of view, and on economic criteria alone with little practical concern for patient care.

It further states:

The transferring of many Health Commission functions to regional administration would ease the way to hospitals being revitalised with real community input and involvement.

While we do not disagree with the concept of regionalisation, we do say that the Bill does not include real community input and involvement. In relation to health, I will quote some further portions of the Liberal Party policy released by the Party during the last election campaign. It is very important to listen carefully to this because it tells an interesting story. First, the Government stated—and at least this was up front—that it would:

... dismantle the Health Commission and devolve significant administration responsibility to regional and local levels.

In relation to the closure of country hospitals, the Liberal Party stated that it would:

... refrain from any further closure of country hospitals without a specific request from a local community for a change of functions for its hospitals.

Yet, in this Bill the Government pays lip service to this because the Minister can, at will, close those country hospitals. If we were feeling a little inclined to take this Minister at his word and say, 'Well, it's in their policy and they got a big mandate,' we should think again. When talking about children suffering from cystic fibrosis last year, this Minister reminded us that the numbers are 36 to 11 and therefore what he said would go, regardless. If we were inclined to take this Minister at his word, let us look at some of the other Liberal Party election policies relevant to any mandate claimed by this Government. I believe that once we look at these members will understand why people in the community are a little worried about trusting this Minister. In relation to cost savings, the Minister states that the Government will:

... encourage management efficiencies within the public hospital system which, according to union representatives and hospital administrators, will create savings of between \$40 million and \$50 million a year, which will then be returned to the health system to improve patient services.

We all know what has happened to those efficiency increases: they have not gone back to health. The Minister went on the say that this would lead to:

... retaining within the health system all savings generated so that increased funds can be provided for direct patient services and for initiatives announced in this policy document.

That did not happen either. He talked about additional funding, involving the allocation of an additional \$6 million annually to public hospitals to allow 2 700 additional operations to be performed. Let us tell that to Flinders Medical Centre, which has to cut 3 700 procedures between now and June.

The Government said it would undertake a comprehensive capital works program to redress deficiencies presently being identified in the system. The policy document further stated:

A Liberal Government's new approach to health administration in South Australia would increase funding for direct patient care and

give public hospital managers the incentive to manage more efficiently, which will produce an increased need for qualified nurses.

How many nurses lost their job at Modbury, and how many more will lose their job as the cuts go deeper? With the 'trust me', hand on heart approach that has been taken in this legislation, the Minister is saying, 'You can't see it but we are really going to do it.' We have nothing upon which to base this. What we can see is that actions speak louder than words; that this Government cannot be trusted; and that the legislation needs to have these things stated explicitly—and they are not stated explicitly.

In connection with this Bill, the Government released some discussion papers, the first of which was launched at the Convention Centre, with all the health bureaucrats in the big lecture theatre, with the screen and with the Chief Executive Officer at his new computer.

An honourable member: Where were you?

Ms STEVENS: I was there, too. I was just about to become the shadow Minister. The first discussion paper introduced such new management strategies as the purchaser/provider split and the regionalisation of the health system, and it talked about the amalgamation of health units. It was a very interesting session, at the end of which most people left the room completely confused. We all know that the Government had to spend the next two or three months explaining it to everyone, and then, of course, because of the outrage in the country areas, it needed to revisit that and come up with Mark II.

I would like to share with members some of the comments sent to the Minister after that first meeting. It is interesting that the Minister has not learnt a lot from what was said after that very first discussion paper was released, given what was in discussion paper Mark II and now the Bill. The first response comes from the Hospitals and Health Services Association of South Australia.

The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: The Minister laughs, but it is interesting that the Hospitals and Health Services Association has as its membership just about every hospital and health service unit in the State and has a reasonable view and handle on views across the system. I will not read the entire letter, but I want to mention a couple of points.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: I am very happy to let you lead it later, but you might find it difficult to understand. The letter from the association states:

The centralised nature of the health system is noted and the potential adverse effects of this should not be underestimated. Ministerial appointment or approval of all board appointments is not acceptable. This proposal legitimises, or institutionalises, political control of the health system. Local communities in particular are best placed to nominate their representative [which is only one, two or three—or whatever—positions] on any proposed regional board. There is concern regarding the token role provided for boards of trustees. As the source of members for the proposed regional boards and for other reasons, it is vital that boards of individual health units be retained and provided with a meaningful role.

The association goes on to say:

Funder/purchaser/provider cannot be supported in its present form for the following reasons:

South Australia's population is considered too small to be suitable for this form of resource allocation.

Casemix and funder/purchaser/provider are incompatible and, for this reason, have intentionally not been introduced in other health systems, even in Victoria. In addition, the myriad

policy changes being wrought upon the health system have the potential to compound the detrimental effects caused by this incompatibility. The roles of funder and purchaser are not separated in the current proposal: they represent functions that will be taken over by existing divisions within the Health Commission.

There were many responses to that first planning document that the Health Commission tabled in October last year. However, on 24 November, Mark II popped up, and the Chairman of the Health Commission released another document, which tried to clarify and explain the first proposal and put it in a form that people could understand a bit better.

Members interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: I will not read the entire thing. This proposal brought up option 1 and option 2 for regionalisation and, as part of those options, outlined functions of boards, ISUs, and so on. This second discussion paper that came out

in November refined matters. The first was not any good: it went out and huge protest and concern was expressed. The second one came up with the option 1 and option 2 regionalisation proposal. We know, because the Minister has said this on many occasions, that 82 per cent of people agreed with option 2. I agree that it seems that 82 per cent of people were happy with regionalisation, but that has nothing to do with this Bill, and that is where the Minister has made his mistake. People have not agreed with the legislation: they agreed in principle with regionalisation; they were working on that, but they did not see the legislation and they certainly have major problems with it. I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 11 April at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 5 April 1995

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MENTAL HEALTH

158. **Mrs GERAGHTY:** Will the Minister provide full details of where and how mental health funds are distributed?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:

Actual expenditure 1993-94 (excluding Windana)		
Recurrent	\$m	
SAMHS	80.8	
CAMHS	7.9	
Metro hospitals	6.4	
Country hospitals	1.2	
Support services	1.1	97.4
Capital	4.7	4.7
Total		\$102.1 m

HEALTHSCOPE

164. **Ms STEVENS:**

1. Has Healthscope's request that the Government not allow the licensing of competing health services in the vicinity of Modbury Hospital, as referred to in the minutes of the Modbury Hospital Private Development Proposal Committee dated 17 August 1994 been agreed to and, if so, what services will be included in this restriction, what geographical area will it apply to and over what period will it apply?

2. What legal advice has been sought or received about the implications of Healthscope's request, particularly as they apply to the Trades Practices Act?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:

1. and 2. In early negotiations on the Modbury Private Hospital Development Agreement, Healthscope sought protection that the Government would not licence another private hospital provider within the immediate environs and thus jeopardise their capital investment. In later discussions this proposal was dropped.

DOGS AND CATS

167. **Mr ATKINSON:** Will a representative of the South Australian Canine Association be appointed to the proposed Dog and Cat Management Board and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is proposed that the Dog and Cat Management Board comprise six members, one of whom is a ministerial representative and five of whom are to be nominated by the Local Government Association. Of these, two will represent the community. There are at least seven special interest groups who would seek membership of the board. All these potentially have a conflict of interest so it would be unwise to specifically nominate any one. The Local Government Association has been urged to consider input received from the Canine Association and the other groups before the nominations as community representatives are finalised.

PATHOLOGY SERVICES

178. **Ms STEVENS:** Further to the answer to the member for Elizabeth's question without notice on 16 November 1994, how much extra money have Gribbles agreed to spend on research, teaching and training in their contract to provide pathology services at Modbury Hospital and how much was spent in those areas by the IMVS at Modbury in 1994?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The contractual arrangements between Modbury Hospital and Gribbles Pathology are commercial and in confidence. However, the contract does require Gribbles to provide both under-graduate and post-graduate education and training within the Hospital. During the 1993-94 financial year, the

approximate quantum of funds expended on research, teaching and training by the IMVS at Modbury campus was \$62 500.

The figure is exclusive of services provided to the Modbury Hospital and its staff by staff employed in other divisions of the IMVS. Unfortunately, it is not feasible to segregate this component from the respective divisional totals. The above figure should therefore be considered the minimum amount devoted to these activities at the Modbury Hospital.

NGARKAT NATIONAL PARK

184. **Mr LEWIS:**

1. Are there any plans to increase/reduce/eliminate the \$11 500 provided by the National Parks and Wildlife Services for the purpose of paying a dogger to control the dingos which inhabit the Ngarkat National Park and attack sheep, goats and other livestock on neighbouring privately owned farmland and, if so, why?

2. When will the perimeter solar powered electric fence around Ngarkat National Park be completed?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:

1. The Department of Environment and Natural Resources has since the dedication of the Ngarkat Conservation Park in December 1979 given financial support to the Box Flat Dingo Control Committee to enable it to employ a person to carry out dingo control in this reserve and others in the Mallee area, including the Billiart Conservation Park north of Lameroo.

It is my intention to maintain the level of funding provided to the committee so that this most important program can continue in cooperation with local government.

2. Through the fencing subsidy scheme offered by the National Parks and Wildlife Service owners of property adjoining reserves are provided with financial assistance to construct appropriate stock proof fencing on the common boundary with the reserve. The scheme provided for several types of fencing ranging from plain wire to rabbit proof netting to solar powered electric fences. There are a few properties adjoining the Ngarkat Conservation Park where solar powered electric fencing has been installed.

Provisions of the Dog Fence Act provide for the establishment of a Local Dog Fence Board which could finance the erection but there has been no support by landholders for such a proposal.

The Department of Environment and Natural Resources does not insist on any one specific design and leaves that choice to the property owner. In the majority of cases neighbours of Ngarkat have chosen to construct rabbit proof netting fences. I do not anticipate the use of solar powered electric fencing by all neighbours of Ngarkat in the future.

185. **Mr LEWIS:** Are there any plans to increase/reduce/eliminate the \$11 500 provided by the Vertebrate Pest and Pest Plants Commission for the purpose of paying a dogger to control the dingos which inhabit the Ngarkat National Park and attack sheep, goats and other livestock on neighbouring, privately owned farmland and, if so, why?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: The contribution made to the Box Flat Dingo Control Committee by PISA will be halved to \$5 750 next financial year. The residual sum of \$5 750 is the contribution required from the four district councils (Pinnaroo, Lameroo, Coonalpyn Downs and Tatiara) as their share to the Box Flat Dingo Control Committee's budget and was carried by the previous administration from 1991 whilst local dissatisfaction about funding for maintenance of the dog fence was investigated.

The councils have been advised that the investigation has been concluded and that agencies under my control have no responsibility for this contribution. The Animal and Plant Control Commission will continue to match the payments by the four councils as was the practice prior to the investigation.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT

189. **Mr ATKINSON:** When Parliamentary Counsel changed the heading (or margin note) of section 359 of the Local Government Act from 'Temporary control of prohibition of traffic or closure of streets or roads' to 'Prohibition of traffic or closure of streets or roads', how many other headings (or margin notes) in the Act were changed in the same reprint?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: None.