HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 30 May 1995

The SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated her assent to the following Bills:

Catchment Water Management,
Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care,
Construction Industry Long Service Leave (Miscellaneous) Amendment,
Consumer Credit (South Australia),
Co-operatives (Abolition of Co-operatives Advisory Council) Amendment,
Credit Administration,
Dairy Industry (Equalisation Schemes) Amendment,
Dog and Cat Management,
Fisheries (Miscellaneous) Amendment,
Housing and Urban Development (Administrative Arrangements),
Liquor Licensing (Miscellaneous) Amendment,
Lottery and Gaming (Two Up on Anzac Day) Amendment,
MFP Development (Miscellaneous) Amendment,
Mining (Native Title) Amendment,
Mining (Special Enterprises) Amendment,
Natural Gas Pipelines Access,
Parliamentary Remuneration (Basic Salary) Amendment,
Petroleum Products Regulation,
Phylloxera and Grape Industry,
Pipelines Authority (Sale of Pipelines) Amendment,
Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Electricians,
Public Sector Management,
Retail Shop Leases,
South Australian Housing Trust (Water Rates) Amendment,
Statutes Amendment (Attorney-General's Portfolio),
Statutes Amendment (Correctional Services),
Statutes Amendment (Female Genital Mutilation and Child Protection),
Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of South Australia,
Supply,
Trustee (Investment Powers) Amendment,
Waterworks (Rating) Amendment,
Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (Miscellaneous Provisions) Amendment.

EUTHANASIA

Petitions signed by 427 residents of South Australia requesting that the House oppose any measure to legislate for voluntary euthanasia were presented by Messrs Andrew, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Caudell, Lewis and Olsen.

Petitions received.

A petition signed by 13 residents of South Australia requesting that the House maintain the present homicide law, which excludes euthanasia, while maintaining the common law right of patients to refuse medical treatment was presented by Mr Leggett.

Petition received.

CRIME

A petition signed by 15 residents of South Australia requesting that the House take action to ensure that offenders receive penalties that reflect the community's perception of what is appropriate was presented by Mr Andrew.

Petition received.

PROSTITUTION

A petition signed by 25 residents of South Australia requesting that the House amend existing laws relating to prostitution was presented by Mr Caudell.

Petition received.

A petition signed by 112 residents of South Australia requesting that the House introduce legislation to decriminalise prostitution was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 163, 183, 190, 190, 192, 194, 196 to 206 and 208 to 210; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

MARU TJUTA INCORPORATED

In reply to **Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith)** 22 February.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Following a review of the Aboriginal Education Program conducted by the Department for Employment, Training and Further Education (DETAFE) during 1993 and 1994, in late 1994 I approved of the future discontinuation of the Aboriginal Business Breakthrough (ABB) and Community Management Training Unit (CMTU) functions being conducted within the Aboriginal Education Program, as they were not considered to be core business.

Those functions were conducted on behalf of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) through a series of grants or contracts.

The ABB function will continue to be provided by DETAFE until the end of 1995, at which time DETAFE will cease its involvement and ATSIC will make alternative arrangements.

The current CMTU grant will continue to be administered by DETAFE until 30 June 1995 while Maru Tjuta Inc., a non-profit incorporated association registered under the Associations Incorporation Act, will provide some of the direct services to the clients involved. DETAFE will not be involved in this activity after the middle of the year.

No DETAFE funds have or are to be transferred to Maru Tjuta Inc., other than payment for the services it undertakes on behalf of DETAFE.

The decision to engage Maru Tjuta Inc. for these services was made because of its non-profit status, its Aboriginal management and the competence of its employees.

WINDSOR GARDENS HIGH SCHOOL

In reply to **Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens)** 21 March.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The Minister for Education and Children's Services has provided the following response:

Windsor Gardens High School has experienced a significant drop in enrolments. Predictions of 547 for the start of 1994 fell to an actual enrolment of 390.9 at the start of 1995. The staffing level has had a commensurate drop of 12.2, of which the 1994 budget accounts for only a reduction of 1.4.

Higher than average numbers in junior secondary and practical classes and the formation of composite classes may be attributed to lower than average classes elsewhere at the senior secondary level. School based decisions regarding maintenance of senior secondary

curriculum choices lead to this situation. In making decisions to maintain curriculum choices in a climate of falling enrolments, schools will form below average class sizes. The nature of the staffing formula means that any classes of less than average size within a school will lead to classes elsewhere in the school being of above average size. The 1994 budget did not alter this aspect of the staffing formula.

The provision of specifically targeted staffing addresses the impact on complexity of the Centre for Hearing Impaired Children (CHIC) and Negotiated Curriculum Plans (NCP) students. Staffed on a ratio of 1:4 the CHIC centre has a target of 12.4. The 1994 budget did not affect this figure. CHIC staffing provides instruction in the centre itself and support in mainstream classes. Windsor Gardens High School receives 2.7 salaries specifically for Special Education. Again, the 1994 budget did not affect this figure.

KANGAROO ISLAND FARMERS

In reply to **MR QUIRKE (Playford)** 23 March.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: The termination of the *Island Seaway* service to Kangaroo Island has not resulted in a shortage of superphosphate supplies to Kangaroo Island farmers.

The representations to which the honourable member refers suggest that 15 000 tonnes of superphosphate will be required this year. However, the Minister for Transport has confirmed with the major suppliers that the current fertiliser market on Kangaroo Island is only 7 000 to 8 000 tonnes.

The Minister has also confirmed with the two major suppliers, Pivot and Hi-Fert, that they are not having any problem with maintaining supplies.

The Government has signed an agreement with KI Sealink for carriage of freight between Cape Jervis and Penneshaw, ensuring freight access to Kangaroo Island at rates that are limited to CPI increases.

The Government has also provided a generous freight subsidy, up to a maximum of $600 000 this year, for freight transport operators who would have used the *Island Seaway* and are now using Sealink.

The transport operators who have made arrangements with KI Sealink have found that they are getting a better deal than they were in the past, although they are free to use other operators and may well choose to use the *El Baraq* when it comes into service.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER: I lay on the table the following committee report which has been received and published pursuant to section 17(7) of the Parliamentary Committees Act:

Fifteenth report of the Economic and Finance Committee on an inquiry into the disbursement of grant funds by South Australian Government agencies.

MEMBER FOR PEAKE

The SPEAKER: I am sure that the House is aware that the member for Peake is now the longest serving member, having been in the House for 25 years.

INDUSTRIAL AND EMPLOYEE RELATIONS (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

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

That the sitting of the House be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the Bill.

Motion carried.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
- Associations Incorporation—Fees.
- Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration—Fees.
- Builders Licensing—Fees.
- Business Names—Fees.
- Commercial and Private Agents—Fees.
- Commercial Tribunal—Fees.
- Consumer Credit—Fees.
- Consumer Transactions—Fees.
- Co-operatives—Fees.
- Cremation—Cremation Permit Fees.
- District Court—Fees.
- Environment, Resources and Development Court—Fees in General Jurisdiction.
- Goods Securities—Fees.
- Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing)—General.
  - Registered Agents.
- Landlord and Tenant—Commercial Tenancies. Application Fees.
- Liquor Licensing—Fees.
- Magistrates Court—Fees.
- Members of Parliament (Register of Interests)—Contracts with the Crown.
- Second-Hand Motor Vehicles—Fees.
- Sheriff's—Fees.
- Summary Offences—Expiable Offences and Expiation Fees.
- Supreme Court—
  - Fees.
  - Probate Fees.
  - Rules of Court—Fees for Appeals.
- Trade Measurement Administration—Application and License Fees—Charges.
- Travel Agents—Fees.

Environment, Resources and Development Court—Rules of Court.

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Gaming Machines Act—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister for Tourism (Hon. G.A. Ingerson)—

Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board—Report, 1994.

By the Minister for Industrial Affairs (Hon. G.A. Ingerson)—

Department for Building Management—Report, 1993-94

Regulations under the following Acts—
- Dangerous Substances—Fees.
- Explosives—Fees.
- Occupational, Health, Safety and Welfare—Fees.
- Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation—
  - Aggregation of Two or More Disabilities.
  - Reviews and Appeals.

Occupational Health and Safety—Regulations—Codes of Practice.
- Abrasive Wheels—Parts 1 and 2.
- Acoustics—Hearing Protectors.
- Agricultural Wheeled Tractors—Roll-over—Protective Structures—Criteria and Tests.
- Approval and Test Specification—Residual Current Devices (Current-Operated Earth-Leakage Devices).
- Approval, Filling, Inspection, Testing and Maintenance of Cylinders for the Storage and Transport of Compressed Gases—Parts 2, 3 and 4.
- Assurance of Product Quality—Part 1.
- Boilers and Pressure Vessels—In-service Inspection.
- Boilers—Unattended and Limited Attendance.
- Conveyors—Design, Construction, Installation and Operation—Safety Requirements.
- Copper Boilers—Part 1.
- Cranes—Parts 1, 4, 5, 10, 15.
- Cranes (Including Hoists and Winches)—Parts 1—10, 12 and 15.
- Earth-moving Machinery—Protective Structures.
- Filters for Eye Protectors—Parts 1—3.
- Fire Hose Reels.
- Fixed Platforms, Walkways, Stairways and Ladders—Design, Construction and Installation

Gas Cylinders Code—Part 1
Guarding and Safe Use of Metal and Paper Cutting Guillotines
Guarding and Safe Use of Woodworking Machinery
Guards for Agricultural Tractor PTO Drives
Industrial Safety Belts and Harnesses
Industrial Safety Belts and Harnesses—Selection, Use and Maintenance
Industry Safety Gloves and Mittens
Industry Safety Helmets
Interior Lighting—Parts 1—2.3
Laser Safety.
Lift Code—Parts 1, 3—7, 9—16.
Lifts, Escalators and Moving Walks—Part 1.
Maintenance of Fire Protection Equipment—Parts 1 and 2.
Occupational Protective Footwear—Parts 1 and 2.
Plastics Building Sheets—General Installation Requirements and Design of Roofing Systems.
Portable Ladders—Parts 1 and 2.
Power Presses—Safety Requirements.
Pressure Equipment.
Recommended Practices for Eye Protection in the Industrial Environment.
Respiratory Protective Devices.
Safe use of Lasers in the Building and Construction Industry.
Safe Working in a Confined Space.
Safety in Welding and Allied Processes—Part 1, 2.0, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3.
Scaffold Planks.
Scaffolding—Parts 1—4.
Selection, Care and Use of Industrial Safety Helmets.
Selection, Use and Maintenance of Respiratory Protective Devices.
Serially Produced Pressure Vessels.
Steel Boilers—Part 2.
Wiring Rules.
Workplace Injury and Disease Recording Standard.

By the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—

National Road Trauma Advisory Council—Report, 1993-94.
Regulations under the following Acts—
Harbors and Navigation—Fees.
Motor Vehicles—
Accident Towing Prescribed Fees.
Passenger Transport—Fees.
Registration and License Fees.
Road Traffic—Inspection and Examination Fees.

By the Minister for Infrastructure (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
Sewerage—
Examination and Registration Fees.
Fees.
Waterworks—
Examination and Registration Fees.
Fees.

By the Minister for Health (Hon. M.H. Armitage)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
Controlled Substances—
General Fees.
Precursor Chemicals.
Chiropodists—Fees.
Health—Revocation.
Public and Environmental Health—Waste Control.
Radiation Protection and Control—Fees.
South Australian Health Commission—
Compensable and Non-Medicare.
Compensable and Non-Medicare Fees.

By the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
Development—
Environmental Protection.
Simplify Safety Provisions for Buildings.
Local Government—Members Allowances and Expenses.
Local Government Finance Authority—Fees.
South Australian Housing Trust—Water Rates and Charges.
City of Marion—By-law—
No. 3—Council Land.
No. 4—Inflammable Undergrowth.
No. 5—Creatures.
No. 6—Lodging Houses.
City of Mitcham—By-law—
No. 8—Poultry.
City of Noarlunga—By-law—
No. 1—Penalties and Permits.
No. 2—Flammable Undergrowth.
No. 3—Bees.
No. 4—Petrol.
No. 6—Animals, Birds and Poultry.
No. 7—Caravans and Tents.
No. 8—Parks, Playgrounds and Reserves.
No. 9—Streets.
No. 10—Traffic.
No. 11—Garbage.
No. 12—Bridges and Jetties.
No. 13—Beach and Foreshore.
No. 14—Bird Scarers.
District Council of Yankalilla—By-Law—No. 35—Inflammable Undergrowth.

By the Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. D.S. Baker)—

Animal and Plant Control Commission—Report, 1994.
Fisheries Act—Regulations—
Boat Replacement Policy.
Spencer Gulf/West Coast Prawn Fisheries.

By the Minister for Mines and Energy (Hon. D.S. Baker)—

Gas Act—Regulations—Fees for Examinations.

By the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources (Hon. D.C. Wotton)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
Bills of Sale—Fees.
Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium—Fees.
Crown Lands—Fees.
Registration of Deeds—Fees.
Environment Protection—
Amendments Various.
Beverage Containers.
Interpretation Pigs.
National Parks and Wildlife—
Hunting Fees.
Take, Keep and Sell Permit Fees.
Pastoral Land Management and Conservation—Fees.
Real Property—Registration of Transfer Fees.
Roads (Opening and Closing)—Fees.
Strata Titles—Fees Payable to the Registrar General
Valuation of Land Fees and Allowances.
Water Resources—Fees.
Worker's Liens—Fees.

By the Minister for Emergency Services (Hon. W.A. Matthew)—

Firearms Act—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister for Correctional Services (Hon. W.A. Matthew)—

Correctional Services Act—Regulations—Communication with Prisoners.

By the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education (Hon. R.B. Such)—

Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia—Report, 1994.

Teachers Registration Board of South Australia—Report for year ended December 1994.

EDMUND WRIGHT HOUSE

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Minister for Tourism): I wish to make a ministerial statement.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I would have fixed it, only I took your advice; that was the problem. I am pleased to confirm that the historic Edmund Wright House in King William Street will be retained as a Government owned asset. Members will be aware that the State Government has been assessing all assets in terms of their potential contribution to the reduction of the State's inherited debt. At no stage during this process was Edmund Wright House approved for sale. However, speculation about the building's future arose following the decision to relocate the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages from Edmund Wright House to Chesser House. In the meantime, the Department of Building Management has been assessing the nature and cost of work required to ensure that the building meets both fire safety and occupational health and safety standards.

With my support, the Department of Arts and Cultural Development has been negotiating a long-term tenancy for an arts-related use of the building. This would ensure that Edmund Wright House and its magnificent banking chamber would continue to be available to the public for exhibitions and performances. It is expected that these negotiations will be concluded in the near future.

The Government recognises that Edmund Wright House is a unique State asset. The building was crafted with great skill and indeed is a work of art in its own right, and today it stands as a monument to the work of noted architects Edmund William Wright and Lloyd Taylor. Edmund Wright House is also a culturally significant building. It was completed in 1878 and served as the State's first Bank of South Australia, which itself was an off-shoot of the South Australian Company whose establishment enabled the colonisation of the State to proceed. The Government is keen to ensure that Edmund Wright House is preserved for the enjoyment of South Australians and visitors to the State, and that a suitable tenant is installed in this historically significant building.

HOUSING TRUST WATER RATES

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD (Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations): I wish to make a ministerial statement. In March 1995 Parliament passed an amendment to the Housing Trust Act which clarified that tenants are responsible for water charges above a certain usage per year. As the House would be aware, regulations recently laid before the House mean that Housing Trust tenants with separately metered properties will pay for any water they use in excess of 136 kilolitres per year.

During the debate on the amendment there were considerable comments, questions and statements relating to the possibility of tenants being evicted for non-payment of a water bill. This Parliament has determined that Housing Trust tenants will be responsible for the cost of any water they use over the amount set by regulation. The Housing Trust has an outstanding debt from tenants, previous tenants and people who have lost bond assistance of approximately $12 million. Each year the water charges, which are the responsibility of the tenant, are approximately $2.5 million. Last financial year the amount of outstanding debt attributed to excess water was of the order of $1.36 million. In the House on 8 March 1995 I stated:

> I will not put genuine people out onto the streets. We will somehow accommodate them if they make an effort to pay it [their debt] off, even if it is $1 per week.

Essentially, if tenants make an effort to pay off their debt to the Housing Trust, they will not be evicted from their houses. The Housing Trust makes great efforts to establish arrangements with tenants to pay off their debt at a rate affordable to them.

When the Housing Trust Board is considering whether to evict a tenant for debt, due largely to the non payment of rent, the trust has an established procedure prior to commencing any evictions which takes the following into account: the size of the debt; the length of time the debt has been outstanding; and the willingness that has been shown by the tenant to make repayments. All factors are taken into consideration on a case-by-case basis, not merely a single factor such as the level of debt or the length of time the debt is outstanding.

The same policy should apply where a tenant has a debt which largely results from the use of water. Consequently water debt will not be treated differently from any other kind of debt. It is money that the tenant, as determined by Parliament, legitimately owes to the trust. Therefore, if a tenant has debt which largely results from not paying a water bill, their situation will be considered on a case-by-case basis, as is done for rent areas arrears. If they are genuinely making an attempt to pay the water debt, of course they will not be evicted. However, if they are just abusing the system this will show up because they will not have made any real attempt to make repayments, and the length of time the debt has been outstanding will be significant. In these cases the trust will have no option but to begin eviction proceedings against the tenant.

Whilst the trust will maintain the practice of not initiating eviction proceedings if a debt for outstanding rent is less than the equivalent of two weeks rent, no limit has been set for outstanding water debt and each case will be treated on its merit. Clearly, without the sanction of eviction, the debt owing to the trust would increase and this would result in fewer services being able to be provided by the Housing Trust to people in need. The trust policy I have enunciated is a realistic, fair and responsible way of dealing with tenant debt. I can assure Parliament that the Housing Trust will continue to assist tenants, who are genuine about repaying their debt, to remain in public housing.

MOUNT LOFTY FORESTS

The Hon. D.S. BAKER (Minister for Primary Industries): I wish to make a ministerial statement. I rise to clarify an issue regarding the one-off sale by tender of *pinus radiata* roundwood from the Mount Lofty forests. Western Wood Pacific's tender was accepted by the Government in July last year. The sale also included hail-damaged wood from relatively unproductive areas and timber from the clearing of pinaster pine, a wood which is generally not preferred by the industry. There is no local processing industry in the Adelaide region which uses this smaller diameter wood, and this lack of a local market has resulted in some difficulty in harvesting thinnings when they are required. The first thinnings of *pinus radiata* are of course very important. They are necessary to ensure the long-term health of the trees and therefore the future supply of sawlog.

Tenders for the purchase of 190 000 cubic metres of roundwood were sought in 1993 and eventually the five expressions of interest were reduced to two, including the South-East company, SEAS Sapfor. SEAS Sapfor, now Auspine, proposed the processing of some sawlog in the South-East and the export of woodchip from Portland in Victoria. Western Pacific proposed the export of that portion of timber unsuitable for sawlog from Port Adelaide, with the remainder of the roundwood being processed in South Australia. These requirements were part of the tender process, which stated that there should be 'local processing of roundwood meeting local sawlog specifications'. The tender prices varied considerably, and I now table the tender documents which show that SEAS tender was $1.6 million and the Western Pacific tender was $7 million, a fixed-price offer, irrespective of recovery from the forest.

SEAS Sapfor was formally advised by letter on 19 January 1995 that the Department of Primary Industries was negotiating with another party. Suggestions have been made in the media that the previous Government accepted the SEAS tender, or indicated that it would do so. There is no record of any such deal, or that an offer was made to SEAS regarding the sale of the wood prior to the change in Government in December 1993. In April last year independent consultants, Australasian Agribusiness Services, reviewed the project and reported that the sale should proceed since 'all market participants had an equal opportunity'. Importantly, the contract with Western Wood Pacific requires the company to process sawlog in South Australia and, at this point, the company has complied with the contract.

A number of mischievous and misleading statements have been made concerning this contract, perhaps the cruellest of all that 400 jobs would have been created had the tender been let to the company in the South-East. I have already said that the timber in this sale is a 'once only' harvest over a two-year period, and I do not believe that this relatively modest amount of timber allowed such a significant capital investment as 400 new jobs.

The process by which this tender was called was on the basis that all participants were equal, and the basis on which it was let was that the successful tenderer was the highest bidder and that there was, in fact, value adding taking place in South Australia.

QUESTION TIME

EDUCATION FUNDING

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Will this budget, so much of which has already been announced, deliver the promises made by the Premier in his policy speech on 28 November 1993 to increase funding to schools and to maintain class sizes set by previous Governments, and will he guarantee that savings from falling enrolments will be used to improve our schools? Student enrolments have fallen by 4 000 this year, saving $16 million on the school budget. It has been put to me that the Premier has a $16 million opportunity to keep his election promises with just two more sleeps to go.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Speaker, I start by congratulating you on your 25 years in this place, together with the member for Peake: two outstanding examples of service to the South Australian Parliament, and today is the anniversary of those 25 years.

As the Leader of the Opposition knows, the budget is coming in on Thursday. He has two more sleeps to wait for the detail of the budget. I will tell the Leader of the Opposition in broad terms what he can expect in the budget with regard to education. First, there will be more money for education in the budget. Secondly, as a result of the budget, we will still be able to stand up and say that South Australia has the best education standards in the whole of Australia; that it has the best student-teacher ratio for the whole of Australia; and that it has—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: But you won't keep your promise, will you?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We will be able to say that the number of ancillary staff in schools in South Australia is well above the national average and that 96 per cent of all classes in the State have fewer than 30 students in them. It shows that this Government has made a specific commitment to put additional resources into education above the national average so that we have the best education standards in the whole of Australia. This Government has maintained that position.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: But you broke your promise.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Leader of the Opposition interjects about the financial position that we inherited. We know exactly what is the financial position we inherited. It was brought down from a Government that the Leader of the Opposition resided in as a Minister. He is the one who left us with a debt problem. He is the one who left us with the huge recurrent deficit of over $300 million a year and he is the one who left us requiring to pay something like two-thirds of all our State taxation towards the interest payments on our debt. That is the inheritance that we took on. That is what Labor has left South Australians with. Let us be quite clear about what broke the State of South Australia: it was 11 years of Labor.

STATE ECONOMY

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): My question is directed to the Premier. Does the Government believe that higher taxes and new taxes are the answers to the financial crisis left by the mismanagement of the former Government, which the Premier just mentioned?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I was interested to hear on radio yesterday the member for Giles saying that State debt is not of any real concern.

The Hon. S.J. Baker: He was the Treasurer.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes. Philip Satchell was on air saying that he knows only too well that apparently State debt is not important because the member for Giles actually told him. That is the former Treasurer.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Philip Satchell yesterday was talking about his discussion with the member for Giles. We then open up the paper this morning and see the former Labor Premier, Don Dunstan, saying that the State debt is not important. We know the extent to which Don Dunstan has been dragged out as the mouthpiece of the Leader of the Opposition, because his own credibility is low. I point out that Don Dunstan failed to draw the difference between the debt created by Tom Playford, as a very successful Premier of this State for 27 years, and the debt created by the former Labor Government. Tom Playford borrowed money to build power stations, roads and infrastructure for this State that was

part of the growth of South Australia. We had a population growth rate of 3 per cent. However, the former Labor Government used the debt, which we inherited, to pay for Labor's mistakes. It was Labor that effectively lost $4 billion through the State Bank, SGIC and other financial disasters. It was Labor that put that money into non-productive purposes for South Australia. That is why debt is important to South Australia.

I point out that, when you have a debt of almost $9 billion and you put two-thirds of your State taxation into paying the interest, when you are putting almost one-fifth of your State budget into paying the interest rates, and when that is going off to international bankers, it highlights what a concrete collar debt is around the neck of South Australia. It is this Government which is the first Government for many years that is actually reducing debt in this State. In the current financial year we have been very successful in selling off assets. There will be an even greater result next financial year as we bring down that debt. In round terms we have been able to achieve asset sales of about $500 million this year. Next year we have a target getting towards $1 000 million. By the end of this coming financial year we will meet our target of a reduction in debt of about $1.5 billion.

That is good news for South Australians, because that is about $160 million to $170 million that does not have to be paid in interest to international bankers. That means we have more money in our budget to pay for health, education and other essential community services. I know the extent to which the broad South Australian community, first, criticised Labor for the financial mess, particularly the financial debt that it left us with, and, secondly, has complimented this Government on the initiatives it is taking to bring down that debt.

For the Leader of the Opposition to have his cohorts and mouthpieces saying that that debt is not important means one thing—that the Leader of the Opposition supports another strategy for the budget, namely, that there should be increased taxation. We know the inheritance South Australia received from Labor just 18 months ago: we had the highest petrol taxes, cigarette taxes and financial institutions duty in Australia. In fact, in the last two to three years of the Labor Government South Australia had the biggest increase in State taxation of any State in Australia. I am proud that this Government has not increased that taxation burden on small business people in South Australia and that we can say that our level of taxation is well below that of other principal competitive States such as Victoria and New South Wales. That is a real benefit to South Australian families and small business people.

SCHOOLS, MANAGEMENT OUTSOURCING

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier give one of his categorical undertakings that the Government will not outsource or privatise the Government's fundamental responsibility for running our schools? The Minister for Education and Children's Services is considering a submission from SERCO to outsource the management of South Australian schools. In a submission on contracting by Public Service agencies to the Industry Commission, SERCO states:

> It is perfectly feasible to contract out the complete management of individual schools, teaching as well as support staff, making the contractors responsible to both the Education Department and the school councils.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I can give an absolute assurance that the running of Government schools in South Australia will continue to be in the hands of the Government. No-one has suggested that it ought not to be. In fact, the running of schools is in the hands of the school principals and the teachers, together with the school council, and that will not change one iota under this Government. We are and have been looking at a range of areas across Government where we can contract out matters such as cleaning and other services provided to Government and do so more efficiently and cost effectively, but I can give an absolute assurance to all South Australians that the running of schools in this State will remain completely in the hands of the Government.

STAMP DUTY

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): My question is directed to the Treasurer.

Mr Quirke: How did you get the No. 3 question?

Mr BRINDAL: It is the No. 2 question, if you can count. You did not go to school for long.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the member for Unley be permitted to ask his question.

Mr BRINDAL: Thank you, Sir. Can the Treasurer confirm to the House what action the Government is taking to ensure that the South Australian stockbroking industry will not be disadvantaged by a Queensland budget decision to cut stamp duty on share transactions? My family has been involved in stockbroking continuously on the Adelaide Exchange for four generations.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: That is actually true. Therefore, I am most concerned, as the Treasurer will be, about the ongoing viability of the Adelaide Exchange.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I thank the honourable member for his question. It did confirm that the shadow Treasurer still cannot count. I have heard a number of statements on radio by the member for Hart concerning why the Government did not take earlier action. I suggest that the honourable member talk to his former Treasurer, because he might be enlightened on some of the financial facts of life.

To go back in history, the Stock Exchange has been through the former Government's door and it came through our door in Opposition saying, 'Have we got a deal for you! If you take off stamp duty on shares, you will have all the financial heartland of Australia move to South Australia.' I said, 'For one minute we will have that. What are you offering?' They said, 'We are not really offering anything, but there is a great opportunity.' That was said to us twice in Opposition and, since we have been in Government, I have received three approaches on the same issue. The proposition was to take stamp duty down to zero and we would have the Stock Exchange and all the financial fabric of Australia moved from the eastern coast and centred in South Australia. I asked, 'What sort of compensation will there be? We collected $6.8 million and it is estimated at $8.5 million, so what sort of compensation will there be.' They said, 'We'll find you the money.' I said, 'I want it in writing; I want the actual details', but they never came back. They never offered South Australia—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: —just wait for it—one red cent or one part of a head office.

Mr Foley: How did Wayne Goss manage it?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I will get on to that, because it is very interesting. They hawked their bodies around to each of the States and said, 'Have we got a deal for you!' We knew what was going on: everyone was talking to each other—all the Treasuries were talking to each other—and they said that if they could get one State to break they would achieve their end and, of course, they did. The reason we said 'No' was, as the former Treasurer can say, it involves not just $6.8 million or $8.5 million in revenue.

If the member for Hart checked his facts before opening his mouth on radio, he would understand two things. One is that we get compensation from the Commonwealth Government through the Commonwealth Grants Commission to the tune of $40 million because of our disparity and our inability to raise the same level of taxation in relation to stamp duty on share transactions, and that is now being put totally at risk. The member for Hart is almost a member of the former Government: he was not quite there, but he was a senior adviser, and if he wants a briefing at any stage he can get it.

The Hon. J.W. Olsen: He looks suitably embarrassed.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: He should look suitably embarrassed. Just as important are the reverberations of Mr Goss's taking this action. He will not win out of this, because Victoria and New South Wales will not allow him to do so. Not only has he lost revenue—I think he collects only about $13 million—but it will cost him at least $40 million because of the Commonwealth Grants Commission . We have netted ours and are negotiating with the Commonwealth to try to drag that back. Mr Goss has not done us a favour; neither has he done us a favour on the Commonwealth Grants Commission, because Victoria and New South Wales have been looking for an opportunity to break the horizontal fiscal equalisation. As the former Treasurer can tell the member for Hart, that is worth $300 million to South Australia, so it is quite serious. Whilst I do not deny the right of any organisation to push its case—and I have great sympathy with the Stock Exchange in competing on international markets—it is the Commonwealth Government's responsibility, seeing that we were losing businesses overseas, to take the initiative, not the responsibility of the States to take that initiative unilaterally.

So, if the member for Hart says we want to make a $320 million or $330 million mistake, let him go out and tell the taxpayers which taxes we will increase or which services we will slash. How many schools or hospital beds does he want closed? He should understand a few of these things. I wish he would talk to the shadow Treasurer. The member for Hart has a sudden interest in the wealthier members of Australia paying less on their share transactions. He should talk to the shadow Treasurer, who wants to box South Australia and take off fees in this State, so that we would be a special State immune to the vagaries of the financial market because he does not want to charge the fees that are charged elsewhere. I wish the Opposition would get its facts straight.

PENSIONER CONCESSIONS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier guarantee that privatisation of water management, cuts to the Family and Community Services budget and increased profit dividends from ETSA and EWS will not lead to any cuts in concessions and subsidies to pensioners and disadvantaged groups? The State Government provides pensioner concessions through Family and Community Services for transport, electricity, water, sewerage and local government rates, and the Opposition has been informed that $4 million will be cut from this budget on Thursday. Half the State Government's funding for FACS goes to provide concessions to pensioners and other disadvantaged groups, and ETSA and EWS also provide substantial cross-subsidies to country and other consumer groups.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I can give an assurance to the people of South Australia that there will be no cuts to the concessions offered by the State Government. Once again the Leader of the Opposition has fallen absolutely flat on his face.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition has had a fair go and should not test his luck. The honourable member for Ridley.

TRADING HOURS

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): In developing Government policy on shop trading hours following the recent High Court decision, has the Minister for Industrial Affairs consulted with the retail industry unions in South Australia and, if so, is the unions' current view on extended shopping hours consistent with the view held in 1993 when the former Government was in office?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I thank the member for Ridley for his question, because some very interesting statements have been made in the public arena by the Labor Party and in particular its funding arm, the STA union. One of the significant differences between the Liberal Party and the Labor Party is that we do not have any direct financial or any other affiliation with a union. One of the very interesting—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: We will take that up, too. Who has egg on his face now? You have egg right on your big, fat face.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The Chair has been most tolerant. Members have been conducting themselves in a good-hearted fashion, and I suggest they continue that practice. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I will mention a couple of facts, because I know the member for Giles likes facts, particularly in this area, and it is worth putting them on the record. It is my view—and I think it is a pretty considered view—that the union's High Court challenge, albeit a successful one, was a political stunt. I say that because—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I did not say that the High Court was a political stunt. You heard what I said: I said that the union's action was a political stunt. I say that because 883 certificates of exemption were issued by Ministers Blevins and Gregory between 1987 and 1993.

An honourable member: And no-one challenged them.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I wonder who challenged those certificates. Probably more importantly, in early 1994, when the union sat down with the previous Government and did a deal under which there would be an extension of shopping hours for Friday nights for supermarkets—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: A deal is an agreement. Hang on, and in a minute I will read the contents of the letter to the Leader. It is interesting that this deal in relation to all night shopping was done between the STA and the Government. In a letter we happened to find in the files from the

STA to the previous Minister Gregory, the STA stated in essence that, having now entered into an agreement with the Coles Myer and Woolworths groups, it would like the Government to do its part in the arrangement and bring the legislation into the House. But that is not what happened.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I will make some comments soon about what you have been saying in public. The previous Government used certificates of exemption to issue in excess of 250 supermarket licences so they could trade during the week. Why did it do that? It did it for two reasons: it knew full well that there would be no political stunt by the SDA because not only did it support the Government in the use of those certificates, which the High Court has now found are illegal, but it also did a compulsory union deal with both Coles Myer and Woolworths to guarantee union membership; and that deal was supported by the previous Government. That is the sort of thing the public ought to know about. They are the sorts of deals that were done. In other words, it is okay to use the exemptions if you are Labor, but it will take a Liberal Government to court to test the issue. Why did it take us to court? It was a very simple exercise.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: We will come to that in a minute. The union wanted to make sure that its mates were able to carry out a political stunt. When one looks at all the statements, some of them are very interesting. I refer to a press release put out by the then Minister Mr Blevins in 1987, which reads:

> Cabinet today gave approval for the issuing of certificates of exemption for furniture and floor covering retailers.

In 1993 the then Premier Mr Arnold put out a press release about five nights a week trading. That was made possible through certificates of exemption. A press release put out in 1993 by another Minister, Mr Gregory, states:

> The extension of shop hours to supermarkets and grocery stores will mean more jobs and greater service to the community.

So it goes on, until we get to this very interesting comment from Mr Sumner, our learned former Attorney-General. It states:

> I am not sure whether Liberals will or Labor will, or whether it will be next year, the year after or three or five or 10 years time, but reality is that at some point in time Adelaide will become part of the world.

He was saying that the extension of shop trading hours and the deregulation of shop trading hours will have to happen. It is quite interesting that when you are in Government it is different from when you are in Opposition.

STATE BUDGET

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Does the Premier stand by his pre-election promise to '. . . stop using ETSA as a branch office of the State tax office', and will he therefore rule out further increases in dividends to the Government from Government enterprises in Thursday's budget? In the Government's last budget, contributions from Government enterprises such as ETSA and the EWS were increased by 104 per cent from $115 million in 1993-94 to $236 million in 1994-95.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: A certain Labor Prime Minister called Paul Keating has put down an edict that, through COAG, all State Government statutory corporations, which are trading corporations, must now pay tax—

The Hon. S.J. Baker: And dividends.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —and dividends. It is a tax equivalent to a corporate tax, and they should pay a dividend equivalent to a private company based on the value of the funds tied up in the enterprise. The member for Hart should go off and talk with his Federal Labor colleagues, because it is the Federal Labor Government that has put a requirement on State Governments throughout Australia that they must pay tax and dividends to the State Government. There is a big difference between the operation of this State Government and that of the former Labor Government. First, the former Government hid money in hollow logs and pulled it out through the back door—and we all know the extent to which it did that—and then lost it by paying off its losses on the State Bank and SGIC.

The Hon. S.J. Baker: It was paying $100 million interest on a $110 million loan!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: That is right. As the Treasurer points out, the former Labor Government was paying $100 million interest on a $110 million loan—almost 100 per cent interest per year. That is the sort of quaint accounting practices that the member for Giles used as the then Treasurer to bolster some of his failing last budgets. I point out also to the House that in fact it has been this Government that has brought about significant reform within ETSA, the EWS and other organisations where we have been able to drop the commercial rates for power and water in South Australia as a result of those efficiencies, and we have been able to achieve what the Federal Government is asking for, which is the equivalent of a tax and a dividend from those trading organisations. We will continue to do so.

PATAWALONGA

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): Will the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations provide an update on the progress of works for the dredging of the Patawalonga? While the dredge has been in the Patawalonga for some weeks now, there does not seem to be very much happening.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I thank the honourable member for his question and recognise his ongoing interest in the project at Glenelg. The process of cleaning up the Patawalonga involves construction in two places: first, in the Patawalonga itself where the dredge will be operating to remove the build up of silt and sand and, secondly, on the disposal site where the silt and sand are deposited for drying out and eventual usage elsewhere. Whilst the disposal site must be prepared first, it was considered imperative that the dredge be brought in at an early stage in the process to ensure it was available to the project and that it was not elsewhere in Australia. There is a limited number of these dredges in Australia and, if it had been committed elsewhere, many months or longer could have elapsed before that dredge was made available to us.

While the Government has negotiated with the FAC regarding a lease over the disposal site, the detail of the appropriate bird management strategy has yet to be finalised, and this is causing some delay. The FAC has indicated that the total area of the disposal site may need to be covered with shadecloth. In fact, it would be necessary to cover and support some 15 hectares to enable the machinery to work underneath. If we need to cover the whole site, an initial estimate for the shadecloth is almost $1 million, and I have questioned the need for such expenditure, given the experience elsewhere. When the contract was signed, SALT advised

me that the bird management strategy would cost between $200 000 and $300 000.

Given this increase in costs, I have asked the project managers, in this case SALT, to review our options, and it is currently working with the contractors to determine whether alternative cheaper solutions to the bird management issue are available, and this is causing the delay to the works. Whilst there may be claims for delays—and at this stage I have not received any—there are significant savings to be made if an alternative and cheaper means of addressing the bird management issue can be found. Whilst these delays are regrettable, they must be put in the context of the total expenditure of the project, and I expect this issue to be resolved in the near future.

I wish to reconfirm the Government's commitment to the cleaning up of the Patawalonga and its catchment which will contribute to the environmental and economic benefits of the State. However, we are determined that there will be a good result to the project and, if we do face any additional costs that we have to go through to meet the expected community standards for the project, I guess that commitment has to be made. At the end of the day, the public is expecting the Patawalonga to be cleaned up, and this Government will achieve that.

KORTLANG, MR IAN

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Minister for Infrastructure explain to the House why he appointed a former Chief of Staff to Nick Greiner and prominent Liberal, Mr Ian Kortlang, to an exclusive PR contract with the EWS without public tendering, and will he confirm that Mr Kortlang has been offered other exclusive public sector contracts?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: As I said on radio, I was not involved in the appointment of Mr Kortlang. That was undertaken by the Chief Executive Officer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department based on the detailed advice and recommendations of the Boston Consulting Group to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. As is the norm in those circumstances, the Chief Executive Officer put in place the contract, which is for some two months. The contract expires on 30 June this year and, to my knowledge and that of other agencies of Government, no contracts are being let to Mr Kortlang.

MARINE PARK

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): My question is directed to the Premier. What action will the Government take to complete a management plan for the Great Australian Bight marine park?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Speaker, I know that this is a matter dear to your own heart because it is part of your electorate. I point out to the House that we have imposed a 12 month complete sanctuary: 35 kilometres long and three nautical miles wide. There can be no fishing, exploration or mining in that area during that period. During that period the Government will bring down a management plan, which will then protect on a permanent basis the whales that come across the Great Australian Bight. I would like to highlight to the House the hypocrisy from the Leader of the Opposition on this issue, because he has been saying that he would introduce legislation to ensure that there was a permanent whale sanctuary there.

As we know, only 18 months ago the Leader of the Opposition was part of a Cabinet and a Government that had been in office for 11 years. We have looked back to see the position of the former Government in terms of approvals, etc., for the Great Australian Bight marine park. We found that, in January 1988, it took the very bold step of agreeing, as a Cabinet, that there should be some discussions with the Commonwealth Government about the possibility of establishing a marine park—it was putting the obligation on the Commonwealth Government. That Cabinet submission clearly shows the views of Ministers of the former Government.

The Minister for Mines and Energy stressed that he thought that mineral and petroleum exploration and discovery should be allowed to continue in the so-called marine park. The Minister for Fisheries said that he did not believe the marine park should in any way prohibit fishing within the zone. That was January 1988. In a speech in July 1992 the former Premier, Lynn Arnold, said that the Labor Government would proclaim a multi-use marine park in the Great Australian Bight. The Labor Government never got around to it.

Incidentally, I should have mentioned that in July 1989 former Premier Bannon took a media circus across to Ceduna and made the big announcement, 'We will set up a Great Australian Bight marine park.' Four years later it had not done a single thing. The then new Premier of the day, Lynn Arnold, said he was going to issue a proclamation for a multi-use marine park in the same area. The former Premier also prepared a Cabinet submission entitled 'To seek Cabinet approval for the proclamation of a multi-use marine park in the Great Australian Bight.'

The former Labor Government—and the now Leader of the Opposition sat around that Cabinet table for four years—could not even put any proposals through Cabinet for a marine park in the Great Australian Bight. If it put anything through it was clearly for a multi-use park. It is quite clear that the Labor Party had absolutely no intention of creating a marine park; and, even if it had, it was for a multi-use marine park. What hypocrisy from the now Leader of the Opposition to come out and criticise the fact that this Liberal Government, within its first 18 months, has imposed a whale sanctuary in the Great Australian Bight, and that over the next 12 months we will prepare a management plan to give long term and permanent protection to the whales in that area. I say again that I have an absolute commitment to ensure that we protect the southern right whales that come across the Great Australian Bight.

EWS OUTSOURCING

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure. Have overseas firms tendering to operate our metropolitan water and sewerage systems been consulted, and have they agreed with the Government's decision to cut the level of capital spending by $9 million this year? The Minister has announced that next year the EWS capital budget will be $74 million, which is $9 million less than the previous year's budget.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The member for Hart really is a slow learner. The Treasurer has already blown him out of the water in relation to his public statements on stamp duties on share transactions. There will be a real increase in expenditure in the capital works program as it relates to the Engineering and Water Supply Department this financial year

and that which is proposed next year. The member for Hart forgot to include in that the costs associated with the BOO projects: the water filtration plants in the Adelaide Hills, the Barossa Valley and the Murray River towns. In addition, in terms of the capital expenditure for this current financial year, the honourable member overlooked the fact that a number of those contracts have gone out to private enterprise.

To indicate the sort of savings we have been able to achieve as a result of private contractors being involved I refer the House to the $600 000 rehabilitation of the Bolivar waste water treatment plant stabilisation lagoon. That was in the budget this year at $1.5 million. By going out to private contract we saved $400 000 on the forward estimates and the allocation of funds. In addition, I point out a rationalisation of 160 vehicles within the light vehicle fleet of the EWS, with a commensurate reduction in the capital cost incurred by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. This Government is about achieving two things: first, getting better value for every dollar we spend in capital works for taxpayers in South Australia; and, secondly, reducing the cost of operating those agencies to cut down those capital expenditure items, such as motor vehicles. As a result of that the EWS, in its forward capital works program next year in real dollar terms, has allocated more than we will have spent this financial year. Once again, the member for Hart has simply got it wrong.

TOURISM, INTERNATIONAL

Mr BECKER (Peake): Will the Minister for Tourism advise the House of the latest statistical information available on international tourism and what it shows about new directions being taken by South Australia? During the past 12 months the Minister has informed the House of various new programs and strategies to promote South Australian tourism, particularly in the international market. In the *Australian* newspaper of 24 February 1995, in an article under the heading 'Adelaide: The Smallest Gateway', the paper's travel writer, Stuart Innes, implied that about 1 per cent of international air travellers to Australia entered through Adelaide.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I thank the member for Peake for his interest in tourism. In recent days the Australian Bureau of Statistics has released the accommodation report on international visitor surveys, and it shows an exceptionally good increase in figures for South Australia for the first time in three years. These figures show that over the past 12 months visitor numbers to South Australia have increased by 11 per cent. It is the first increase we have enjoyed in those numbers for the past five years. In this time international visitor nights in South Australia increased by 22 per cent and, during that time, the increase for the whole of Australia was only 5 per cent.

The general direction tourism is taking in South Australia, particularly through the 'Come to your senses, come to South Australia' campaign, has been very successful internationally and nationally. In relation to the 1 per cent increase in numbers in the international gateway area, whilst we have lost British Airways as a direct flight, one important change that has occurred is that Qantas last month announced a 22 per cent increase in seat numbers into South Australia. In essence, whilst we have lost the direct gateway, Qantas is putting in special flow-on seats from Melbourne and Sydney back into Adelaide. We are working on the long-term single fare price around Australia, as that is the only way, and then the destination port will not be so important. In the short term, the fact that Qantas has increased the number of its national seats out of Sydney and Melbourne into Adelaide by 22 per cent is very important.

There is another very important issue as a result of our involvement in the Australian tourist exchange. This year 28 new international operators have taken up the South Australian product. Whilst 28 may not sound a large number, the fact that we are now in 28 extra selling journals around the world—in Asia, Europe and America—is a very significant change. That has been brought about by our very good campaigning and because South Australia is now seen as a new destination and opportunity. It is an issue of which we in tourism are very proud.

EWS COMMUNITY SERVICE OBLIGATIONS

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Minister for Infrastructure give an assurance that community service obligations now financed by the EWS from internal sources will continue at the same rate after the privatisation of the management of our State's water? Community service obligations undertaken by the EWS cost about $25 million annually and include free water for the Adelaide city parklands, contributions to Aboriginal water supplies and management of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: This Government is about proper accounting, as required by the Federal Government under the Hilmer competition policies, and real identification, as the Audit Commission recommended, of community service obligations. The Government is attempting to identify clear community service obligations so that they can be accounted for and understood readily by the community at large. In many instances they will be going from some agencies to Treasury under specific lines funded by the Treasury as a community service obligation. There is no intention in the EWS that there should be any change in existing arrangements for community service obligations. In particular, the member for Giles made comments publicly last year and this year about the cross subsidy referred to by the Leader of the Opposition in a question today about country consumers of water. The Government has already made a commitment in that regard: we will maintain the cross subsidy for country consumers of water.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: No ifs, no buts?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: If you had taken notice of that in 1985, we would not be in the mess we are in today. We are maintaining those community service obligations and cross subsidies to rural areas of South Australia. As the Opposition desperately searches for issues to run on, it is continually putting forward false, misleading facts to the public of South Australia. The Leader of the Opposition has done that on numerous occasions. Whenever he talks about water, he talks about privatisation, albeit time and again the public of South Australia and the Opposition, including the member for Hart, know full well that we are not privatising water in South Australia: we are simply entering into a contract for the management and the provision of a service for South Australians. The Government of South Australia and the Water Corporation will continue to own and control those assets, and we will continue to set the price of water for consumers in South Australia. Much as they may want to drag red herrings over the track to put fear into the minds of South Australians—and the Leader of the Opposition might respond to that, because that is exactly what he has in mind: to generate a bit of fear and concern, albeit the accusations by the Leader of the Opposition are totally unjustified—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I have noticed that he is constantly getting on the Murray Nicoll program repeating the hackneyed old phrase, despite being corrected every time. This is the Leader of the Opposition who, when working for the former Government, altered the front page of a report and shifted the confidential stamp, as we all remember. The Leader of the Opposition is creating a set of circumstances and working on the adage, 'Don't let the facts get in the way of a good story.'

OFFICE FOR FAMILIES

Mrs HALL (Coles): Will the Minister for Family and Community Services inform the House what action the Government is taking to expand the Office for Families and what form the expanded office will take? There has been a rumour circulating within the community that the Domestic Violence Resource Unit within the Department for Family and Community Services is to be closed. Also, some uncertainty has been expressed regarding the future role of the Children's Interest Bureau within the Department for Family and Community Services. I seek clarification on these matters and how they will relate to the expanded Office for Families.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Regrettably, there has been a lot of misinformation circulating recently regarding the possible closure of the Domestic Violence Resource Unit. It is unfortunate that much of that misinformation has come directly from the Opposition, and it is particularly unfortunate that it has caused much concern in the community. We have received a lot of correspondence that has clearly indicated that the concern has arisen as a result of statements made by the Opposition. There has also been some uncertainty about the future role that the Children's Interest Bureau should have in government. That concern and uncertainty has been with us since the time of the previous Government.

I am pleased to announce that the Office for Families will be expanded to become the Office for Families and Children from 1 July. That expansion will mean that the Children's Interest Bureau and the Domestic Violence Resource Unit will be brought into that new unit. This will bring together vital policy and advocacy areas to create a new multifaceted and broad approach to social issues and policy planning in South Australia. I see the move as a natural progression, following the success of the Office for Families which has been foremost in keeping family issues on the agenda in this State. I should like to take this opportunity to commend those people within the Office for Families on the way that they have carried out their responsibilities since the formation of that unit. The new structure will allow strong input and advocacy on family issues affecting children and domestic violence in the overall Government policy context. It will also allow a broader opportunity for input to the Human Services Cabinet Committee and in the preparation of family impact statements.

Finally, social issues are interwoven, and this new structure will allow us more dynamically to focus not just on the family in isolation but on the total picture for children, families and society across all portfolios. I look forward to a very strong involvement in the new Office for Families and Children. I believe it will do a great deal in regard to policy development in this State.

EMPLOYMENT, TRAINING AND FURTHER EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education confirm that he received advice that budget cuts for DETAFE this year could require staffing cuts of more than 300 full-time positions?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The honourable member should know that the budget comes down on Thursday, and he will have to wait.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): Will the Minister for Health inform the House of the true facts in relation to the allegations made by the Opposition at a meeting of union organisers held in relation to Flinders Medical Centre yesterday? On Monday 29 May 1995, the Australian Nurses Federation held a meeting for local members of Parliament to hold discussions with staff representatives of Flinders Medical Centre. There was only one staff representative present: the rest were trade union organisers from South Terrace.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Mitchell for giving me the opportunity once again to allay a number of fears, which the Opposition delights in spreading.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: As the member for Wright says, this is just like the Modbury Hospital exercise, where a former Government that had been scared to address the facts for over a decade did not like the present Government getting it right. When I saw the article in the paper this morning, I sought information from Flinders Medical Centre about the allegations. I was surprised when I read the paper, because no information in relation to the article had come to my notice. Obviously, the Government keeps a very close watch on these matters. The information that I have from Flinders Medical Centre, which I sincerely hope the member for Elizabeth notes, is as follows. The savings targets are a challenge for Flinders Medical Centre, but it is coping with that challenge and, importantly, according to Flinders Medical Centre, it is misleading to suggest that patients' lives are in danger. There is the first rabbit chased down a burrow.

Secondly, there is no record of an incident in which a patient required resuscitation due to a lack of specialist nursing skills, as stated in today's *Advertiser*. The ANF, lead by Gail Gago, who is the endorsed Labor Party candidate for the Federal seat of Adelaide and who can hardly claim in any way to be anything other than immediately and passionately biased in this matter, has been asked for details about the issue so that an investigation can take place. I make the point that there is no record of this matter whatsoever at Flinders Medical Centre. If it were a matter of concern for the ANF, it would have identified this to Flinders Medical Centre long ago to allow the appropriate investigation to take place rather than wait for it to be a political stunt. I compare the positions of Gail Gago, the endorsed Labor Party candidate for the Federal seat of Adelaide, and Brendon Nelson, who, immediately upon preselection, resigned his position as a leader of a body speaking on medico-political matters. I challenge Gail Gago to do exactly the same.

The information I have from Flinders Medical Centre is that current staffing levels are adequate for the occupancy levels. Agency staff are sometimes required, as they are in all hospitals, in periods of peak occupancy, but the hospital has its own casual pool of nursing staff which it draws on first.

There is a national shortage of intensive care nurses but currently all shifts are supervised by staff with intensive care experience. Intensive care experience is requested when seeking agency staff and, according to the information that I have been given, is usually available. Last Sunday night the occupancy of the medical and surgical wards (and there are many other wards but those particular wards) was high. There were six patients in the accident and emergency department who were waiting for a bed but they did not lie around for days on end in a stretcher, as was reported. What happened, as always happens in these cases, is that they were accommodated the following morning.

The union set-up yesterday also said that there was a ward with 37 patients staffed by only two staff. The best information that Flinders Medical Centre can supply me with this morning is that ward 6C, which had roughly that number of patients, was staffed by four nurses, not two. There are a number of patients who stay for longer periods in what is known as the short stay ward, for a variety of reasons, but that in no way affects the standard of care, as patient standards of care are exactly the same in that ward as they are in any other ward at Flinders Medical Centre. There is a farrago of lies that, when you actually get the facts, simply do not stand up.

While I am addressing yet another smokescreen about Flinders Medical Centre, I indicate that the budget situation at Flinders Medical Centre is significantly impacted by a fall off in receipts. Receipts in 1994-95 are expected to be $1.9 million less than the target as a result of decreased patient receipts. There is a direct relationship between private inpatients admitted to the hospital and patient receipts. The simple fact, which Labor Governments around Australia will not actually admit, is that private occupied bed days at Flinders Medical Centre for the 10 month period to 30 April were down by 18 per cent—a direct cost shift to the taxpayers of South Australia caused by Federal Labor Party policy. I thank the member for Mitchell for his ongoing interest in Flinders Medical Centre and for giving me the opportunity to put the correct facts on the record.

COMMONWEALTH GROWTH FUNDS

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education rule out any cuts to the TAFE budget which would jeopardise access to millions of dollars of Commonwealth growth funds? The Minister has written to a large number of people expressing concern that South Australia has missed out on $5.3 million in Commonwealth growth funds and that Western Australia and Victoria have had similar action taken against them. The Opposition is aware that Victoria and Western Australia have now received their Commonwealth funds, with Victoria receiving the extra money only by increasing its State budget allocation for TAFE by $12.8 million.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in employment and training issues. If he waits a while, he can expect some good news.

SHARKS

Mr KERIN (Frome): Will the Minister for Primary Industries explain the Government's plan for the protection of great white sharks in South Australian waters?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I thank the honourable member for his question and interest in white pointers. There has been widespread concern about the use of berley and the capture of white pointer sharks.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: Absolutely not. If the Leader of the Opposition listens for a moment, he will recognise that both the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources and I passionately believe in caring for white pointers and, of course, whales.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: A lot more passionately than Ms Gago. The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources and I announced on 22 December that we would prepare a discussion paper on the management options for these fish. It was jointly prepared by both departments—by Mr Ross Allen from the Department of the Environment and Natural Resources and Mr John Presser from PISA, Fisheries. That paperwork is now available for public comment and the responses should be in by 28 July.

There are six proposals for the future management of white pointer sharks in South Australia which are summarised as follows. It is suggested that the shark be declared a protected species and that regulations be amended to prohibit the use of fish products or fish oil to attract the shark within two miles of the mainland or all islands and reefs of the State which are exposed at the low water mark. The second proposal is that the use of a wire trace with a gauge of 2mm or greater and fishing hooks greater than size 12 be prohibited in all South Australian waters. It is suggested that a limited entry licence scheme for a white pointer shark cage viewing industry be developed under the National Parks and Wildlife Act and that the boundaries of the Sir Joseph Banks Islands Conservation Park, Neptune Islands Conservation Park and the Pages Conservation Park be extended under the National Parks and Wildlife Act to include all waters within two nautical miles of the low water mark to establish better control over access to the white pointer shark. Of course, this proposal will not affect continued access by recreation and commercial fishermen. It is important to note that this is a joint proposal by the two Ministers to ensure that these magnificent animals are protected in the future.

CENTENNIAL PARK

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Will the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations agree to Unley council's proposal to sell Centennial Park Cemetery? Why did he fail to ensure that Mitcham council adopted reforms to the management of the cemetery trust, which is a major factor in Unley council's proposal to sell its share in the cemetery?

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I thank the honourable member for her question. I would like to give her a full reply to this question and I may have to do that tomorrow. It came to everyone's knowledge only this morning through ABC radio that the council had resolved last evening to sell the cemetery. If the council has an interest in selling the cemetery, certainly the Government has a real interest in what is going on and what the council's agenda is. I am endeavouring over the course of the day to find out exactly what that agenda is. Because the operation of the cemetery is such that it caters to the whole metropolitan area, we all have a very real interest in the cemetery's future.

I take up another point running in the media at the moment concerning allegations from one political Party here that the Government is about to sell cemeteries. I can assure the

House that that is not on the agenda: we are not about to sell cemeteries. As to the honourable member's question, we are researching it at the moment. I am awaiting advice from the Unley City Manager giving further details as they become available. As I get information, I will provide it to the House.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Today, I want to talk about the Alice Springs to Darwin railway, because a decision—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is amazing that members of the Government do not seem to be supportive of this project: I hope that that is not the case. The fact is that a decision will soon be made by the Federal Government on the Alice Springs to Darwin railway and all members of this Parliament, regardless of Party, should be urging the promptest action to facilitate that railway's construction. All of us would agree with the Prime Minister's commitment to policies of nation building that promote Australia's development as a modern sophisticated trading nation.

Certainly, the year 2001, which is the centenary of Federation, must mark in various real as well as symbolic ways our new confidence as an independent nation, with a clear vision of its future in Asia. A commitment to facilitate the construction of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway, I believe, is one of the most significant and beneficial ways in which the Keating Government could signal to our neighbours that Australia in the new millennium is committed to a dynamic presence in Asia. It would also provide important practical support for the improvement of our export competitiveness.

The project is of immense national significance. I understand that Neville Wran, Chairman of the Darwin committee, within the next couple of weeks will make a recommendation to the Federal Government. Certainly, by providing an efficient corridor for our exporters to Asia the railway would improve the competitiveness of our existing exporters. In addition, the railway would facilitate new activities in the tradeable goods sector which until recently were not considered cost competitive. In this way the Darwin to Alice Springs railway would contribute significantly to addressing Australia's principal economic problem, our balance of payments.

But there are other ways in which this project can help improve Australia's external position. Our reliance on foreign owned shipping services is a costly component of our current account imbalance. The Alice Springs to Darwin railway would reduce these costs to the national economy and, as the project would involve high levels of Australian content, it would have a high multiplier effect domestically. In my discussions with Neville Wran last year I stressed that this project would deliver jobs to some of the people who need them most: the people of South Australia, particularly those of the Upper Spencer Gulf.

The construction phase would lead to the creation of 2000 jobs, approximately half in South Australia. It would provide a stimulus to activities such as steel production in Whyalla and concrete production in Port Augusta. It would also provide those cities, which have been largely neglected by the present Government—it has certainly abandoned the policy of giving them enterprise zone status—with opportunities to restructure their main industries for future viability as well as securing new and diversified investment opportunities. South Australians and the people of the Upper Spencer Gulf need jobs as never before and a project such as this of national interest—the Alice-Darwin railway—can help give a hand up to the struggling regions of Australia and to a struggling area of South Australia.

I support the community's demand for protection of the environment and for economic development that is environmentally sustainable. So, this project—the Alice Springs to Darwin railway—would contribute significantly to this objective by reducing reliance on road vehicles and conserving our scarce fuel resources while reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and by reducing our reliance on an ageing stock of freight ships we reduce the danger of environmental disaster along our coastline. Other factors lend support to the development of the Darwin to Alice Springs railway, and with Neville Wran we are all aware that the project is unlikely to proceed if it relies solely on private investment.

I believe the Federal Government needs to give detailed and serious consideration to intervening in what is clearly a project of national significance. Such intervention could take a number of forms but is most likely to involve tax breaks or direct part funding. There is evidence that the Federal Government could claw back a significant proportion of its expenditure in increased revenues. The January 1993 Australian National report on the Darwin to Alice Springs railway pointed to substantially increased revenue from income tax, company tax and fuel excise, alongside expenditure savings on unemployment support.

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

Mr BECKER (Peake): On Saturday evening I had the opportunity to represent the Premier at the Croatian Club (Adelaide) Incorporated celebration of the Croatian Independence Day. The club's president, Mr Josip Mezic, in welcoming the distinguished guests, made an excellent speech expressing the pride that Croatians have built up in the South Australian and Australian community. I would like to read some extracts from that speech, particularly because of an unfortunate incident that followed the grand final of the Australian National Soccer League championships held recently at Hindmarsh. Mr Mezic stated:

> Tonight the Croatian community in South Australia takes the opportunity to celebrate Croatia's day of independence, its national day. This day is held dear in the minds and hearts of Croatians around the world. It is a day that many thought they would never be able to celebrate and acknowledge in their lifetime. . . As we all know, Australia is a country which prides itself on its freedom, its independence and its acceptance of and respect for human and civil rights. Regrettably, in present day Australia there appears to be very little understanding of Croatia, its history of Croatian communities in Australia or of Australian-Croatian issues and Croatian-Australian perspectives. Present indications are that many Australians hold incorrect and inappropriate stereotypical views of Croatia and Croatians.

His speech went on as follows:

> A very real and recent example of this in South Australia was the sensationalist media coverage that occurred regarding a soccer event

at the Hindmarsh stadium. Without any factual basis, the civil rights of all Croatian Australians were abused. Factual accuracy was ignored in a quest for news headlines. Ignorance, misinformation and racial vilification were paraded as responsible views and news reporting within the Australian community. Aboriginal Australians are not alone [in] feeling that their civil rights and reputations have been abused. Croatians and Croatian soccer supporters are not all soccer hooligans hell-bent on destruction *en masse* and bringing overseas problems to Australia, as recent hysterical news reports sought to suggest.

Our community does not accept that there is anything sinister in waving a Croatian national flag in Australia at a sports event or elsewhere or in wearing sports paraphernalia with the word 'Croatia' on it. That it should be suggested as something sinister by the media and others smacks [of] something more than the infamous 'Australian cultural cringe'. It smacks of intolerance and racial discrimination, both of which should have no level of acceptance in the press or in the minds of fair-minded Australians.

He went on to ask:

What sort of Australia is a sports writer advocating when he writes about all the efforts to remove the ethnic base from Australian soccer? Where do Australians of non-English background stand? Are we to be denied our names, our cultural heritage, our civil rights in the name of hysteria, bigotry and ignorance?

He further stated:

We would urge those in Parliament, in State and Federal departments and agencies, in various law enforcement agencies, in areas responsible for community services, to be more aware of the great need for accuracy discernment, for correct historical and current community information, for genuine respect for, and understanding of, cultural sensitivities and cultural differences. Lip service to civil liberties is plainly not enough. We invite you to learn more about Croatia and Croatians and about Croatian-Australians in this community. From the greater learning and understanding of each other, surely we will all benefit.

This club was formed in 1952. There are about some 3 000 Croatians in South Australia.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BECKER: The member for Spence keeps interjecting and now informs me that it is in his electorate. If it is in his electorate I hope that he will, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and I have done, look after the people concerned and support the sentiments expressed by the President, Mr Mezic, because we feel they were unfairly treated by certain sections of the media recently. The Croatian community has contributed much to South Australia through many organisations, through its culture and through the benefits of shipping, fishing and the metal and manufacturing industries throughout the whole of the State, be it the West Coast, the Iron Triangle or the Riverland. No matter what ethnic communities we have been able to establish successfully in South Australia, none of them deserves the treatment that this community suffered following that soccer match. The community deserves our support and continued opportunities for its development.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Yesterday I attended a meeting held at Brighton by the ANF in relation to Flinders Medical Centre and heard with a number of other people there quite different information from that provided by the Minister. I would like to put on the record here a particular submission that was read out to the group by the staff of the admissions office of Flinders Medical Centre. I will read from the information that was presented, as follows:

The admissions office is staffed by 5.6 FTEs [full-time equivalents] and rostered seven days per week, responsible for a complete client service to patients, medical professionals and ancillary staff, of any aspect of admission to FMC, management of the entire waiting list of patients and the bed allocation between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m. Since February 1995 the waiting list has steadily increased for all specialties. There is in excess of 2 000 patients now waiting for surgery. Orthopaedics alone has increased from 429 patients waiting [on] 1 February 1995 to 513 patients [waiting on 1 May 1995]. Orthopaedics was advised in mid-March 1995 that all hip and knee replacements were to be cancelled because of the cost of the prostheses. Patients cancelled indefinitely until more funding becomes available. Early April, eight major back operations were cancelled indefinitely. These operations required some equipment to be hired from the RAH for use during surgery. There were not funds to do this. All these patients were in pain. Most wondered how they would continue. They were angry, not at FMC, but at a Government which allowed citizens to suffer indefinitely. Some felt discriminated against because they were pensioners and could not afford private health insurance. They all wanted to know how long before a new date would be given.

More cancellations.

Between 14 April 1995 and 15 May 1995 inclusive: Flinders Medical Centre decided to close the eight day surgery and 12 short stay. . . beds to save money. The surgeons were given restricted operating times and some lists were cancelled altogether. Eight beds remaining in ward 5E were closed. Four beds were used to create a surgical reception area. [The] majority of patients are now expected to arrive at 7 a.m. on the morning of surgery. They are received in surgical reception, proceed to theatre and from recovery to an inpatient bed. These patients have all been to a pre-admission clinic for work-up. During this period all patients who would normally have been short stay or day patients were vying for inpatient beds along with those patients requiring more extensive surgery. It is the admissions office job to advise these patients of their cancellations. For some it is their second and third cancellation.

These patients' reactions were anger, many reduced to tears, even suicidal; most [were] in pain and wondering how they will cope. For a lot of patients, being admitted to hospital for surgery is very traumatic. Some people have to organise help for family members if they are a sole carer; others need to organise time off work, which is not easy when jobs are so hard to find. Being cancelled has a major impact on these people. They are already aware [that] no bed in a public hospital can be guaranteed, so from the moment they are told they need surgery they are put under pressure, either by going on an ever increasing waiting list, getting their local doctor to manage their pain during this period, or [by] receiving a date for surgery but not knowing if a bed will be available on the day. The patient cannot win.

The person then went on to discuss some effects of the budget cuts on the admissions office staff themselves. I cannot read it all in the time I have left but, in essence, they talked about one staff member working up to two hours longer on most days; office budgets not increased to cover staff wage increases; staff anxious about their jobs, asking whether they will be the ones to go; and, finally, to see the hospital running down as it is and patients being treated so badly is distressing. Areas now have to clean their own departments, vacuum, dust and empty rubbish.

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

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I rise in my place today because I am truly offended. Outside this place during Question Time there was a rally of teachers, and one of the banners at the rally read simply, 'Liberals hate kids'. I find that totally offensive, and I am sure all members on this side and, I would hope, all members of this Chamber feel similarly. One thing to which we in here should all be dedicated is the fight against bigotry and stupidity. The trendy lefties of South Australia who believe that the sole repository of care, concern and compassion is the ALP are wrong. I admit that there are people on the other side who do care, and care passionately, but there are equally people on this side of the House who care no less for kids, hospitals and roads than do those on the other side. In here we will debate fiercely about where money should be applied, but I do not believe that any members of

this House could come here and say they do not care; we all do. The sooner those people who would call themselves professionals cease carrying signs like that, the more chance they might have of being regarded as professionals.

I was doubly offended because, in the last election, as a member of the Institute of Teachers, I sought to put an advertisement in the South Australian Institute of Teachers journal. One of my team received the following reply on 6 May 1993:

> At the South Australian Institute of Teachers executive meeting on 27 April 1993, the following motion was passed:
>
> That the SAIT Executive allow no party political advertising in the SAIT journal in the lead-up to the next State election.
>
> I am therefore returning the advertisement for Mark Brindal. Signed, Andrew McFarlane, Editor.

That was fine, until the journal appeared on 17 May 1995, because it carried a quarter page advertisement which read, 'Waite ALP sub-branch presents the great ALP debate'. The title of the debate: Is the Federal Liberal Party the ALP's greatest asset? I have to report to the House that star billing—in fact, in a photograph encapsulated in a star—was the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Ralph Clarke. I have to say that that is probably the closest he will ever get to being a star. If they did nothing else, they did that.

I believe that this is the serious point at issue: South Australians deserve to consider carefully whether our children are not being used for purely industrial purposes by segments of this profession. I hate to say that all teachers are grasping and rapacious. I would never say that. I came into this place because I care about kids, and I know that a great number of totally dedicated teachers want nothing better than the well-being of their children and those that they teach. One of the signs read 'Your kids, our conditions, we are all losing.' I listened to the speeches, especially of the would-be if she could-be member of the Legislative Council who spent $100 000 of union money trying to get elected and who stood there pontificating as if she had been elected. I would say to the President of the Institute of Teachers that, if she wants to play politics, let her come in here and play it. She has already tried, and the electorate of South Australia has rejected her, unlike you, Sir, whom they have accepted for the past 25 years. I do not know what you have and she does not have, but I must say that you had better give her some lessons because, at the rate she is going, she will never get here.

All teachers are entitled to fair reward for fair effort. They are entitled to arbitration, and they are going for arbitration. To suggest, as one speaker did, that it is something they cannot get from this Government is absolute and total rubbish. Why is it that with some teachers quality education always comes down to the size of teachers' pay packets? The only thing to some teachers that is more important than the size of their pay packet is that quality education improves with the amount of time they are not in the classroom. Clare McCarty said at the end of the rally, 'Educators will say that they themselves will save the public education system.' I have news for Mrs McCarty: if it takes rabbits like that, the education system has a long way to go. The Liberal Party—not Clare McCarty—will save State education.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Following what the member for Unley has spoken about, I want to know what sort of health system we have that shunts a woman in her mid 80s out into the night when she has been diagnosed as having pneumonia. I am really quite saddened to tell members about this, because this story needs to be told. Our health system is run by a Minister who is driven by blind and bottom-line ideology. Our health system is run by a Government that does not care about people. I do not care what the member for Unley said—the Government does not care about people. Our health system is on the point of collapse because of savage cuts it has already had inflicted, and it looks like being slashed even further. The cuts have gone very deep. Unfortunately he is not here, but the cuts that this cold as stone and heartless Minister has administered, and backed up by the whole of the Liberal Government, have really cut into the spirit of the health system.

My 84 year old constituent was taken to the Royal Adelaide Hospital by ambulance and was known by the RAH to be living on her own. She was x-rayed and diagnosed as having a lung infection—and I quote the doctor's words—'commonly known as pneumonia.' After waiting around for several hours, until about 12.30 a.m., she was told she could go home. We are talking about the middle of the night. The hospital arranged for a taxi to pick her up and off she went. Soon after 1.30 a.m. she was on her way home to an empty house, and she arrived home at about 2 a.m. She then discovered she had to pay for the taxi, so it was lucky that she had some change on her. I am very grateful to the taxi driver. We do not know who he was, but I am very grateful that he was very concerned for her welfare—much more than those who sent her home. He assisted her into the house and made sure there was no-one in there and that she was safely inside.

I am sure that many members opposite will have had similar cases brought to their notice, but they are simply not speaking out about them. I have heard of many other cases like this. If, as the member for Unley says, they do care—and I have heard the member for Mitchell say he will be speaking out about such issues—

Mr Meier: You lobby your Federal Government, too.

Mrs GERAGHTY: I am quite happy to lobby the Federal Government, but this is an issue in this State that needs to be dealt with now. So, quite frankly—

Mr Meier interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: Members opposite ought to be telling the Minister and Dean Brown what is happening out there in our health system, and what is happening to the elderly and the sick. Thankfully, my constituent is not a frail old lady. This lady, who has an enlarged heart, worked until she was 75 years of age. We are not talking about a frail old lady but someone with a strong character. She was very frightened and very concerned about her welfare. I think it is appalling that she was shunted out of hospital in the middle of the night. I ask again: what kind of health system is the Minister running? Certainly it is not a system that has compassion for its patients, and certainly it is not a system that is fulfilling its duty of care.

The Minister is certainly running a system which has been reduced to the minimum because of the Liberal Party's cold, ideological commitment, as I said, to bottom line economics. Employees are stretched to the limits of their capabilities and are being asked to do even more with less and less. The Minister is hellbent on reducing what was once one of the finest delivery systems in this country to one which is becoming one of the worst. I ask the Minister: does he really care that an 84 year old woman was sent out into the night with diagnosed pneumonia and, if so, how can he continue to say he is proud of such a health system? What is he going to do about it? I certainly hope his response is not to take more money from an already exhausted budget. I would be very happy to hear the Minister's response to this issue, and

I encourage members opposite to tell the Government that what it is doing is wrong.

Mr ROSSI (Lee): The member for Torrens intrigues me every time she talks. She lacks an understanding of the fundamental principles about supplying money for the administration of hospitals. It is her Federal leader, the best Treasurer Australia ever had, Paul Keating, who controls the purse strings for hospitals and Medicare. If the Prime Minister did the right thing, the Minister for Health in this State could put that money to better use. The topic that she has just raised seems to be identical to that relayed to me by a patient in West Lakes in July 1993, well before the election, with respect to an incident that occurred under the previous Labor Government. Perhaps the honourable member is quoting from a letter that was provided to her while her Labor cohort was Minister.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr ROSSI: This is identical to an incident in July 1993. The point is that if we had more funds from the Federal Government we would not be in the present situation. Also, if the former Treasurer had left us more money in the kitty it may have been put to better use. Moving away from the member for Torrens and to a more constructive topic, I inform the House that I have received several complaints from people who drive along Tapleys Hill Road, Military Road and West Lakes Boulevard. Their criticism of the Department of Transport is that speed signs seem to change three or four times along those main roads for no apparent reason.

The number of lanes, the direction of traffic and the vegetation on the side of the roads do not change, yet every now and again a sign appears amongst the trees indicating that the speed limit is 80, 70 or 60 kilometres an hour. Unless a driver sees these signs while their eyes are on the road, they are booked by radar. If there is one lane for traffic, the speed should be 60 kilometres an hour. If there are two lanes of traffic, the left lane should be 60 kilometres an hour and the other lane 70 kilometres an hour. When one looks at Port Road, which has three lanes for traffic travelling in one direction, in my opinion it is quite safe to travel at 80 kilometres an hour.

I suggest that, where there are three lanes of traffic travelling in the same direction, we should make the left lane 60 kilometres, the centre lane 70 kilometres an hour and the outside lane 80 kilometres an hour. Unless road conditions and road markings alter, there should be no change in speed zones. It is imperative that this type of idea be considered and given some credence by the Department of Transport. The other dangerous problem concerns the concrete median strips on major roads. They are painted white where they start and finish and on some protruding points along the way.

The white paint usually lasts one or two days before the tyre marks from vehicles and trucks turn it black and, as a result, at night the concrete median strips are very hard to see. When a driver approaches an intersection, and particularly a T junction, before they know it the bottom part of their car is ripped apart by the concrete barriers. There is no reason why the protruding parts of these median strips cannot have a yellow reflector embedded in them to enable a vehicle's headlights to indicate to the driver that there is an obstacle ahead. That is another issue the Department of Transport could look at.

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

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

A quorum having been formed:

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

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

That under section 12(b) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1995 Ms Trish White be appointed to the Public Works Standing Committee.

Motion carried.

SGIC (SALE) BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for privatisation of SGIC, to amend the State Government Insurance Act 1992 and the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I insert second reading explanation in *Hansard* without my reading it.

This Bill involves the eventual sale of the State Government Insurance Commission (SGIC).

This sale, which the Government intends to conclude this calendar year, is an important part of the Government's debt reduction program. This program, mandated by the 1993 election, aims to return South Australia's economy to one of growth and prosperity. The Government's program involves a substantial effort to reduce the State's debt which blew out of all proportion with the economic disasters which occurred during the late 1980's and early 1990's.

SGIC commenced business in January 1972, predominantly as a motor vehicle and household insurer. It was set up by an Act of this Parliament to provide an alternative provider of general insurance for the South Australian public.

Over the years SGIC expanded its business operations. In the early 1970's the SGIC began writing Compulsory Third Party Insurance, and since 1975 it has been the sole CTP insurer in South Australia.

In 1977 the SGIC Act was amended to allow the SGIC to write life insurance, and in 1987 the SGIC commenced its health insurance operations.

In the forthcoming sale of SGIC the Government will sell the competitive business operations of SGIC. These are general insurance, health insurance and life insurance. The Bill allows for the creation of a new corporate structure, referred to as the "Newco Group". It is expected that the Newco Group will consist of a holding company and five subsidiary companies. Two of these companies are existing SGIC subsidiaries being the health insurance company, SGIC Health Pty Ltd, and the superannuation trustee company, SGIC Superannuation Pty Ltd. The Bill provides the Treasurer with the power to vest asset and liabilities of SGIC into the Newco Group. It is intended that the assets and liabilities of the General Insurance, Life Insurance and the Head Office operations will be vested into separate subsidiaries in the Newco Group.

This will leave the Compulsory Third Party Insurance fund and the discontinued operations in the Commission. The discontinued operations include the businesses that SGIC should never have entered into, but, used the Government Guarantee to underwrite. These include Inwards Reinsurance, Financial Risk (including aircraft residual value insurance) and securitisations.

The underwriting of Compulsory Third Party Insurance will not be included in the sale. Instead, the Government will amend the *State Government Insurance Commission Act 1992* to form the Motor Accident Commission. This statutory authority will have responsibility for the CTP scheme, and will contract out the management of that scheme to the SGIC for a period of three years. This management contract will be part of the SGIC sale.

Over the next three years the Government will appoint a Committee to review the operations of CTP insurance in South Australia. In consultation with the Motor Accident Commission, the Premiums Committee and other interested parties this Review Committee will consider reforms to CTP operations that may be desirable.

CTP insurance is a significant cost to South Australian motorists and the Government wants to consider the future options for CTP with due care and in a timely manner. If CTP, after a three year period, were to be deregulated, the SGIC because of its ongoing experience with this South Australian business, would be initially granted a share of the deregulated market.

In selecting a purchaser, the Government will not be driven by price alone. Although price will be a key objective of the sale, the following objectives are of similar importance:

- to sell all the SGIC businesses offered for sale as a whole;
- to maintain SGIC as major financial institution in South Australia;
- to maintain SGIC's existing staff and branch structure;
- to maintain SGIC headquarters in Adelaide;
- to deliver future economic benefits to South Australia; and
- to ensure that the purchaser capitalises SGIC's businesses to current industry standards, and gains all necessary regulatory approvals and licences.

The last objective is particularly important. The SGIC has always had its liabilities covered by a Government Guarantee. This has permitted the SGIC to operate its businesses with less capital than private sector insurers. The Government Guarantee also enabled the SGIC, in the 1980's, to venture into areas of risk-taking where its capital base was inadequate and to undertake activities which have cost this State dearly.

After the sale of the SGIC the Government will phase out the Government Guarantee. All existing policies at the sale date, which are covered by the Government Guarantee, will remain covered until their renewal date. The only exceptions to this are those policies in the life insurance area which have indefinite or very long terms. In these cases the Government will continue the guarantee for five years and then phase it out.

The purchaser of the SGIC will be immediately regulated by various bodies, including the Insurance & Superannuation Commission. The ISC sets minimum capital requirements that must be met. Further, as part of the sale requirements, the Government will insist that the capital backing of the SGIC meets industry standards. This will ensure that the capital of the SGIC exceeds regulatory requirements.

At present the SGIC is not legally required to meet all regulatory rules and (after the 1980's) it has not always had the capital to do so. The sale of SGIC will ensure that SGIC's capital base meets and exceeds regulatory standards.

Preparing the SGIC for sale involves considerable restructuring. The businesses for sale will be transferred into a corporate structure—the Newco Group—which allows the Government to sell its shares in the Newco Group and its various subsidiaries.

There are a number of assets and liabilities, mainly left from the excesses of the 1980's, that will be excluded from the sale. These include financial risk insurance. These operations will be managed and worked out as soon as possible. The responsibility for that will rest with the MAC.

The operations for sale are well performing insurance operations in competitive insurance markets. There is no reason for Government ownership of these businesses and their sale will allow SGIC to compete in these markets without the hindrance of public ownership.

The Government is aware of the sensitivities of employment in this asset sale. The SGIC workforce contains specialised insurance and finance sector people. This workforce is expected to be required by the purchaser of SGIC.

SGIC employees and management have worked closely together to achieve substantial productivity gains which has assisted in making SGIC an attractive purchase option for companies seeking to enter the insurance industry or for those seeking to expand their operations in Australia, and South Australia. Indeed, substantial interest has been expressed already from national and international companies in this sale.

I commend this Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

PART 1

PRELIMINARY

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Interpretation

This clause contains the definitions required for the purposes of the new Act.

Clause 4: Date of divestiture

This clause defines the date of divestiture for Newco and the Newco subsidiaries. The date of divestiture is a concept of particular importance to the provisions dealing with the government guarantee.

Clause 5: SGIC subsidiaries

This clause defines SGIC subsidiaries. These are the bodies corporate listed in Schedule 2. Additions to, or variations of, the list may be made by proclamation.

Clause 6: Territorial operation of Act

This clause is intended to give the new Act extra-territorial operation to the full extent of the legislative power of the State.

PART 2

NEWCO

Clause 7: Provision of capital to Newco

This clause provides for capital subscriptions to Newco.

PART 3

TRANSFER AND SALE OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES

Clause 8: Transfer of assets and liabilities to Newco and Newco subsidiaries

Under this clause assets or liabilities of SGIC or an SGIC subsidiary may be transferred to Newco or a Newco subsidiary.

Clause 9: Re-transfer of assets or liabilities

This provides for the re-transfer of transferred assets or liabilities.

Clause 10: Conditions of transfer (or re-transfer)

Conditions may be imposed under this clause on the transfer or re-transfer of assets or liabilities.

Clause 11: Supplementary provisions

This extends the operation of securities in relation to transferred assets or liabilities.

Clause 12: Legal proceedings

This provides for the continuation of legal proceedings in respect of transferred assets or liabilities by or against the transferee company.

Clause 13: Evidence

Under the clause the Treasurer or the Treasurer's delegate may issue certificates about the transfer or re-transfer of an asset or liability under the new Act. The certificate is to have evidentiary value in legal proceedings.

Clause 14: Transfer of shares in Newco or a Newco subsidiary

This provides for the Treasurer to enter into a sale agreement shares in Newco or a Newco subsidiary, or assets or liabilities in Newco or a Newco subsidiary.

Clause 15: Application of proceeds of sale, etc.

This clause deals with the application of the proceeds of the sale.

PART 4

STAFF

Clause 16: Transfer of staff

This clause deals with the transfer of staff from SGIC or an SGIC subsidiary to Newco or a Newco subsidiary.

PART 5

GOVERNMENT GUARANTEE

Clause 17: General guarantee

This is a general guarantee of all liabilities of Newco or a Newco subsidiary that fall due before the date of divestiture.

Clause 18: Government guarantee (Part A policies—general insurance)

Clause 19: Government guarantee (Part B policies—term life and other insurance)

Clause 20: Government guarantee (Part C policies—continuous insurance)

Clause 21: Government guarantee (Part D policies—investment contracts)

Clause 22: Government guarantee (Part E policies—unit investment contracts)

These clauses provide for less extensive guarantees of liabilities under various kinds of policies where the liabilities fall due after the date of divestiture.

Clause 23: Amortisation principle

The amortisation principle is the principle under which liability under a guarantee is gradually reduced and then extinguished. The principle is used in the above provisions for guarantees operating after the transferee company's date of divestiture.

Clause 24: Appropriation of Consolidated Account

This provides for the appropriation of money that may be required for the purposes of a guarantee.

Clause 25: Subrogation

If a liability does have to be paid out under the guarantee, the Treasurer is subrogated to the rights of the person to whom the payment was made against the company whose liabilities were guaranteed.

Clause 26: Agreement that this Part will not apply

This clause provides that a company may enter into a policy on the basis that the guarantee will not apply.

Clause 27: Restrictions on the application of this Part

This clause empowers the Treasurer to impose restrictions binding on a transferee company about the terms and conditions on which insurance policies and investments offered by the company may be entered into or made, or about the variation by agreement of the terms and conditions governing a guaranteed liability.

Clause 28: Government guarantee under the State Government Insurance Commission Act 1992

This provides that the guarantee under section 21 of the *State Government Insurance Commission Act 1992* has no application to transferred liabilities.

Clause 29: Schedule 5 proclamation

Schedule 5 may be varied by proclamation made during the transfer period by the addition of further items.

PART 6

MISCELLANEOUS

Clause 30: Transfer of assets and liabilities to other authorities

The Governor may, by proclamation, transfer assets and liabilities of SGIC or an SGIC subsidiary to an authority or person nominated in the proclamation.

Clause 31: Payment to be made to Consolidated Account

A transferee company that makes a profit before it ceases to be an entity under the control of the State may be required under this section to make a payment to the Treasury in lieu of income tax.

Clause 32: Registering authorities to note transfer

This provides for registration authorities to note the transfer of land and other assets under this Act.

Clause 33: Stamp duty

Transfers of assets under this Act are exempted from stamp duty.

Clause 34: Act overrides other laws

The new Act will operate override the *Real Property Act 1886* and any other laws that might impose limits on its operation.

Clause 35: Effect of things done or allowed under Act

This clause will prevent action taken under the new Act being treated as the trigger for a liability or other adverse consequence under another law or instrument.

Clause 36: Regulations and proclamations

This provides for the making of regulations and proclamations for the purposes of the new Act.

SCHEDULE 1

Consequential Amendments to the State Government Insurance Commission Act 1992

This schedule makes amendments necessary to transform the present State Government Insurance Commission into the *Motor Accident Commission* to operate the compulsory third-party motor accident insurance scheme.

SCHEDULE 2

SGIC Subsidiaries

This schedule lists the companies that are to be regarded as SGIC subsidiaries for the purposes of the new Act.

SCHEDULE 3

Superannuation

This schedule defines the superannuation rights of transferred employees.

SCHEDULE 4

Amendment of Motor Vehicles Act 1959

This schedule amends the *Motor Vehicles Act 1959* to provide (in effect) that insurers cannot be approved to enter the compulsory third-party insurance field until 1 July 1998.

SCHEDULE 5

Policies subject to Government guarantee and referred to in Part 5

This schedule categorises the various kinds of policies issued by SGIC for the purposes of the provisions dealing with the government guarantees.

Mr QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

DEVELOPMENT (REVIEW) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 March. Page 2148.)

Ms HURLEY (Napier): I give notice that the Opposition is unequivocally opposed to several amendments set out in the Bill. Apart from a few administrative details the whole thrust of the Bill is to give more power and discretion to the Minister in a number of development proposals. We feel that that is unnecessary, unwarranted and, in fact, dangerous. When the Development Act Monitoring Group was set up it called for suggestions, and I understand that a number of groups responded, made some valuable comments and put forward some useful views. This Bill skates over that entire process. I understand that some of the suggestions put forward in that monitoring process have not been taken up; and I suppose that is reasonable. However, some were included which did not arise from that review. The Minister has set up a monitoring group and virtually ignored the process that the monitoring group undertook. He has simply put in a number of measures for which there was no call, demand or justification.

The major issue which arises in this Bill is the Minister's ability to waive the requirement for an environmental impact statement. An EIS can be waived if a project is regarded by the Minister as being of sufficient economic significance and if he believes that the social and environmental impact would not be significant. The Minister may determine thus and give a development authorisation via the Governor. It is a situation in which there are no checks and balances, no public consultation and no real avenue for appeal. The report which is required in such circumstances needs to be presented to the Parliament after it has all happened.

There are no guidelines, no parameters, set out in this Bill to guide the Minister as to what can be defined as of economic significance and in what circumstances. Given that, it seems hard to imagine what project will be of such major economic significance yet have very little social and environmental impact. The Bill is silent on that point. In those circumstances, a developer may persuade the Minister that a project is of significant economic impact to the State and that will be enough to regard the social and environmental impact as insignificant. In fact, we will create more uncertainty for developers in this State.

Developers have long been calling for a set of rules and guidelines under which they can carry out feasibility studies and begin their work in an atmosphere of stability and certainty. What we have now is a situation where, if it seems through the normal course of events they may not succeed, they can go directly to the Minister and argue their case.

The call has been for improvements in the current process. There has been a recognition of some deficiency in the EIS process, but the calls have been not to overturn the whole process, which has been developed over a number of years and has worked reasonably successfully, but to improve the environmental impact statement process. Such calls have included an independent preparation of environmental impact statements rather than have the developer or proponent organise their preparation. The call has been for monitoring and follow-up of environmental impact statements to assess the way in which the process has been followed through, whether safeguards have been built in and whether the questions and the assurances given in the EIS have been verified after the event.

Most significantly perhaps for this process there have been calls for different levels of environmental impact statements, including some kind of community consultation model to enable people to sit down together before the project begins and look at the difficulties there might be in setting up the

project and at ways of resolving community difficulties and the difficulties of any other interested parties. This has already worked well in a couple of cases.

The Minister is bringing in a very slim list of amendments to the Development Act which do not address any of the serious questions that have been raised about development approvals in this State. This little clause gives him more power to waive the requirement for an EIS if he considers that necessary. Many people might think that the Minister has enough power within the present proposals. We have no better example of this in recent times than the Wirrina development where the Minister decided that there was no need for an EIS, despite the fact that a small township is being created where there was approval for a resort only. Obviously the Minister considers that the social impact of dumping a small township in that rural community is not significant. He considers that the environmental impact of building houses on the cliff tops and moving back the coastal zone protection area is not significant. This does not give us much heart in contemplating agreement that the Minister should be given further powers and opportunities to exercise that discretion. There is no redeeming feature in this Bill that I or any of those whom I have consulted can see. We will oppose this measure outright as we can see no reason or call for any such action.

The next major part of the Bill to which the Opposition objects is the further restriction of public opportunity for comment about development proposals. I refer to the amendment of section 38, 'Public notice and consultation.' The main effect is to reduce the opportunity for the public to have their say. It is a complicated process, but basically, regarding category 3 developments, if no category is given to the development under the development plan or the Act, under this amendment anyone who has an objection to that development will no longer have the right to be heard in support of their representation. It applies also to category 2 developments.

In a climate in which the public are clamouring for an increased opportunity to have their say in developments in their area, we have a further restriction on their representation. In any amendments to the Development Act, I had hoped to see the opportunity for the public to have their say at an earlier stage of the development approval process and for tighter requirements for the public to be notified when development is about to take place. For example, councils and other authorities might contact only one or two neighbouring people or the smallest section as required under the Act, and after all that so-called public consultation process a number of people might find out about the development and protest about it. This creates problems for the public, in some cases it creates enormous problems for the developers, and it often creates problems for the council and the Government.

The Hon. J.K.G. Oswald: Under this legislation there is no change in that respect.

Ms HURLEY: I am saying that there should be a change. There should be an improvement to the public consultation process, not this amendment which further restricts public consultation.

Mr Evans: You are saying that your mob got it wrong?

Ms HURLEY: I am saying that the Development Act is a large Act which was brought in after wide public consultation, but in a fluid area such as this there will, of course, be an ongoing need for amendments.

Mr Evans interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: If we got it wrong, it was not as wrong as the current Minister is about to make it. The third major area where the Opposition has objections relates to the three yearly reviews of the development plan. I refer to the amendment to section 30. This amendment—and I will be interested to hear the reason—requires councils to prepare their development plan every three years rather than every five years, as is currently the case, unless the Minister gives a specific exemption. We again have an instance where the Minister gives himself much more discretion, much more power, and everyone falls in behind him. Serious issues are raised about whether a three year review gives adequate time frames.

Again, I raise the matter of public consultation. As I said before, there is an increasing requirement by the community to be more adequately and fully consulted about these matters. In fact, most councils are doing their best to make sure that people have their say and that they have adequate opportunity to have their say. They are encouraging people to get involved in the council planning strategy on development issues, zoning issues and so on. This is a very good tactic because it avoids problems later for everyone.

A number of those councils are concerned that they will be constantly and unnecessarily in this process of drawing up reviews to the development plan, particularly in the more settled and stable inner metropolitan areas. It might not apply so much to the faster growing outer areas where there is much more need for review. The existing Act adequately allows for changes to the development plan by the putting in of a plan amendment report which caters for specific areas when and where required. I have no understanding of why the Minister needed to insert this change and, in any case, I understand that it is not supported by the Local Government Association.

The final major objection the Opposition has to this Bill relates to the call in powers. I refer to the amendment to section 34, 'Determination of relevant authority.' This clause will allow a developer, who is worried about his ability to get a proposal through a council, the option to go directly to the Minister to persuade him that he might have a better case if it went directly to the Development Assessment Commission. Again, we have another case of the Minister's giving himself more discretion and more power but, again, there is more uncertainty for the developers. The Minister decides which cases can go to the Development Assessment Commission.

The Hon. J.K.G. Oswald interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: Well, you had better talk to your department officials, because they briefed me on this.

The Hon. J.K.G. Oswald interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: The amendment provides:

> . . . (iiia) the Minister declares, by notice in writing served personally or by post on the proponent, and sent to the relevant council, that, in the Minister's opinion, the Government of the State has a substantial interest in whether or not the development proceeds and that in the circumstances the Minister desires the Development Assessment Commission to act as the relevant authority for the proposed development;

That is pretty unequivocal.

The Hon. J.K.G. Oswald interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: No, I did not imply that the Minister has the authority. If the developer thinks he might have a better chance through the Development Assessment Commission than through his local council, he can persuade the Minister to let him do that. That is what I was saying.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member will address the Chair. It will obviate the need for objections from the Minister's bench.

Ms HURLEY: I apologise, Sir. Again, we have another amendment under which the Minister's opinion is the one that counts. The existing Development Act provides that the councils are the relevant authority. I am reliably informed that the councils, generally speaking, put these things through fairly quickly and that there is no real reason why the Development Assessment Commission, which is not on the ground, so to speak, and knowledgeable about the local area, would necessarily produce a better result than the relevant local authority.

Mr Evans: Try three years for a house.

Ms HURLEY: If you have a problem with the development process you had better speak to the Minister, not to me. In the Opposition's view, this Bill does not fix anything. It puts increased power, responsibility and discretion in the hands of the Minister. That, as has been well proved in past instances, has, if anything, led to mistakes. It proves that there is really almost contempt for the public view in these matters. There will be a gradual winding back of the public consultation process, the public appeal process, when it has been proved over and again that local people and communities have been able to point out the problems and, indeed, the benefits of various parts of development proposals. When the community is ignored and the development goes ahead, the community is often proved right, and there are significant problems in the development.

The Minister chooses to think that his opinion will be more significant than community consultation. This is particularly so with the environmental impact statement. Over the past several decades, the environmental impact statement has been built up as a process whereby consultation can occur, problems can be raised and Government bodies and the community can have an input so that any problems can be resolved at that stage rather than once the project has begun or even completed. It is a very valuable process. The community thinks it is a valuable process, even though, as I outlined before, there are a couple of changes that people would not have minded the Government looking at. Rather than doing that, the Government has ignored that call and chosen to do away with that process where it can.

There are several other minor amendments of a technical nature which the Opposition has no quarrel with, but we will be opposing strenuously those areas that I have outlined. I call on the Government to be rather more reasonable and sensible about this and to talk to its constituents and the people who are aware of what is happening with development proposals.

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): I support the Bill. It refines and improves the existing Development Act, being designed to facilitate and reflect the Government's policies, and to ensure that the development assessment system is clear and efficient. Anybody who has had experience with the Planning Act 1982 would understand quickly the decision by the previous Government to conduct a review, which was brief, to determine improvements to that Act. The previous Government played around the edges with the Planning Act for a considerable time, putting into place no fewer than 15 changes. This alone would indicate the problems that were associated with that original Act.

The key objectives of the Planning Act 1982 were to provide a planning process, to regulate development within South Australia, and to establish the South Australian Planning Commission and the Advisory Committee on Planning. In reports referred to the commission the Minister retained veto rights on all reports. In effect, the Planning Commission reported to the Minister on the relevant uses of land, made recommendations about regulations needed under the Act and had discretion to grant or refuse a planning authorisation.

The advisory committee advised the Minister on any matter relating to urban or regional planning and was effectively a clearing house for planning changes, that is, supplementary development plans to change the development plan, finding their way to ACOP prior to the Minister's approval. A real frustration of this system was that there was no overall strategic direction and so the whims of ACOP were often reflected in the concluded SDPs. This happened often to the frustration of local councils trying to plan their own areas and there was no adequate two-way flow of information back from ACOP to the councils. This was quite in contrast to the previous speaker's statements that this process will frustrate councils. In fact, it is actually the past frustration of councils that has caused the need for change in this way. The previous Government recognised that as much as the present Government. All too often the rigidity of ACOP simply reflected a Government's view of the day and did not allow for any fluidity in the planning process or any development of lateral thinking in the planning area.

Changes in philosophy took a long time to eventuate and there was no surety or security on the part of councils in the planning process at all. The Government could have had a hidden agenda and councils would not know about that but were trying to make changes to a plan that were unsuccessful because ACOP kept refusing to accept their plan. If members want evidence of this, they need only consider the number of times that the Willunga basin SDP was produced by the Willunga council and presented to ACOP. It was refused many times for a whole range of reasons, yet none of these turned out to be the truth in terms of the final process. In fact, the only way that Willunga council finally got the truth from the previous Government was to threaten and offer Minister Hopgood to return planning powers to the Government. He accepted that but Crown law advice was that he could not do that and he handed the powers back to the council.

Willunga council's experience was that only by doing that did the council overcome the frustration of the system and find out what the hidden agenda was of the Government of the day. There is no way that one can say here that this process will frustrate councils: it is the frustration that has caused this change. It is not surprising that in the 1990s there was a planning review undertaken to advise on improvements to the State planning system. The prime recommendation was that a new method of dealing with urban development was required and an overall planning strategy was needed for the State so that policy directions could apply to all developments whether they be private or public in an overall vision needed for South Australia. Until that point development was just *ad hoc* and all over the place.

Each council area tried to set its own agenda which did not take into account the State's objective or even what was achievable for the infrastructure provision and so on. The planning review culminated in considerable public consultation in the *2020 Vision Final Report*, suggesting policy be determined and maintained by a strategic planning process. This meant that change was recommended to draw up policies and apply them across all Government departments,

but only following much community consultation. The legislation requires that policies are set out in the planning strategy and they are reflected in documents that form part of the policy development decisions made by all councils in South Australia.

Clause 4 amends section 25 so that the Minister does not have to refer to the advisory committee. One can argue that, once the overall strategy is set, the need for advisory committee intervention on many occasions may not be necessary. In fact, the mandatory report simply adds time to the whole process. Development plans should not be distinctly different as to State and local areas. In fact, if there has been adequate consultation, it should not matter whether the strategic plan is set by the State Government or local government. If that community consultation has been adequate throughout the community, those two plans should be the same. If there is adequate consultation, the strategic planning program should show little variation between local government and State Government planning. They should reflect the overall State objective.

Planning is a fluid and moving process and it is appropriate that plans be reviewed frequently. Three years is the suggested period in the amendment to section 30 and I accept it. As the previous speaker stated about the amount of consultation that takes place, if the Government is changing its plans every three years, it would tend to do more consultation every three years than it would do every five years. Therefore, I reject the statement made previously.

Clause 3 amends section 24 to allow the Minister to make a plan amendment to ensure and achieve consistency of the plan throughout the planning strategy. It makes common sense that, if the Government has gone to the trouble of undertaking community consultation, as has been the case with both the previous and the present Governments, the Minister should have some power to make sure that local government takes into account that overall planning strategy.

Section 30 currently requires a council to give public notice of a review to be carried out and invite people to make a submission. The amendment requires a council to prepare a report on the review. A reality is that, if councils are serious about adequate consultation, they will receive many more valid submissions from the community if they have given people something to make conclusions about rather than simply asking for open comment. The review necessarily will be in line with the strategic plan, so the presentation of the report is not such an onerous task.

People who have had experience with the previous Development Act concerning major project development and the lengthy process of the EIS production will understand the need for two main provisions: first, certainty of the approval process, even if the certainty means that the answer is 'No'; and, secondly, speeding up the approval process, especially if the project will have no major detrimental environmental effects on the State. Because major developments are such a key to the economic development of our State, we cannot be placed in a position potentially to lose good developments that may go to other States simply because an EIS is required even if there is no justifiable environmental grounds for one. Thus it is under major projects that the assessment is made that the EIS is not a requirement and the project should not be forced to face a lengthy process of checks and balances which could take up to 18 months.

Such costs borne by a developer will often see a development go elsewhere. The placing of such reports before both Houses of Parliament exposes the process to public scrutiny and allows all representatives to have a say in the final outcome of the process. Many major developments were lost to South Australia under the previous Labor Government, yet some of these developments could have stayed in South Australia if there had been certainty at the beginning of the process about what could be achieved through the strategic planning process and an early indication given whether 'yes' or 'no' would be the likely final outcome. Secondly, the process should have been speeded up.

Governments that are serious about increased activity in our State should become proactive about the development process, not reactive. We must send a positive message to the development sector that investment in South Australia is worthwhile and, more importantly, is now achievable. Naturally, it is accepted that certain developments will require a thorough investigation by the EIS process, and this is as it should be. Parliament can reject the Governor's assessment and send a project back for an EIS if it so decides.

The addition of the Development Assessment Commission to be a relevant authority where the Minister deems it appropriate is provided for in the amendment to section 34. This is necessary to allow the Minister to make decisions to take approvals out of the hands of the local government authority, particularly if it can be expected there will be a conflict of interest with a council doing a similar project and not wanting competition. If members do not believe that that fear is real, they should just look at the situation around South Australia. This is more likely to happen as councils become entrepreneurial and undertake more development themselves. In these situations it is appropriate that the proponent can seek another approval mechanism that is seen to be independent. If it is to qualify for this independent assessment, the Minister should be satisfied that the State has a substantial interest in whether or not the development proceeds, for example, does it fit in with the economic development of the region, is it a job generating development or is it simply a costly infrastructure demand, and so on?

In regard to representation regarding category 2 and 3 developments, the Bill recognises the time taken unnecessarily by councils when hearing representation from residents. The Bill allows residents to write to councils about category 2 and 3 developments but removes the necessity for councils to hear personal representation on category 2 developments, regarding which there are no appeal rights in the long term, anyway. This exercise in the past has been a time wasting exercise, because the category 2 developments are usually complying developments and set as part of the development plan/SDP process in conjunction with public consultation. If the process of public consultation to set up the SDP has been adequate, the community has had adequate opportunity to make positive or negative comments as to whether those types of developments ought to be included in the SDP.

It is appropriate for councils to hear representations when there is an appeal mechanism, as in the category 3 developments, because the development is outside the complying category and representation is important for residents in such a case. I put to the House that under a complying situation it is simply a waste of time for councils to sit through listening to that type of repeat. As a member of a council for 8½ years I can tell the House that very rarely is anything produced in the spoken representation that is not in the written representation anyway; no new evidence normally comes to light.

Also, it is appropriate that third party appeal rights should exist only in non-complying developments, for the reason I have already mentioned regarding setting up the SDP process.

With an agreed set of developments listed there should be some certainty that, once those developments are listed as complying, they will be accepted by the community and can be produced without going through the interruption of the third party appeal where, frankly, one member of a community can decide that for $15 it is worth holding up a development that is probably worth $3 million or $4 million to a community just because the person concerned does not particularly like that type of development.

I repeat that, under the proper consultation with the SDP process, all those problems ought to be ironed out, and the community should already have had ample opportunity to put its likes and dislikes on the council's agenda. The prime example of that type of situation is in my electorate in Seaford Rise, where we have a rapidly growing development area which is zoned district centre. People are already coming to my office to object to the fact that Hungry Jack's and now a proposed Pizza Hut are within that area. That is the type of certainty required. The developer who has put a major amount of money towards buying a piece of land which is zoned district centre ought to have the certainty of knowing that within that district centre he is quite able to put up businesses such as Hungry Jack's and Pizza Hut, because they are deemed to be appropriate to the district centre. I support the Bill.

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I rise briefly to support this Bill, which is designed to put in place and effectively streamline planning and development strategies and approvals throughout the State in both metropolitan and country areas. I support the Bill in the knowledge that the specific planning strategies are being prepared right across the State, and I understand in particular that the regional development task force within the Premier's Department is in the final stages of doing just that in relation to my electorate in the Riverland. Local government and community contributions have been and are being made in conjunction with the Riverland Development Corporation, and I anticipate that this will stimulate further interest in development in the region. This afternoon I want to refer to one clause of this Bill, which is clause 10, because I foresee this as having particular relevance to proposed infrastructure developments in my electorate in the Riverland. Clearly it clarifies the position of private companies when they potentially become involved in the BOOT (Builder Owner Operated Transfer) schemes for the provision or commissioning of public infrastructure by the State.

Members would be well aware of the current proposed Berri bridge project before the Government, and I have raised this matter and indicated its current status. One proposal is currently being offered under the BOOT program. Also, members would be aware that, as was announced last year and confirmed by the Minister for Infrastructure in the past day or so, expressions of interest have now been called for under the BOOT scheme to build water filtration plants for the Riverland towns. Without doubt, any other infrastructure construction to improve provision of services is integral to this Government's vision and to the practical feasibility of the provision of those types of services. In this case, about five filtration plants will be constructed, and I believe that this legislation, particularly this aspect under clause 10, will enable such projects to be treated as Crown developments for planning approval, from which the best outcomes will be achieved for all involved. It will ensure that applications for land usage or building work are in accordance with standards and requirements expected of State agencies, so it will further assist in the State Government's effective and efficient provision of basic services to the community.

In addition, I believe it will provide added encouragement to the private sector—in this case in the water industry—with respect to getting the best possible tender prices, because the potential tenderers will be embarking on or getting involved in the tendering process in the knowledge that they will be competing on a more consistent bottom line with respect to standards for planning approval. I commend the Bill in this regard, and particularly clause 10 in terms of what it will do for streamlining and providing greater assistance for the provision of and approvals for public infrastructure here in South Australia. I support the Bill.

Mr EVANS (Davenport): I rise briefly in support of this Bill. I was amazed by the hypocrisy displayed by the Opposition speaker in her contribution to the debate on this Bill when I considered what her Party did when in Government over the period of the past 17 or 20 years and what it did in the electorate of Davenport in relation to the development of Craigburn Farm. For members opposite now to say they wish to consult the community about planning issues and that Government should be more consultative over planning issues is the height of hypocrisy and an insult to Blackwood residents living in the Craigburn Farm area. On at least five occasions their Government promised the community that that development would not go ahead. That Government and some of the developers deliberately designed the development so that it was taken out of the hands of the local councils of Mitcham and Happy Valley and, at one stage, Meadows, so the community had far less say in the proposed development of Craigburn Farm.

So, now that members opposite find themselves in Opposition, for them to say, 'We're holier than thou; we will consult and the Government should be more consultative on every development project', is an absolute insult and shows just how out of touch current Opposition members are with the history of their own Party and its lack of consultation. Even when the previous Government wanted to consult with the community, if we take the Davenport example, when it set up a consultative committee on the Blackwood forest land some eight or 10 years ago it put a Liberal in charge of the consultation process, not one of its own Party. Ultimately, when the consultation process was finished, it refused to act. It set up its consultation process, it had a community committee which met and, at the end of the consultation process, it refused to act; it refused to accept the recommendations of the committee.

We find ourselves in a position where we are now consulting with the community and looking at doing something with the Blackwood forest land. The history of the Labor Party as far as planning and consultation go is indeed very dismal. You have only to look at the projects that were lost to South Australia under the past Labor Governments: projects such as the Mount Lofty redevelopment, Jubilee Point redevelopment, the redevelopment of the Port, Wilpena Pound, Kangaroo Island, Tandanya, Marineland and Cape Jervis are just some of the developments that have been lost due to the planning strategies and the handling of developments in South Australia by the previous Labor Government. Now members opposite are standing here with their holier than thou attitude saying we should consult. The Cape Jervis exercise was lost because one person from the Barossa Valley objected, and the development was gone.

This State will get itself back on its feet and, if it is to attract developers to invest money, create jobs and provide tourist resorts, ultimately the development process has to be streamlined; it has to be more user friendly. It does not mean it has to be anti environment or anti local representation, but it does need to be fair to both sides of the agenda. There is no doubt in my mind that, after the consultation process that the Minister and the various committees have gone through in developing these amendments to the Development Act, this system will be fairer to all parties, and that can only be a good thing for the future of South Australia.

I agree with the member for Kaurna when she says that we certainly have to put out a positive message to developers that in South Australia they have at least a fair chance of getting their development through. I do not believe that that was necessarily the case under previous Labor Governments. I support the Bill, which contains important changes needed for South Australia. For the Labor Party to now stand up and say we should be more consultative, when we look at its past record, is just the height of hypocrisy and an insult to the people of the Blackwood area.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I support the measure. When the member for Elizabeth began her contribution I was dismayed but, as it progressed, I became quite delighted. It is clear to me that, if this is the level of Opposition analysis confronting us as a Government, we will be in Government for a very long time. The Opposition's disappointment in respect of this measure has its roots in the fact that it has always tried to do two things, both of which are wrong. One is to pick winners in developments, and it does so at some public risk and tries to minimise the political fall out that might arise from that risk. The other is to extract patronage from those to whom it gives developmental approval through its convoluted system of attempting to convince the likes of me and the rest of the electorate that the public really wants what it proposes to do, project by project, instance by instance, over the years.

In the course of her remarks we heard the member for Elizabeth bleating about the necessity for consultation, public involvement and public review. I can tell her, as I said by way of interjection during the course of her remarks, that it would not change the outcome one iota.

Mr QUIRKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I believe that the honourable member addressed the shadow Minister as 'her' instead of 'the member for Napier' or 'the shadow Minister'. As a member who has made that point himself several times previously, he should know better.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point of order is upheld. I would ask the member for Ridley to refer to the honourable member as the member for Napier, not the member for Elizabeth, which he originally did.

Mr LEWIS: The member for Napier, as I understand it in grammatical terms, can be referred to by the third person pronoun, and that is not in the least bit disrespectful, in the same way as it is not in the least bit disrespectful to refer to the Minister at the table as 'he' or 'him'. I have never seen any Standing Order that precludes me from referring to an honourable member by the third person pronoun when I have already referred to that member by way of his or her electorate. I am astonished that the honourable member opposite now wants to make it impossible for us—and as his point of order has been upheld I suppose 'us' is no longer a permissible pronoun—to do so. Regrettably, the honourable member for Napier has been caught out.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member was simply pointing out that, from the outset, the honourable member had referred to the shadow lead speaker as the member for Elizabeth. The Chair took the opportunity to draw the honourable member's attention to that.

Mr LEWIS: My mistake, Sir; I apologise for that. The member for Playford's point has no standing in Standing Orders, as I understand them. It is possible for us to refer to other members in this place by the third person pronoun. Having cleared up that point, I return to my contribution. The kind of consultation that the honourable member bleats about as being necessary constipated this State's development during the more than 10 years that the Labor Party was in office in this State. What is more, whenever it suited it, the ALP chose to do exactly the things which are provided for in this legislation, such as Wilpena.

I do not know, then, that the Labor Party can claim to have any particular qualifications enabling it to take the high moral ground, if there is any high moral ground. As far as I am concerned, there is the public interest, and that is best served by a process which ensures that we do things correctly, that are appropriate to the surroundings in which those things are to be located and things which are appropriate for the purposes of the people who will work there when the development is completed. Beyond that, so long as we are aware of how people feel about it, a decision has to be made, and the sooner that decision is made the better. It does mean that the next generation of South Australians will be engaged in jobs which are included in developments that are relevant to the things people are prepared to pay to have done for them, or prepared to pay for goods which they may wish to purchase arising from such developments, or enjoy the benefits of the dwellings and the surroundings of those dwellings in which they can live and raise families. Any other approach to development is philosophically unsound.

I draw attention to some of the remarks made in the second reading explanation by the Minister—remarks which were referred to in part by the member for Napier but which were not well argued. The member for Napier said it was unfortunate that the Minister will be able to declare that the Development Assessment Commission determine an application, notwithstanding the fact that a council would otherwise have been the relevant authority for that application. So long as we have a Liberal Minister on this side of the Chamber with that authority I will have no worry. However, if the ALP ever got back into office, that would be a worry, because I know that a Labor Minister would interfere. One has only to look at the way Kym Mayes interfered with proposals in the Unley area—proposals that should have been resolved at local level. He used his executive position as a Minister to interfere to suit himself and his own political ends. Of course, he is like so many other people in the Labor Party: as long as the price paid is high enough, they will accept a proposition and allow development to proceed. That is why he is no longer here. The man lacked principle of any great moment, in my experience.

It is against that background that I raise my concern in respect of the legislation. I refer to the fact that a Minister will be able to override a council where it might otherwise have been better to leave the process in place. Against that is the capacity provided in this legislation for a Minister to recommend to Cabinet and to the Governor in Executive Council that a proposal be fast-tracked, which will mean that such things as environmental impact statements may not be necessary. I do not have any difficulty with that approach

because it means the Government will accept the political responsibility and the flak and, finally, through the ballot box, any odeum or credit that may arise from such decisions. They will not be the province and responsibility of the process which is presently in the law and as it will be amended when this becomes law.

I now turn to a particular point I have tried to make many times in respect of developments in rural areas of the State outside the metropolitan area, and perhaps even within the metropolitan area from time to time. Neither this Bill nor the Act provide for developments involving a new industry, such as aquaculture. It is unfortunate that we could be making well over $1 billion a year from enterprises that we presently do not have, simply because there is no means by which they can come into existence. No pressure group is agitating for aquaculture, and there is no existing farmers' organisation of which the members are aquaculturists, whether they be people raising fin fish (vertebrates), or crustaceans, and whether indeed they are raising for sale, wetland vegetables grown in salt or fresh water.

There is no provision in any of this approach to development which ensures that such industries as could be established will ever be established. Indeed, the way in which the plan is currently being developed locks them out from the property through local government and the region to the State level: they are simply locked out of existence forever. That is a very grave deficiency in a law which prescribes too much as what might be permissible and the process by which it will come into existence. I urge those people who may have been part of the monitoring group, the people who conducted the review of the legislation, and my colleagues in Government to reconsider their attitude to approaches to development, so that such industries as we could establish but which yet do not exist are not excluded from becoming part of what people do in this State to sell to others, whether within this country or overseas. More often than not the produce to which I refer would be sold on the export market.

That is the kind of industry we desperately need in this State and in this nation, because those jobs will provide income revenue to help the right side of the balance of payments ledger, and they will also then strengthen our position as a community internationally. They are jobs which will be enduring so long as we do them well. The world population is increasing and the demand for the food that we can produce and sell to them as exports is increasing. The world population is increasing and, as world economies expand and grow, the levels of prosperity in the economies of the other countries will improve. People will want to travel here and enjoy a tourism experience, and in turn that is export revenue to us if we can attract them here with the kinds of development we can put in place to provide them with appropriate facilities. I want to illustrate the stupidity of some of the things we have in place affecting developments by reading a letter into the record about a proposed development and the way in which it has fallen on stony ground. The letter is addressed to Mr Tickner, and it states:

Dear Minister, I am a direct descendant of the Ngarrindgeri tribe.

This letter is about the development of Hindmarsh Island and the kind of things that have bedevilled it. The letter continues:

My grandfather, William McHughes, was born at Point McLeay and lived there all his life. He was a stone mason and local preacher and when he died he was buried at Point McLeay. My father, Walter McHughes, was also born at Point McLeay, but later moved to Wellington with a number of other Aboriginals to start a new life. I was born at Wellington and there were 15 in our family. We came here to Goolwa around 1946-47 and have lived here ever since. We have been the only Aboriginals that have lived here permanently since the early 1960s. I did submit a letter to Professor Saunders, explaining my background and in support of the bridge and needless to say I was very disappointed in the way you arrived at your decision. I was speaking to a fellow Aboriginal, Mr Henry Rankine, by phone last Monday and congratulated him on the successful negotiations with the Victor Harbor council about the Granite Island development.

I also remarked about the absence of any women involved. I was referring to the women's secret spiritual thing, or whatever it is called. I said wouldn't the same laws that apply for Granite Island also apply for Hindmarsh Island? Mr Rankine said no, because that was all killed when they blasted rock for the breakwater on Granite Island. I would like to point out that I have a lot of respect for Mr Rankine's opinion. I have not met Mr Doug Millera officially, but I did see and speak to him one Saturday evening in the Corio Hotel. He walked in with his right arm raised [in the black power salute] and said quite loudly, 'I have the power to stop or build the bridge.' He then introduced himself to one of the barmen.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has to question the relevance of a Federal Minister's involvement in Aboriginal affairs when the House is currently considering the State Development Plan. I do not intend any disrespect to the honourable member, but he has not directly linked the reason for reading the letter to the clauses of the Bill.

Mr LEWIS: Quite so, Sir. I put it to you, Sir, that the general thrust of the Bill and the level of public consultation which it proposes and the framework through which it would deliver that consultative process, and the way in which it would modify it to enable the Minister to have prerogative as against the kind of structure that is there at present makes it relevant to the proposed development on Hindmarsh Island and other developments that have been made or proposed to be made on other islands along the South Coast. It is in that context that I see it as a relevant illustration of the need for this legislation—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member is taking the unusual ploy of arguing essentially about what is not in the Bill rather than what is in the Bill.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I do not wish to take issue with you on that point but, notwithstanding that observation, I still believe it is relevant to the context of the debate. With your indulgence, Sir, I shall continue. The letter continues:

I have not met Mr Doug Millera officially, but I did see and speak with him one Saturday evening in the Corio Hotel. He walked in with his right arm raised and said quite loudly, 'I have the power to stop or build the bridge'. He then introduced himself to one of the barmen. I did not quite hear what he said, so I asked the barman what his name was and he replied, Doug Miller. I said no I think it's Doug Millera. I walked around the bar to where Mr Millera was standing and asked him if we were going to get a bridge, and he replied, 'I don't know.' I said to him, you came in here and said you have the power to stop or build the bridge, so are we going to get a bridge or not. He then said to me, it has been left to the women to make the decision and that I would not understand. He then asked if I was in favour of the bridge and I told him I was, because of the enormous employment it will create.

He then said to me that I didn't understand, but if a bridge is built, every pylon they drive into the river bed he would feel enormous pain going through his body, but again he said that I would not understand any of this. I don't think he realised I too was an Aboriginal. During the late 1950s I worked for the contractor who built the approaches for the existing ferry. I personally drove every pylon down into the river bed as I was on the pile driver. I never experienced any pain whatsoever while driving the pylons in and I worked there from start to finish. The old breakwater on both sides of the ferry were removed to make way for the existing ferry. When the old breakwater was removed to make way for the existing ferry, the pylons were not cut-off by axe or saws, they were blasted off by a ring of explosive wrapped around the bottom of the pile underwater. This blasting surely would have had the same effect on the

women's secret thing that killed the spirit on Granite Island. Therefore the women's spirit thing on Hindmarsh Island would also have been killed.

I would like to point out that I am very proud of my race. We cannot change what happened in the past. Mr Tickner, your decision, I feel has put a wedge between our race and the white people all over Australia. This wedge, Mr Tickner, is only at the thin edge, don't drive it in any further. A reversal of your decision will help to get rid of this wedge once and for all. I cannot understand any of this, because when Signal Point was built there was not one thing brought up about sacred sites or anything that built in 1987-88. In 1989 the plans for the Hindmarsh Island bridge were unveiled. Now almost five years down the track—

Mr QUIRKE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Could you rule on the relevance of these remarks? The honourable member has been going on now for some considerable time. I have yet to see what this has to do with anything other than the honourable member's strange views about aboriginality.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair has been considering the honourable member's remarks. They are becoming increasingly tenuous with regard to State legislation and more and more relevant to Federal legislation within the jurisdiction of Federal Minister Tickner. I ask the honourable member to conclude his remarks on this score.

Mr LEWIS: Only a sentence or two remains. The letter continues:

This is the first time, after all these years, that I have heard of any such things in or near the vicinity of the bridge. In 1990 myself and a close friend of mine, Mr Geoff Byrnes, were instrumental in getting a rock and plaque—

Mr QUIRKE: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, this is a deliberate flouting of your indulgence and the Chair. The honourable member says he has only a few sentences left. It has been made fairly clear to him that these remarks do not relate to the topic being discussed. The honourable member is abusing your good graces and that of other members to get some strange views across.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point of order is upheld. I ask the honourable member to conclude his remarks on that score.

Mr LEWIS: The member for Playford, ignorant of what public consultation involves, is racist in his outlook and does not believe that Aborigines are entitled to the same views. I think he ought to be ashamed of himself.

Mr QUIRKE: I wish to raise a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Playford will resume his seat. The member for Ridley, by virtue of his comments, is really challenging the ruling of the Chair and using the member for Playford as an instrument. The Chair has been very generous towards the honourable member with regard to his comments about Aboriginal relationships on the island and the jurisdiction of the Federal Minister, but they really are not within the bounds of the State Minister's jurisdiction. Therefore, I ask the honourable member to show respect both to the member for Playford and to the Chair and to continue in a different vein.

Mr QUIRKE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I also ask that the slur that I am a racist be unreservedly withdrawn. I believe it is unparliamentary.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes. I ask the member for Ridley to withdraw the racist comment. There was nothing racist in the point of order drawn by the member for Playford. It would be in the best interests of the House and of the member for Ridley if he withdrew that particular comment. I ask the honourable member to do that.

Mr LEWIS: If the member for Playford withdraws the insinuations about my mentality—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not offering the member for Ridley any qualification: I am simply asking him to withdraw the racist allegations.

Mr LEWIS: I have no wish to do so unless you require the member for Playford to withdraw the reflections that he made on me.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Ridley leaves the Chair with no option but to name him. The member is not challenging the member for Playford: he is challenging the Chair. As such, he leaves the Chair no option. The Chair has ruled that the point of order was valid. The member for Playford made no racist comment and there were no racist overtones. He simply felt, as a member of this House, that the member for Ridley was using the debate as a vehicle for a certain line of debate which was not relevant to the Bill. The Chair has upheld that point of order and the Chair simply asks the member for Ridley, without qualification, to withdraw the racist allegation against the member for Playford. That is all, and I ask you to do that.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I withdraw. I have a point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. If I call on the Minister—

Mr LEWIS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I have a point of order. I ask that the member for Playford withdraw the imputation about my reputation.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member may well have a valid point of order, but the Standing Orders of the House, which the member had a part in compiling, after all, require that a point of order be taken immediately the offence is detected. In those circumstances, however valid the point of order may be, the Chair cannot accede to the member's request to make that call.

Mr LEWIS: In deference to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, is not this the first opportunity that I have had to respond to the remark made by the member for Playford during the course of the point of order that he took against me?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No. The member for Ridley in fact resumed debate and concluded by again returning to the subject matter of his letter. I believe the point that the member for Ridley made was at that stage. I am sorry, but I rule that the time for taking a point of order has passed. I ask the Minister to close the debate if there are no other speakers.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD (Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations): I am pleased to get back to the debate. I believe that this is one of the most important Bills to have come before the House for some time. Members may recall that in 1993, when the original Bill came before the House to create the Development Act, there was a vigorous and long debate. I must say that I am disappointed with the contribution by the Labor Party towards what is really one of the most important Bills that we have debated for some time. The Development Act is about the development and development potential of this State. I recall that my speech in 1993 lasted two hours. Members might say that two hours is a long time to speak, but I was the lead speaker for the Opposition at that time. It took me many weeks to write that speech, but I took the time to spell out a direction for development in the State and support for the change which had to take place. It is some time ago now, but I think that there were about 80 amend-

ments. I appreciate that the Labor Party in government at the time did not on principle accept many of those amendments.

However, we had discussion between the two Parties, because we realised that there had to be a bipartisan approach to where we were going with development and that, if we did not have that bipartisan approach, development would not get off the ground. We had that bipartisan discussion and ended up with a Development Act which has now been in place since 1993. When that Act went through it was always recognised that within a year or so there would have to be a review. I undertook a review of the Act because, by sheer luck, the people of South Australia changed the Government in this State, but there was still this recognition that we would amend the Act. To assist this process I set up a review panel of experts on development in this State. They received approximately 100 submissions from industry groups, Government agencies, local government and the public, 35 of which were on the Act itself. We went through the process and received a paper which reflected what the industry wanted by way of change.

The member for Napier, the only speaker for the Labor Party in this debate, said that the development industry was still uncertain and that the new legislation that we are proposing does not create any certainty for developers. I must say that the developers had a major input into this legislation. In fact, it was at the suggestion of many developers that we formulated these amendments. Therefore, it is not accurate to say that the developers were looking for certainty and that they did not get it in this legislation.

It appears that the very flimsy contribution this time round by the Opposition—in this instance the Labor Party—ran on three lines. The first was its obsession with the notion that we are putting too much power in the hands of the Minister. I shall be very happy to analyse that statement as we go through the Bill clause by clause. The second point was that we have not done anything about improving consultation in the Act to which the Bill refers. I suppose we had an opportunity to remove the category 2 notification in the Act if we had wanted to do so, but we chose not to do that: we have left consultation in the Act. It is not right to criticise the consultation process. In fact, everything that is in the Act regarding consultation was put in by the Labor Party, and we have left it there.

The new Bill creates certainty. It means that if we are genuine about wanting development in this State—and I thought that everyone in this Chamber would support us in wanting development to take place—we must create a process whereby it can happen. Development equals jobs, equals progress, equals the State going ahead. The Government should not be denied the opportunity of bringing in these changes to the Act. If the Opposition were not playing petty Party politics this afternoon and would get behind these amendments, we would get some progress in the State. We cannot in 1995 continue to erect walls around South Australia and think that the rest of the country is not watching us. The Opposition, by objecting to these proposals, which are simple, sensible and straightforward and will bring certainty into the system, is once again putting up walls around South Australia and saying to the rest of the world, 'We don't want to do business with you. If you have an idea, for God's sake, don't come near South Australia, because the Labor Party will make sure that you don't get your idea up and we won't create jobs.'

The trade union movement is about the creation of jobs and looking after its workers and those who have families to support. I would have thought that the Labor Party would actually embrace these amendments and say that they provide an opportunity for a developer or proponent who comes to this State with finance to invest. We need to create a situation of predicability so that the planning process will not appear, as it will if these amendments do not get through, as another brick wall. We will have developers coming to South Australia saying it is too hard. We have an opportunity through the Bill to put in the Act a series of amendments which will send a clear message to would-be investors in this State that we want to do business with them, that we are making it easy, and that we are still having the checks and balances.

The honourable member referred to the call-in powers, but it is important to realise that the call-in powers save time. The application still has to go before the Development Commission, but we do save time. As we go through the various clauses I will also demonstrate how we can save time and provide predicability. I am bitterly disappointed with the attitude of the Opposition. I hope that, before the Bill gets to another place, the Opposition has had an opportunity to realise the message it is sending out to would-be investors in this State. I hope that someone in the trade union movement realises that there is an opportunity to open up South Australia and make it part of the world and part of the rest of this country so that developers and people with capital to invest will not be frightened away because of this 1970s and 1980s attitude of the Labor Party. I commend the Bill to the House and look forward to the Committee stage.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I am not too sure whether or not I am confused, but after hearing the second reading contribution of the honourable member opposite and her objections to various clauses, and now that we have passed all the clauses, I can only hope that, when the matter goes to another House, we receive as much support there as we did here. The Bill is all about the future of the State and predicability in development. On that ground, I believe it is one of the most important Bills that we have had before us for many years. I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SGIC (SALE) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 2390.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): The Opposition basically supports this legislation but I want to make a few remarks on the record. In the first place, if we have a look at the historical record of SGIC, we see that it is now about 23 years old. The environment in the early 1970s in South Australia was a very different environment from that of the mid 1990s. The atmosphere in which SGIC was created, namely, one in which there was very little insurance competition, meant that it prevailed in all sorts of areas. Initially, SGIC was involved with household insurance and compulsory third party insurance, although at that time the nature of CTP was somewhat different in that a person would nominate, when

they went to renew their registration, which of the insurance companies they were doing business with. The central issue in the early 1970s was the lack of competition regarding a whole range of insurance products.

The SGIC would, between 1972 and 1977-78, move into a range of other insurance products. In 1987 it moved into the health insurance field as well. There is no doubt that the environment we are now in sees healthy competition in a whole range of insurance product not only here in South Australia but in all the other States. I do not believe it is SGIC that has managed to do that, although in the early days of SGIC I think it did engender competition among the insurance pack in South Australia, but those days are now long gone.

The competition we find today in insurance is very much to the benefit of the consumer. The SGIC, which was determined as the Government insurance agency in the early 1970s, is no longer relevant as a Government owned enterprise in the 1990s. As a consequence, we support the thrust of this legislation, which is the primary vehicle to split this into a non-saleable package of insurance liabilities and obligations which shall remain within Government ownership with the creation of a new entity which will have within it all the items that can be sold off. The Opposition does not believe that public ownership of this enterprise is warranted in the 1990s. I could go on at great length (but I will not because of the lateness of the hour) about the fact that SGIC can be rightly said to have lost its way in the 1980s.

Indeed, we now have a situation where a number of unfortunate decisions have taken place which in many respects have destroyed the image that those who created SGIC in the 1970s saw as the direction in which that enterprise should go. It would be appropriate now to comment on the creation of these two new entities, because SGIC is to be split, to form the Motor Insurance Commission, which will include the compulsory third party area as its main component. All those assets—impaired assets or accounts, or whatever one wants to call them—that are not readily packaged are included in the other entity for sale.

The other entity is to be called Newco. I do not know who dreamed up these names, but I want to tell the Deputy Premier that these are the worst names I have seen for any new enterprises. 'Newco' and 'Moco' are the acronyms for these new enterprises and I am surprised by these names. I accept that BankSA was not a bad name with which to move on from the old State Bank and dress it up with a new name, although it cost a bit of money, but at least it is a decent name. I do not know that many people will be running to buy an insurance policy from Newco, and similarly people might not be so happy about Moco. Whoever is responsible for these names has a bit to be responsible for, although I hope that person is not present in the House and is not offended by my remarks but, when people go to renew their policy with Newco, they will know what I mean.

The Labor Caucus has discussed the Bill. My Caucus is very strong on the question of gender balance for the Moco board. I notice in the legislation that the board shall consist of at least three persons appointed by the Governor but it can be up to 10 persons. The Labor Caucus has determined that at least four of those positions should be of each gender and, before members scream about that, I will be moving my usual amendment to achieve equal gender representation on the board. Caucus thought it was a fixed board of 10 positions, but it is not. It is to be up to 10 positions and, as a consequence, I want the Deputy Premier to note our argument that at least 40 per cent of each gender should be on the board. In Committee I will be moving an amendment that ought to be circulating under my name now, but I will make sure it is on file so that we can achieve gender balance on the new Moco board.

The Opposition's other concern relates to the future of compulsory third party insurance. This morning I told Caucus that the Government had seen sense and was not seeking to sell off CTP. I sat here for four years before the election and saw one motion after another, usually starting in another place, talking about how wonderful it would be to break SGIC's compulsory third party (CTP) monopoly and how all the other insurance companies ought to have a piece of the action. Of course, not all of them were as interested in it in 1975 when it became an SGIC prerogative as they are today. In 1975 we had a queue of insurance companies wishing to leave CTP in South Australia and go into any other insurance business. The situation has changed now for a variety of reasons. It is now an extremely profitable business but it is also an extremely important business for the residents of South Australia. It is important that the current price of CTP insurance remain at one of or the lowest levels in Australia.

As a result of this concern we have examined the legislation closely and sought legal advice on this point. In Committee, I will be asking the Deputy Premier about CTP. We believe that to divest Moco of that part of its business—the CTP area—a further Bill will have to be introduced, and at that point we will debate the position to ensure that CTP remains a monopoly within the Government sector in South Australia. I am not arguing about potential private management arrangements for CTP or any other parts of Moco. What I am saying is that from my understanding of the Bill compulsory third party insurance will remain part of the Government sector for some years to come. As to the newly created Newco and the transfer of various assets to that enterprise, the time frame for any transfer of CTP will have expired and it is the view of the Opposition and our legal expertise that another Bill will be necessary to split CTP from Moco and sell it as a privatised enterprise.

In a general sense this legislation does not come as a surprise to the Opposition. Indeed, we have been expecting the Bill providing for the sale of SGIC. We presume it will be a trade sale of SGIC or those assets which can be parcelled up under Newco. I do not want to delay the House any further. The amendment we will be moving in Committee is to schedule 1.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I thank the member for Playford for his support. SGIC has had an interesting history. It was a product of the Dunstan era and it was probably not one of the worst experiments undertaken in South Australia. We have heard various details of why it was necessary to introduce some form of competition in that area of the marketplace. If I went back into history I could say that I had extreme reservations about SGIC at the time because I did not believe that the Government's running insurance companies *per se* was appropriate. People can refer to the 1970s and 1980s and say that I was wrong, but it was only in the late 1980s that we had a disaster on our hands. If we look at SGIC's assets and associated losses—for example, 333 Collins Street—SGIC's level of disaster was greater than that of the State Bank. However, that is now history, but it is history from which we should learn. When we came—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The member for Spence is quite unwelcome to the debate but nevertheless we have to put up with him.

Mr Atkinson: I've missed you.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I have not missed you. I will not spend a lot of time on the background, because it is part of the record now of how mistakes are made and how governments become lax in the scrutiny of their enterprises. I can assure the House that whatever enterprises this Government is running they will be run under strict financial and auditing control and will be made responsible and accountable for their actions. Any mistakes would be made only after a number of eyes have scrutinised the details of the various propositions to ensure they are advanced in the best of faith, with the best of goodwill and for good economic and social outcomes. The mistake of the 1970s and 1980s was that people lost sight of the fact that there was an ultimate responsibility to the taxpayers and, because the responsibility of Government was not exercised in terms of the way that the management and operations of SGIC were scrutinised, despite numerous questions, the results were there for everyone to see. We are cleaning up SGIC and virtually splitting it into two companies, one of which will contain the CTP and those areas of liability which we believe have to be managed away from the SGIC. The other company will have the strong, solid, good money earning assets of SGIC. That is appropriate; the way we are handling SGIC is the same way we have handled the Bank of South Australia.

There are a number of issues involved. An enterprise agreement has been made with the staff, and that agreement has been signed off by the union and all the employees, so the member for Playford can take some heart from the fact that there is basic agreement on the terms and conditions of employment. It contains some provisions which protect the interests of the employees when the new company is sold, to the extent that, for example, if their services are not required, proper packages are in place. But, we would wish that SGIC, which has been more finely tuned and more profit oriented since we came to Government, will continue to be a very strong performer in the marketplace in all its endeavours and that we will see that entity in its modified form continuing effectively to serve the South Australian public under different ownership.

I appreciate the Opposition's support for this measure. I have made a statement about the guarantees and how long they should last. We would wish to reassure anyone who believes that there is any element of concern about guarantees and indemnities on life policies, for example, that they will be unduly penalised in terms of ownership, because the fact is that any new company would have to comply with the ISC requirements and be monitored properly to ensure that it is appropriately capitalised and has sufficient reserves. That should provide more than enough comfort for those people who have policies with SGIC. Although the amount we receive for SGIC may not be as large as for some of the other assets we are selling, we believe it is a very marketable proposition. It has some real strengths in South Australia with which, with an injection of new blood, we might expect it to achieve even greater heights than has been the case to date.

I note the member for Playford's reference to the CTP fund. For obvious reasons we will be assessing that matter much further down the track. I feel that he appreciates the steps we have taken to take CTP out of the general business. In New South Wales, for example, we have noted some experience which we would not wish to be repeated here in South Australia, and Victoria has had a rethink on the part to be played by compulsory third party insurance and whether it should remain in the hands of Government or provided to other insurance companies in a competitive market. We believe that a bit of time and more scrutiny of the marketplace will allow us to take those decisions in a more comfortable fashion than is possible today.

As the honourable member would appreciate, whilst we could have received a far greater price by having CTP bundled up with SGIC, the fact remains that we have the best interests of South Australians, the motorists, at heart—those who have benefited from very low premiums in comparison with some of the other States and a pretty well-run CTP fund in recent years. We wish to preserve that relationship so that we stay beneficiaries of it. We are aiming at being a low cost State in every area so that business comes to South Australia. Even in this area we have an advantage, and it would be crazy to throw away that advantage simply to get a better price by including the CTP fund in the SGIC sale. I thank the honourable member for his contribution to this debate. If we had revisited some of the arguments of the past it could have become quite hectic, but we all understand that we must move on. I believe that we are moving on very constructively in this regard.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 36 passed.

Schedule 1.

Mr QUIRKE: I move:

Page 20, line 1—Leave out paragraph (g) and insert:

(g) by striking out section 6(3) and substituting:

(3) At least one of the directors must be a man and at least one must be a woman.

The Bill provides for the creation of a board of up to 10 persons, of whom three will be nominated by the Governor. My Caucus thought that at the very least four ought to be of the female gender and four of the male gender. Having looked closely at the legislation, I see that it provides for 'up to 10' members, so I cannot move an amendment that requires four females with respect to that, because if I did it may be a board of only three persons. I hope the Deputy Premier takes on board the spirit with which my Caucus determined this issue and its view that approximately 40 per cent of each gender should be represented on the board. What we believe is the minimum position and what we will be insisting on either here or in the other place is what I would call our usual amendment ensuring gender balance on the issue.

I must say also that previously I have always found the Deputy Premier to be a most reasonable person. In fact, I have noticed on a few occasions that he has even introduced Bills with that requirement, and that has saved me the work of getting Parliamentary Counsel to draft an amendment. With those remarks, I will hand over to the Deputy Premier to let me know how my amendment is going.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: As the member would be aware, the SGIC Board that is in place would go over to the new company, and we would have the old company which we will be running through the AMTF. We do have a woman on the AMTF, and I am more than happy to accommodate this amendment. It would have been more difficult if we had been dealing with the board of the new company where people are already in place, compared with the CTP which will remain with government. The way this is being treated is consistent with the honourable member's amendment, so it causes us no

difficulty whatsoever and we are more than happy to agree to the amendment.

Amendment carried; schedule as amended passed.

Remaining schedules (2 to 5) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

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

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr BECKER (Peake): It is not very often that one has the opportunity to speak in a grievance debate twice in one day. I wish I was aware earlier this afternoon that I would have the opportunity to speak for a further 10 minutes, because I had to be very selective in the comments I read from the speech of the President of the Adelaide Croatian Club that he delivered last Saturday evening. The point was that he felt his people and the Croatian community were being maligned by irresponsible press reports following the national soccer league grand final played at Hindmarsh Stadium.

He was very annoyed that the community was not contacted and given the opportunity to comment. A closer check of the facts would have revealed that the Croatian community is a very proud group of people. They have many clubs within the organisation and a very successful soccer club of their own that has won just about every championship, every cup and every title that can be won. It is high time that the Australian people, and particularly the Australian media, appreciated what the ethnic groups within our community are doing and contributing to our community—and, more importantly, the pride they have in their new country. I can assure all members that the Croatians in South Australia would not do anything to destroy the reputation they have jealously built up amongst the Australian community. Of course, many now are well and truly settled within the community, particularly the younger ones, and they are very proud Australians.

I was also disappointed to read in *The City* Messenger today, on page 9, an article headed 'City's $500 000 river clean-up bill.' As all members are aware, the Government has at long last brought in legislation and established a Torrens River Catchment Board, as well as one for the Patawalonga, and we are now progressing quite rapidly with a program of cleaning up the rivers that run into our very popular beaches in this city. For over 25 years we have complained about the condition of the Patawalonga and of the creeks that feed into the Patawalonga system and the upper reaches of the Patawalonga, namely the Keswick, Brownhill and Sturt creeks. The big problem has been to get local government and the State Government to ascertain where the rubbish and pollution came from and to get somebody to accept the liability and responsibility for cleaning up that waterway.

The same problems exist with the Torrens River, which carries quite a large volume of water. I think people would be surprised at the amount of water that comes through the Torrens system. It flows through the city and adds to the attractiveness and beauty of the city of Adelaide. Of course, the Adelaide City Council would be very concerned. In her article, Mary Wynne states:

> As Adelaide straddles both catchment zones, its ratepayers in the Torrens River stormwater catchment area will contribute $413 800, while those in the Patawalonga zone will contribute $82 000. This means a $39 average bill for ratepayers in the Torrens catchment and $19 for those in the Patawalonga catchment zone.

I have raised this issue with the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. I live in the Patawalonga catchment area, and $19 on average will not upset many of the residents particularly in Glenelg or Glenelg north. However, the $39 average bill, if this is correct, will certainly upset my constituents who live in Thebarton, Torrensville, Flinders Park, Lockleys and Fulham.

Many residents will be absolutely furious if they are charged an average of $39. The Minister was quick to assure me that that will not be the case. In fact, he said that in some areas it may be as low as $12 or $13 and certainly nowhere near $39. This is an indication of the mischievousness that is created by reporters who do not fully check the facts with the Minister and who attribute articles to other people who are presently hell bent on sabotaging the operations of this Government. This Government has a most responsible attitude and has a most responsible approach towards the State's finances and its responsibilities in respect of the environment, health, education and other services required by the people; and it is managing them in a way the public can afford.

Whilst some people are jumping up and down and a few complain about so-called cut backs in the areas of education and health, it was the previous Government that over-staffed most Government operations. The previous Government realised it had over-staffed and was irresponsible in its economic management of this State and that there had to be cut backs. It started those cut backs, but we are continuing to bring about economic rationalisation and better management. That is not done without upsetting one or two people who have nice, cosy little niches in the bureaucracy of this State. I found out that, after almost 20 years of looking at the public accounts of this State, accountability has improved markedly.

In the early days of the 1970s and during that glorious Dunstan era—which we had brought to our attention again this morning—it was all very well to let the people have their heads when you had control of the taxpayers' purse. The attitude was spend and do not worry about settlement day—as the Federal Government is carrying on at the present moment. One has only to ask and, within reason, one will get it from the Federal Government. But there does come a day of settlement; there does come a day when someone says, 'Whoa, that cannot continue.' Dunstan knows jolly well, as does anyone else, that one must be responsible and that one must apply sensible economics to rein in the excesses, which certainly happened in the 1970s, the 1980s and part of the 1990s.

We are starting to get there, but it has taken 25 years to convince Governments about the pollution of the Torrens River and the Patawalonga. I commend the Liberal Government for accepting that responsibility and for getting on and doing something about it, even though some of the moneys are provided by the Federal Government. We are at least ensuring now that young people today and the people of the future in the western suburbs can look forward to a better balanced environment along our very popular and safe

beaches. It is just a pity that we could not settle the problem with the Glenelg North sewage treatment works.

It is all very well to say that there is a terrible odour hanging over Adelaide, but I believe the treatment works have contributed to that. For the past 18 months to two years a problem has existed at the treatment works with one of the digesters, and the Engineering and Water Supply Department has not been able to rectify the situation. It can only be described as an atrocious smell. I appeal to the Minister, as I have done on many occasions, to rectify that situation. If we extend the runway, clean up the Patawalonga, improve the beaches and enhance our environment, one big problem remains—the sewage treatment works. That problem must be rectified as soon as possible because it makes living conditions in that area extremely difficult at the present moment.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I return to my earlier remarks and the information that was provided to people who attended a meeting yesterday in relation to the Flinders Medical Centre.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: We have heard from the honourable member. I will put some other things and then talk about the honourable member's position. I return to the information given by the Admission Office staff of Flinders Medical Centre. The first set of information I gave earlier related to the effects on patient waiting lists, closures of surgery, and the issue of telling patients a second or third time that their operation has been cancelled. I refer to another section headed 'Effects of budget cuts on the Admission Office staff', which states:

> Like all departments at FMC we are faced with trimming 15 per cent from our budget. For many months we have been unable to use a casual to cover sick and annual leave. We are a small office expected to keep up with all the continuing ward changes and closures during this time of crisis. Cancellations make twice as much work as doctors need to be notified their patients did not get a bed and a new date needs to be obtained (if possible) and the patient in turn needs to be notified a second and sometimes a third time. Because of patients arriving at 7 a.m. to Surgical Reception and the number of day and short stay patients being admitted—the Admissions Office can admit 25—30 patients before 8.45 a.m. Thus requiring more staff early leaving less to cope at the end of the day. One staff member—

Mr CAUDELL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I understand Standing Orders are such that a member is not supposed to read from a written speech and is allowed only to use notes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth clearly indicated to the House that she was going to quote from a statement made by others. Therefore, she is not speaking from her personally prepared speech.

Ms STEVENS: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I will go on quoting from the information that was provided to us at the meeting.

Mr CAUDELL: Mr Deputy Speaker, the member for Elizabeth says that she is quoting from prepared speeches given at that meeting. I was at that meeting as well. I have a bit of a conflict in the fact that—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member can have a conflict, but he does not have a point of order. The member for Elizabeth.

Ms STEVENS: Democracy is an interesting process. I will continue from where I left off:

> One staff member is working up to two hours longer most days to cover. Office budgets have not been increased to cover staff wage increases. How can a department come in on budget if the budget does not even cover normal working hour wages? Staff are anxious about their jobs, asking, 'Will I be the one asked to go?'
>
> Morale is at rock bottom. Working understaffed with an extra stressful workload is taking its toll. Three of the admission staff are long-term employees of FMC, two with 19 years of service and one with 13 years. To see the hospital running down as it is and patients being treated so badly is distressing. Areas now have to clean their own departments, vacuum, dust and empty rubbish as cleaning has been cut so much there is not the staff available to clean office areas.
>
> FMC used to be a nice place to work. We need more funding from the Government so staff will once again enjoy coming to work and patients will be treated as they should be.

Most people at the meeting were greatly concerned about the extent of the run-down at Flinders Medical Centre. For many months now we have been hearing about dollars, beds and wards, but the description of what was happening at that hospital, as given by the people there, really drove it home to us.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: It is interesting that the member for Mitchell should continue to interject and try to distract me. I want to talk particularly about the member for Mitchell and that meeting. I arrived about 10 or 15 minutes late at that meeting because I was held up when leaving Elizabeth. However, the member for Mitchell arrived a good 15 to 20 minutes later than I did. He missed quite a substantial part of the information that had been given to the group. The interesting thing was that the members for Reynell and Elder, and also the Federal candidate for Boothby, got there on time, listened to what was said and stayed until the end of the meeting.

Mr CAUDELL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The member for Elizabeth is casting aspersions on me associated with the fact that I turned up late. As the member for Elizabeth is aware, I offered an apology for not getting there until that particular time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Ms STEVENS: Another interesting thing is that, before leaving to go to another appointment, the member for Mitchell assured the people at that meeting that he would relay their concerns to the Minister.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: I cannot remember word for word the tirade of the member for Mitchell, which was of about 10 minutes' duration. However, it was along the lines that he would relay the concerns of the group to the Minister and ask him to look with compassion—the word 'compassion' was used by the member for Mitchell—at the situation at Flinders Medical Centre.

Mr CAUDELL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The member for Elizabeth is quoting things that I said which in actual fact I did not say.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr CAUDELL: The honourable member is totally misrepresenting the situation.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth is in fact attributing compassion, which is certainly something not worthy of a point of order.

Ms STEVENS: I am surprised that the member for Mitchell is concerned that I would have misrepresented compassion. However, that being said, let me continue. The member for Mitchell indicated to the group that he would talk to the Minister, relay concerns and ask the Minister to consider Flinders Medical Centre with compassion. He walked out of the meeting and said the same thing to the assembled media: 'Yes, I am concerned; yes, I will talk to the

Minister; yes, I will ask him to look at Flinders Medical Centre with compassion.' Today, he came into this House at Question Time and came out not with compassion but with a question insinuating that most of the information given at that meeting was false—

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: The member for Mitchell says he was not insinuating. He was saying point blank that the information was false and it was a set-up, enabling the Minister to come out and deny all this stuff that has been happening at Flinders over the past six or seven months, but particularly recently. The interesting thing about the member for Mitchell is his complete hypocrisy. To the assembled media and on ABC TV he is this concerned person: when he was in the House today he did exactly the opposite.

Mr CAUDELL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The member for Elizabeth called me a hypocrite and I find those comments uncomplimentary.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order; the term has been used on several occasions today.

Ms STEVENS: I am actually stunned at the hypocrisy displayed by the member for Mitchell in saying one thing to a group of people to their face, and saying it to the media, and then marching in here and saying exactly the opposite.

Motion carried.

At 6.8 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 31 May at 2 p.m.