HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 12 October 1995

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

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MAIN NORTH ROAD

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): I move:

That the twelfth report of the committee on the Main North Road upgrade be noted.

The Department of Transport has referred to the Public Works Committee the Main North Road upgrade project under the terms of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. The department proposes a $21.2 million expansion and upgrade of a section of the Main North Road as part of its ongoing responsibilities for the development of an arterial road network. The committee has heard detailed evidence of the department's long-term road network strategy and is familiar with the context of the Main North Road proposal. The committee is satisfied that the proposal at hand is beneficial to road users and is appropriate both in terms of its priority and its position in the overall road network strategy.

The proposed works are funded entirely by the Federal Government with the planning, construction and supervision of the project conducted by the State Department of Transport. The long-term strategy for development of the arterial road network between Gepps Cross and Gawler was outlined in the 1985 Department of Transport report, 'The northern area study'. The study examined a number of options to cater for long-term needs for arterial traffic movements in and through the area ranging from a freeway east of Main North Road to expressways along either Martins Road or Main North Road to major widening on many of the existing arterial roads.

The Main North Road concept is endorsed by the committee because its investigation has revealed that when compared with all the other options it will provide the least impact on the environment, it will have a lower overall cost as part of the infrastructure that already exists, and its implementation could be staged very effectively. If conditions changed in the future, the proposal could be varied without jeopardising the network strategy. This option has been supported by the councils of Munno Para, Elizabeth and Salisbury, and has subsequently been incorporated into the proposals for the planning strategy for metropolitan Adelaide and the northern Adelaide Plain.

These broad planning studies have clarified the future directions for planning in the northern metropolitan area and require the construction of appropriate roadways. The committee believes that the Main North Road upgrading conforms with these directions. This option envisaged the ultimate development of Main North Road as a six-lane standard road with minimal direct access, minimal road junctions and grade separation at selected major arterial road intersections. This concept has been used as a basis for a staged upgrading of the section considered in this report. The department provided evidence to the committee that a subsequent examination in 1991 of the programming strategy for the upgrading concluded:

Main North Road south of Elizabeth is approaching capacity in the peak period. A six lane cross section will be required to satisfy present and future traffic demands. The highest priority for improvement is between John Rice Avenue at Elizabeth and Montague Road, Pooraka, and improvements should commence by the mid-1990s and should be designed to address access and safety problems as well as catering for the required capacity.

The committee is of the opinion that the project will provide increased traffic capacity, overcome some specific black spot locations and improve the gateway to Adelaide from the north. This will improve traffic movements by reducing delay and assist economic development in the region. The Main North Road is part of the Adelaide to Sydney national highway link and is a major link between such centres as the proposed MFP, Technology Park, University of South Australia, Elizabeth Regional Centre and other major centres at Munno Para and Gawler.

The committee finds that the upgrading of Main North Road as proposed is consistent with the goals and objectives outlined in the Metropolitan Planning Review. I remind members that this section of Main North Road is amongst the most highly trafficked four-lane arterial roads in the urban area. Travel along it is congested at peak periods and is hazardous for cyclists, it provides a poor level of service for interstate and intrastate freight and passenger movements and has facilities totally inconsistent with national highway standards and objectives. The committee considers that the addition of a third traffic lane and cycle lane in each direction, a pedestrian overpass at Malinya Drive, improved landscaping and changes to access to improve safety will provide a road corridor to cater for expected traffic increases well beyond the year 2000 with significant improvements for motorists, pedestrians, cyclists and users of public transport.

In recommending this project, the committee accepts that the direct economic benefits of the proposal will derive from reduced travel times, resulting from smoother traffic flow and less delay at intersections; reduced vehicle operating costs due to reduced wear and tear on vehicles, and reduced fuel consumption; and reduced road accident costs. Benefits derived from reduced travel times and reduced fuel consumption for both commercial and commuter trips should be significant, and other benefits will include support to the economic development of the State and improvement of environmental amenity, including reduced fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions resulting from reduced traffic congestion. As I have already stated, all funds for this project—both capital and recurrent—are to be provided from the Federal Government under national highway funding.

The committee has examined evidence that the first two stages of this project, Hogarth Road to the Grove Way and the Grove Way to Kings Road have been subject to an extensive community consultation program involving the three relevant local councils, local businesses and residents, and accepts that concerns expressed regarding the project were addressed and generally resolved satisfactorily to all parties. Several land acquisition and access matters are currently being negotiated with owners and the committee has requested written updates from the department on the progress and outcome of these negotiations. Although some trees and vegetation will need to be removed, the impact of this will be relatively minor and the overall character and appearance of the road will remain, if not be improved.

The need to improve safety and provide a major highway appropriate to national highway conditions inevitably results in some reduced accessibility to people living along this road. The evidence indicates that the major concerns of residents

and businesses have been overcome through provision of alternative access arrangements.

The committee is satisfied with the evidence provided by the Department of Transport, and notes that the department has adequately responded to further inquiries by committee members, including a specific question on the provision of access to the Salisbury Heights Primary School. As a safeguard, the committee requires the department to provide six-monthly written updates on the project incorporating the results of negotiations relating to property acquisition and the provision of access.

In conclusion, pursuant to the Parliamentary Committees Act, the Public Works Committee recommends this stage of the Main North Road upgrade project to Parliament.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I support wholeheartedly the comments made by the Chairman of the committee. As a commuter on that road every day, I can certainly vouch for the need for its upgrade. As the main route to Elizabeth and to other areas further out, it is badly in need of this upgrade. We acknowledge and are pleased to receive Federal funding for the road work and look forward to its completion. Work is under way at the moment. Some of the trees have been removed, which certainly makes a difference, and there have been some lane closures as the work begins. I look forward to the completion of the road and to seeing new trees planted.

I was pleased to hear that the concerns particularly of the Salisbury Heights Primary School in relation to parking and access will be addressed through the construction of an overpass, as well as providing extra parking areas and a way in which the parents involved can turn on Main North Road and drive north. I was also pleased to see that lights will be installed at the Black Top Road and Main North Road intersection, which for a long time has been a very dangerous right-hand turn off Main North road to the east. I support this report wholeheartedly and look forward to a brand new road comprising three lanes each way.

Mr KERIN (Frome): I endorse the comments of the Chairman of the committee and the member for Elizabeth concerning the Main North Road upgrade. It is certainly an overdue and worthwhile initiative and, no doubt, will be welcomed by the many commuters who travel daily along the route. I point out that benefits will also accrue to constituents living in the eastern section of the Frome electorate as well as constituents of Light, Custance and Chaffey. In recent years we have seen terrific improvement to the entrance to the city from Port Wakefield, and this has cut the time taken by motorists travelling from that direction. This latest development will increase safety and reduce the time involved for people travelling to the city from regions to the north and north-east. I support the project.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: DARLINGTON POLICE COMPLEX

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): I move:

That the thirteenth report of the committee on the new Darlington police complex development be noted.

The Police Department and the South Australian Government propose to spend approximately $10 million on replacing the current Darlington police complex. Under the terms of the Parliamentary Committees Act, this level of public expenditure requires the project to be examined by the Public Works Committee.

The department proposes to construct a replacement complex on the area known as Laffer's Triangle. The Darlington complex was constructed in 1963 comprising a police station, courthouse, cells, garages, adjacent residence and a two-storey building for single men's quarters. In 1973 the introduction of 'sector' policing required the establishment of a major policing base at Darlington in line with regional metropolitan strategies. This form of policing concentrated a range of police functions in the one location to enable the efficient delivery of services. The available accommodation on the site was quickly committed, and expansion was achieved by conversion of the living accommodation to offices and the rental of a vacated Highways Department building in adjacent Sargent Avenue. In the mid-1970s accommodation was augmented with the introduction of several DEMAC transportable buildings, and in 1986 the court was converted for police use.

The current buildings are located on two separate sites either side of a public road with numerous access points, making security a very real problem. Because of their age and temporary nature, these buildings do not provide accommodation of a suitable standard to support modern policing. The existing cell facility is inadequate and does not conform to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Deaths in Custody standards because the facility is located in a building separate from the police station so that proper surveillance cannot be achieved; the old style cell and exercise areas provide risks to prisoners, despite attempts to modify them; and interview facilities are lacking.

The introduction and implementation of the metropolitan policing plan in 1986 confirmed the need to consolidate specialist and support expertise at Darlington. This, together with steady growth in police workloads, has seen a significant police presence emerge. The problems evident at Darlington were further confirmed in the department's 1994 accommodation strategic plan.

Accordingly, the requirement for a replacement complex was listed on the department's forward capital works program and was planned to proceed in 1995-96. The announcement in March 1995 by this Government that work would commence on the Southern Expressway has hastened the need to proceed with the replacement of the Darlington police complex. But I stress to members that the need for a replacement facility at Darlington does not in any way depend on the expressway going ahead.

The committee heard evidence that the following options to deal with the current situation were examined. First, redevelopment on the remaining site: this was rejected on the grounds that it was an inferior site with particularly poor access and egress for both police and the public; the available site area was not large enough to support the required building and associated car parking; the completion of the Southern Expressway will render the site relatively isolated between two major road systems; it will be difficult to create reasonable working conditions because of noise from the proximity of the roads; and redevelopment of the existing site will require a staged approach which will be prohibitive in terms of time and cost.

The second option was to relocate all or some functions at Darlington to temporary accommodation pending completion of a new complex by traditional means. The committee agrees that this option should be rejected, on the grounds that severe disruption of operations would occur and considerable

costs would arise associated with temporary leasing and fit-out costs of between $300 000 and $400 000. Staff expressed considerable concern about this option.

Thirdly, to fast track the replacement building construction program to ensure completion by June 1996: evidence provided to the committee confirmed the feasibility of proceeding on this basis. This option provides the most direct and cost-efficient solution and, accordingly, the committee endorses the proposal to proceed with a fast track construction program. This option avoids temporary accommodation costs; ensures all staff receive the benefit of appropriate accommodation at the earliest time; reduces public difficulty in obtaining police services by virtue of a new prominent police facility; and minimises disruption to police operations.

The committee believes this will consolidate functions directly associated with Southern Command Police operations and assist in achieving a reduction in unsuitable accommodation. The new site is at Sturt Road, Bedford Park. It occupies an area of 1.2 hectares and has a frontage of 100 metres. It is bounded by Sturt Road, the Department of Transport works depot, Hugh Cairns Avenue and vacant land owned by the Technology Development Corporation. The site was acquired from the Technology Development Corporation (MFP Australia) and is owned by the Minister for Emergency Services. The committee considers this land the most appropriate site for a high profile police presence within the Darlington region.

The new facility, which the committee recommends, will not only accommodate functions currently operating from Darlington but also use the opportunity to accommodate functions from other areas in accordance with a strategy to reduce overall departmental accommodation costs and decentralise police operations. The new facility will accommodate 386 staff members and provide benefits through consolidation, collocation and improved management control, and provide a standard of accommodation and space allocation which meets the Government office accommodation guidelines.

The proposed accommodation will provide the following: a modern purpose-built police complex, reflecting a greater focus for the public and the provision of police services; secure and safe accommodation for police and prisoners; special child interview facilities for child abuse victims, which are currently not available; adequate general and video interview facilities; stores facilities, which are properly secured and organised; an appropriate design for the police station to achieve an efficient general office and public reception area; a cost efficient design to appropriately cater for a full range of police functions with a proposed staffing level of 386 members in total; adequate, secure car parking; specific information technology requirements; and energy management with a view to low energy consumption levels, ease of management and low recurrent costs.

The new facility will incorporate features recommended by the Royal Commission into Deaths in Custody and, in particular, will provide ease of surveillance (both personal and electronic), a special observation cell situated in a location to enable easy supervision and quick response for prisoners assessed at risk, intercom/duress alarms and electronic surveillance throughout cell and public areas, interview rooms for private consultation with solicitors, and a visitation area for use in the Aboriginal Visitation Scheme. The committee can report that this project has proceeded in consultation with the following agencies: the Department of Transport, the Department for Building Management, the Passenger Transport Board, MFP Australia, the Department of State Aboriginal Affairs, and the Marion city council.

No heritage buildings are associated with this project and the site has no existing heritage classification. With respect to the matter of Aboriginal heritage, there is no evidence to suggest that the specific site of the proposed works is subject to Aboriginal heritage or sacred site issues, but the committee has noted that the nearby Sturt Creek has strong links to the Kaurna people. The committee is monitoring this situation and cautions the department to maintain timely communications with the Aboriginal community as plans and construction progress.

The design solution has been based on the accommodation brief prepared by the South Australian Police Department Property Branch and endorsed by the department's executive. The proposed building faces north to Sturt Road and will comprise two levels. An entry point from Sturt Road on the east side of the site allows both public and police access and links with public car parking. Police parking is secured at the rear of the site and benefits from two independent access points. The public entry to the police station is designed to be both obvious and approachable while at the same time providing reasonable security for police staff, which the committee has seen is seriously lacking at the current site. The site layout has been specifically designed to allow expansion to the rear should this be required in the future.

The committee has requested evidence of the use of Construction Industry Development Agency (CIDA) guidelines (or equivalent) to ensure best industry practices in project initiation. Project management, tendering practices and selection of proponents are incorporated into the procurement process where Government funds are to be applied to the development. Evidence has been provided demonstrating that best practice procurement is occurring. Maintenance expenditure has been kept to a minimum in recent years in anticipation of relocation. An amount of $21 500 was spent in 1994-95, but $100 000 to $150 000 will need to be spent immediately if the current proposal does not proceed.

With respect to the impact of the proposed Southern Expressway, the committee is firmly of the view that, even if there are delays or postponement of the road works, inadequacies still exist in the current accommodation which must be dealt with. For the benefit of members concerned with the relationship of the Southern Expressway to this proposal, let me assure them that this matter has been referred to the committee and will be the subject of a later separate report. I stress to the House that the current Darlington police complex is totally inadequate and must be replaced.

On Wednesday 2 August 1995, the Public Works Committee conducted an inspection of the existing Darlington police complex and the site for its proposed replacement. This is the second police complex the committee has inspected in the past year and, as was the case at Port Augusta, the committee was unanimously appalled at the existing working conditions at Darlington. The inspection revealed a ramshackle collection of old, unsafe, crowded, poorly lit, and totally unsuitable permanent and transportable buildings. I would like to quote from a statement I made to the Deputy Commissioner during the site inspection, which emphasises my concern at the appalling working conditions at the present police station. I said:

> Having investigated both Port Augusta and this complex, it makes me wonder how the police have been able to operate under these conditions. The conditions that this committee has now seen

twice amaze me. Port August was appalling and I do not think this is far behind it. If you could pass on to your officers the committee's admiration for the work that they are doing under conditions which—and I do not use the word loosely—are appalling. I do not believe that anybody, particularly in private enterprise, would work in such conditions. Could you pass on our commendation to them for the work that they are doing. The committee is very strongly in favour of this redevelopment which, obviously, is needed. I only hope that this facility will not be too far away and that your officers will be able to move into the new facility and to the surroundings that they deserve.

The committee commends the staff of the current complex for enduring these substandard conditions. It believes that requiring the difficult task of policing to take place in overcrowded and dislocated office accommodation, spread over two sites, is inconsistent with the important role that these officers undertake in society, and it believes that the present inadequacies can be largely overcome by the provision of new consolidated accommodation. That is the case irrespective of the future of the Southern Expressway.

The police function at Darlington provides an essential service to the public in the council areas of Marion, Noarlunga, Happy Valley, Mitcham and Brighton. The construction of new, well-designed, prominent and better-placed facilities at Sturt Road will enhance the level of service provided. In addition, the inclusion of extra functions will create a strong base for the Police Department to deliver a wider range of services and to adhere to its mission statement, and the committee has no hesitation in supporting this initiative.

However, the committee was extremely concerned to note that work commenced on this project prior to the tabling of its report, which is contrary to the Parliamentary Committees Act, and would urge the Government to ensure that such breaches of the Act do not occur again.

It is obvious to the committee from the available evidence and its inspection of the current facility that a new police complex for this area is long overdue. The provision of the new police complex at Darlington will provide the department with modern, purpose-built facilities which will overcome the difficulties of inappropriate and dysfunctional accommodation, and assist police to provide a more efficient and effective public service. While this proposal has the wholehearted support of the committee, the department is cautioned to maintain appropriate and timely communication with the Aboriginal community on the issue of the significance of the site on which the new complex is proposed to be built.

The committee will follow the progress of this proposal pursuant to its statutory obligations and will report further to Parliament as and when the need arises. Pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to Parliament that it recommends the proposed work.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): Over the years I have known of the appalling conditions to which the Presiding Member of the Public Works Committee has addressed our attention this morning in the motion to note the report of the committee on the Darlington Police Station, and I commend him and other members of the committee for their diligence in examining the proposal and for their findings. I do not think it would have been possible for any reasonable human being to come to any other conclusion.

Without going into any detail, I point out that, several times during the course of my membership of Parliament, I have had to visit that establishment for various reasons, not just related to visiting people who ended up there because they did not know who else to contact but more particularly to see the police themselves who have had problems there. I remember that some of the temporary lock-ups did not have ceilings or roofs over them. When people apprehended of drug offences were locked up in them, their friends threw drugs up over the top of the wall through the wire covering to give them a hit to keep them happy. I cannot imagine anything more ridiculous than that.

I entered this debate not just to make those remarks but, more importantly, to ask one specific question of the Presiding Member for him to address when he makes his closing comments on this motion. The committee has discovered that there are no sites of significance to the Kaurna people in that location. To my certain knowledge there are other land titles and buildings between that location and the nearby Sturt Creek where there is said to be some significance in spiritual terms, if not sites of significance in the Sturt Creek itself. I know of sites of significance, but none in that immediate vicinity.

My question is: have we as a Parliament got before us a report that says it is okay but it is not? We do not know whether there are spiritual beliefs related to that location which could produce the same mess as we have with the Hindmarsh Island bridge. After signing off on that proposition, at one minute past midnight someone discovered that they forgot or did not say what should have been said prior to the occasion and again committed the State to enormous expense to try to address the position too late in the day.

If that is the case, it is not wise or sensible for this Parliament to sign off on the committee's proposition that things can go ahead in the noting of the report, which is the recommendation today. We must have a clear-cut commitment that there is nothing of significance and that we spend no more money until that is the case. If it is not the case, it would be irresponsible to proceed because we would be proceeding into uncertainty and inviting problems.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): The Darlington Police Station is a $10 million development, which is part of a $400 million investment, both private and public, in the electorate of Mitchell over the next two years. Accordingly, as the local member of Parliament for that area, I support the development. An investment in that area of $400 million is no small amount, and it demonstrates the faith of the Government and of the private sector in what is happening in the city of Marion and the electorate of Mitchell.

In addition to the $10 million investment by the State Government in the new police facilities, across the road there is a $50 million investment with the upgrade of the Mitchell Park area and the development of a new housing estate, which will be one of the top housing developments in the city of Adelaide.

Within a kilometre of the Darlington Police Station is a new $150 million shopping centre development by Westfield Marion. That shopping centre will become the third largest in the whole of Australia with its cinemas and virtual reality entertainment centre. As well as that there is to be investment in the northern part of the Marion triangle of a further $50 million with the inclusion of Government and civic offices and also private sector developments.

In December this year the Southern Expressway is to be commenced at a cost of $120 million. That will create new investment in this area and, more importantly, provide in

excess of 2 000 jobs for local businesses and people in the area. The city of Marion has been supportive of the development of the Darlington Police Station. I express my thanks to the planning staff and local councillors, David Woodhouse and Robert Donnelly, for their support and help in the planning stage for the Darlington Police Station.

The need for the re-establishment of the Darlington Police Station is not because the Southern Expressway will go through one of the buildings but because improvements are required to be made to the present accommodation. With three buildings on two different sites there are problems regarding the suitability of that accommodation on the basis of occupational health and safety as well as a proper working environment. There have also been problems for local residents being able to visit the Darlington Police Station. By siting it at the Sturt triangle (or, as some people call it, the Laffers triangle) on the edge of Mitchell Park, Darlington and Bedford Park, access will be available to local residents. A number of other facilities will also be located at that centre. Everything will be in the one location and the modern facilities will provide security and safety for those who have to attend the Darlington Police Station. The development is expected to be completed by the end of June next year.

The member for Ridley mentioned Aboriginal culture in that area. I assure the member for Ridley and the House that the Kaurna heritage people have done a site inspection of that area and have written to the committee personally and signed off that letter stating that there are no Aboriginal sacred sites at that Darlington Police Station site. Paul and Naomi Dixon of the Kaurna Heritage Commission have volunteered their services to the Police Department during the construction stage so that if any artefacts were located, not previously known to be there, they could stop the construction and recover those artefacts. That particular area has been studied numerous times and a number of people have attempted to rewrite history in regard to the Sturt Triangle.

The Sturt Triangle is the last known area of open space through which the Sturt Creek flows before becoming the Sturt drain. A booklet produced by the City of Marion covers the Aboriginal heritage of the area of the city quite explicitly. There is some dispute as to where the big campsite actually was, whether on the area of the oxbow in the Sturt Creek on Sturt Triangle or at the gum tree where Suneden School is now located. Local historians believe that the gum tree, which was located at Suneden School, was the site of the big camp.

Irrespective of that situation, one must be mindful of the heritage of the local Aboriginal people who inhabited the plains. It is the last remaining green field site within the city of Marion associated with Sturt Creek, and a number of things are being done. We are consulting with the local Kaurna heritage people to ensure that their feelings are taken into account. As a result, the City of Marion and the State Government are involved with the Kaurna heritage people for the establishment of the Warriparinga Interpretive Centre which will be established at the oxbow site. A lot is happening within the city of Marion and the electorate of Mitchell, in relation to both development and Aboriginal and European culture.

I expressed some concerns during the committee stage on this report in relation to the design of the building. The plans provided to the Public Works Committee indicate that in comparison to the development going around the centre the design might be rather bland—a white building with a blue light on top. I expressed my concern to the Police Department and asked them to ensure that during the building stage they were mindful of the new housing development across the road and that they acknowledge the local Aboriginal involvement in that area by the design of a feature wall depicting the Aboriginal culture being established at the front of the police headquarters, similar to that presently located at the corner of McInerney and Sturt Roads.

I hope that the Police Department will be taking that into consideration when the final plans are put in place and the building is commenced. On behalf of the people of the community of Marion and the electorate of Mitchell, I advise that we are most appreciative of the Government's support in the development of the Darlington Police Station. It is long overdue. We have been waiting for its redevelopment for some time not only for the police who have to work in the area but also for the local residents who require the support of the police station and the local police. Local residents totally support the new Darlington Police Station.

Mr KERIN (Frome): I will quickly endorse the report on the project. The only doubt I have after hearing the member for Mitchell wax lyrical about how wonderful is the area is whether it needs a police station at all. He made it sound very rosy down that way. On going through the Darlington Police Station we saw what has been inherited by the police over the past 25 years, namely, some very 1960s and 1970s buildings. The Darlington complex is very tacked on. As it needed more people it whacked another building into the area. It has narrow aisles and tiny rooms. As they say, swinging a cat would not be possible in many of the offices.

The occupational health and safety problems are endemic with the type of construction down there and, while attempts have been made to make it safer, those problems cannot be solved within the current building. We saw a charge counter where attempts at improvement had been made, but a policeman standing there charging someone who had done the wrong thing would not be in a safe situation.

Earlier the committee saw exactly the same problems at Port Augusta and I have no doubt that we have not yet solved all the problems within the police system. I add to what the Presiding Member said about commending the members of the force who have continued to work in such conditions over the years. While the Minister is listening so intently, I advise him that the committee is looking forward to seeing further projects that increase the comfort and safety of our Police Force.

Motion carried.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I move:

That the seventeenth report of the committee, being the annual report for the year ended 30 June 1995, be noted.

It is with great pleasure that I present to the Parliament the annual report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee for 1994-95. It is the third annual report and the second since I have been Presiding Member. The financial year 1994-95 was a year of consolidation for the committee. It always takes a little time for members to get used to each other and for a newly constituted committee to develop a style of its own. This year has been another busy and productive one. In the reporting period the committee met on 43 occasions, either to hear evidence, deliberate or undertake site inspections.

Meetings take place every Wednesday morning, both in and outside of Parliamentary sitting times and average about three hours duration. I mention this because the commitment made by members to the standing committees of Parliament may not be widely known. In addition, I am happy to note that in this reporting period we have been supported by a constant gallery of interested spectators and also the press. I believe that the interest taken by various groups in the work of the ERD Committee is an important way of raising awareness of the work of standing committees and should be encouraged. Access for the public should be an important consideration when the committees move to Old Parliament House. In response to this interest the committee has produced a pamphlet to explain, for the benefit of witnesses and others, how it works. This has been distributed to members, and further copies can be obtained from the Committee Secretary at Riverside. By now members would have received copies of our second newsletter, which is aimed at keeping them informed about committee activities.

The committee would like to highlight two significant inquiries that took place during the reporting period, namely, the investigations into the Canadair amphibious firefighting aircraft and into compulsory motor vehicle inspections. First, I refer to the Canadair inquiry. I believe it is recognised that bushfires are an inescapable fact of our long, hot Australian summers. Too often, however, once the immediate danger is over, we forget the horrors and immense toll of human suffering and financial cost which they leave in their wake. In 1994 Parliament asked the ERD Committee to investigate the merits of an amphibious firefighting aircraft, the Canadair CL415. We saw this as an opportunity to make a significant contribution to the debate on bushfire fighting in South Australia. As hearings progressed, committee members discovered that, while there is a great amount of goodwill in the community about the need to address the problems, there is a bitter debate about the means whereby this should be done. This is particularly evident in the differing approaches taken by the various agencies involved: the CFS, the then EWS and the Conservation Council, for example.

The debate is also fierce in regard to the allocation of scarce resources and the uses that these resources are put to. Since the mid 1980s, the received wisdom in the area of amphibious aircraft for bushfire fighting was a negative Victorian report commonly known as Project Aquarius. The committee concluded that the findings of this report were outdated, and that amphibious aircraft could make a significant contribution and should be trialled in Australian conditions. As the costs would be substantial, this could be done only as a joint State and Federal venture. Regrettably, although they were supported at a local level, the committee's recommendations to this effect did not receive support on a Federal level.

More recently, the Canadair company has decided to facilitate trials of the aircraft in Australia itself, and will be bringing an aircraft to all States in January next year. The committee will be monitoring this with a great deal of interest, and I commend the Minister for Emergency Services in supporting initiatives such as this one. South Australia cannot afford another Ash Wednesday catastrophe, and we would never forgive ourselves if we let narrow interests of small groups prevent us from trying new solutions. We must re-evaluate the way we do things. We must reappraise our bushfire policies and open our minds to new initiatives.

I now turn to the motor vehicle inspection inquiry. This inquiry came to the committee as a result of an election promise by the Liberal Party that there would be an investigation into the merits of compulsory motor vehicle inspections. It was indeed long overdue. There would not be a member in this Chamber, I believe, who would not wish to address the horrendous problem of deaths and accidents on South Australian roads. The committee's wide-ranging inquiry examined data from all States of Australia and overseas. A large number of witnesses appeared before us and, as with the Canadair inquiry, there was a great deal of disagreement about the merits of vehicle inspections.

Interestingly, and to the surprise of some members, we were forced to conclude that there was no clear correlation between vehicle inspections at change of ownership and the reduction of accident rates. The committee looked at a vast amount of research material and heard from the best experts in the field before it came to this inescapable conclusion. In its report, the committee did, however, recommend random on-road inspections by multi disciplinary teams involving the police, road traffic and Environment Protection Authority staff. Other recommendations covered the consumer protection area, safety, environmental issues and vehicle theft.

Under the Parliamentary Committees Act, Ministers have four months to consider the recommendations of a report which relate to their specific area. The motor vehicles report requires responses from the Ministers for Transport, Emergency Services, the Environment and the Attorney-General. These are due to be received by the committee at the end of this month. Some indeed have already arrived. When they are all received, I shall be discussing with the Committee whether we as a committee shall ask for a whole of government consideration of the issue as this is far too important an issue not to be followed up, because it does not fall into a discrete portfolio area. The ERD Committee, in common with other standing committees, does not usually make recommendations which fall into the portfolio areas of so many Ministers.

The Parliamentary Committees Act is silent on cross-portfolio coordination of initiatives recommended. I believe it will be an appropriate time to consider such initiatives. As an aside, it has been brought to my attention that some industry groups are not happy with the committee's findings. The committee spent a great deal of time on the issue and came up with a considered and well documented report. I take this opportunity to reiterate that there is no hard evidence to link compulsory vehicle inspections with reduced accident figures. To recommend another compulsory impost on the taxpayers of South Australia, without convincing evidence that it would be of clear benefit, would be delinquent on the part of any committee of the Parliament. Anecdotal evidence in these cases is not enough, nor is urban myth. I suggest that advocates of simple solutions to complex problems study the committee's report very carefully.

Moving on to other issues, the committee has obligations under various other Acts, and I will mention two of these. Under the Development Act, the committee looks at all amendments to the development plan. In the reporting period, the committee considered 34 of these amendments, all of which were approved, some with recommendations to the Minister. As part of its scrutiny of the Wirrina Cove amendment, the committee visited the site and held its hearing there. Evidence was taken from the developers, the Department of Planning and Urban Development and from local groups. The committee has signalled to the Ministers for Housing and Urban Development and for Tourism its ongoing interest in this development.

The Environment, Resources and Development Committee has always been interested in the process of consultation between the various groups involved in development in this State and sees proper consultation as an essential part of the planning process. The committee therefore welcomes initiatives by the Minister for Tourism and the developers of Wirrina Cove to establish ongoing communication with local environment and resident groups.

On a more general note, the committee is disappointed that the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations has rejected the recommendation in its fifth report on amendments to the development plan to change its place in the legislation back to its previous position, that is, before the amendment goes to Cabinet and the Governor in Executive Council for authorisation.

I move on now to the other statutory obligations. Under the legislation setting up the MFP, the corporation must report to the committee on the environmental resources, planning, land use, transportation and development activities of this project. In the reporting period, the corporation reported to the committee twice, on 31 August 1994 and 28 February 1995. The committee reported to the Parliament on 2 November. The committee was not satisfied at that time that the corporation had fulfilled its obligations and expressed its disappointment that, in its second report on the MFP, as in its first, it had had to dwell on procedural matters and not on matters of real substance. However, on 1 March this year, the committee again inspected the MFP sites and received a briefing from senior MFP officers. Again, the committee reported to Parliament, documenting an improvement.

The most obvious improvement has been the construction of the Barker inlet wetlands as part of the original MFP core site. Winter rains have now filled that 172 hectare wetlands, which is being built to one of the most advanced designs in the world, restoring a degraded wasteland area into a haven for recreation and bird life, and which at this time is extremely impressive. I urge members to see for themselves this innovative project, and I look forward to presenting a more extensive report to Parliament on this statutory responsibility and highlighting a range of enterprising developments being undertaken by the MFP in this State.

At the end of the reporting period in June 1995, the committee was continuing its inquiry into the Sellicks Hill cave implosion, and was about to begin hearings into the leakage of water from the tailings dams at Olympic Dam mine at Roxby Downs. The committee hopes to report on the Sellicks Hill cave shortly and on Roxby Downs well before the end of the year. As usual, the committee has a veritable queue of inquiries banked up.

Finally, I thank all the members of the committee for their support and dedication throughout the year. Parliament certainly has good reason to be proud of the work of its standing committees, which go about their business quietly, conscientiously and steadily throughout the year. I thank also the committee staff, whose professionalism is expressed each time the committees sit. I extend my sincere appreciation to them. As this is the annual report, I also commend the members of *Hansard*, who go about their business in a most professional manner, not upsetting the proceedings of the committee, but operating under some very strained conditions at times. I accord my compliments and those of my committee to all the members of *Hansard*.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (RACIAL VILIFICATION) BILL

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 and the Equal Opportunity Act 1984. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is an indictment that we have reached a stage in our history where on a regular basis citizens of our State are victims of vile, racially motivated attacks, but it is to our credit that the overwhelming majority of people in our State and, I believe, every member of this Parliament simply cannot and will not condone or accept racially motivated attacks or racially motivated violence. Nevertheless, all of us have been shocked and horrified by increases in the number and severity of incidents involving racial violence and hatred in our State in recent times. Recently I was most interested to see an *Advertiser* report on this increasing extremism that is occurring in our community.

None of us can forget the violent acts committed in Rundle Mall and at Glenelg, the desecration of graves at the West Terrace Cemetery, the attacks on Serbian statues in the western suburbs and, more recently, the desecration of a mosque. In recent weeks there have been persistent reports that South Australia is gaining national and international notoriety as a base or haven for extremist groups with a history of racially motivated attacks. With the Premier and many other members of Parliament I attended the special ceremony and service at the West Terrace Cemetery some months ago. There a speaker stood up and read messages from the Prime Minister of Israel and others about their shock and horror at what was occurring here in our great city.

This Bill is similar to legislation which has been in force in New South Wales since 1989 and which was introduced with bipartisan support by the former Liberal Government. It was introduced by Mr Greiner and reviewed by the Fahey Government with Labor's total support. Like the New South Wales legislation, this Bill provides heavy fines and even prison sentences for people convicted of severe racial vilification involving physical harm or threats of physical harm. However, most importantly, the Bill places great emphasis on the conciliation of complaints of racial discrimination which are of a less serious nature and provides for compensation to be awarded to victims.

The question of whether the racial vilification laws in New South Wales had been successful was important in determining whether to proceed with racial vilification legislation. A recent report by Hennessy and Smith of the New South Wales Anti-Discrimination Board staff and Columbia University respectively would suggest that the New South Wales legislation has been successful. The report states:

> . . . the legislation has provided a focal point for the Anti-Discrimination Board to carry out education strategies designed to alert the media and others to the existence of the law and its rationale. These education strategies would not be nearly as effective without the civil and criminal sanctions of the racial vilification provisions to back them up.

If it works well in New South Wales, I believe there is no reason why this legislation cannot work effectively in South Australia. Perhaps the most common objection to legislation of this kind is that it inhibits free speech or freedom of expression, which are tenets of all truly democratic societies. But these freedoms are not an absolute right: they also carry

a heavy responsibility and clear duties, and this right must be balanced against other rights that can be in conflict. For example, there is the fundamental right of all people, both as individuals and as members of organisations, to live in complete freedom from incitement to racial hatred or threats of racially motivated violence.

Another objection that is sometimes made is that legislation such as this merely provides a platform for bigots and extremists. That is not the case in New South Wales, and that is why the legislation places great emphasis on the process of conciliation which, except in the most extreme cases, can be put into effect in a decent way. Experience has shown that this process effectively removes the platform for perpetrators. Where does this leave the media? The legislation is quite clear in its intent to allow fair reporting and fair comment. Section 86a(2)(a) exempts fair reports of public acts and section 86a(2)(c) allows for public acts done reasonably and in good faith for academic, artistic, scientific or research purposes or for other purposes in the public interest, including discussion and debate about an exposition of any act or matter.

Before having this legislation drafted, I took careful note of the recommendations of the 1991 report of the National Inquiry into Racist Violence in Australia. The report recommended tough legislation with high criminal penalties in the various crimes Acts at Federal and State levels where there is a racial motivation element in the commission of an offence. Unfortunately, because of Senate amendments, the Federal legislation is lacking in this regard, and this has made it imperative that legislation with criminal sanctions be enacted at the State level. It is true that critics of this legislation will say, 'New South Wales has these tough criminal sanctions including gaol and heavy fines, but no-one has been prosecuted.' That is not the point. People in New South Wales, including members of the Liberal Party, the Labor Party, the Democrats and the Independents, believe that the very presence of that tough sentencing in the Act allows the Anti-Discrimination Board to go about its work of conciliation.

However, there needs to be a sting in the tail in terms of the statute books and a sting in the tail that will and must be used in extreme circumstances. I am not suggesting that my legislation provides a perfect solution, although I must say that 99 per cent of it is based on the New South Wales legislation, which was reviewed by an all-Party committee several years ago, which made some fine-tuning after talking to the media, to civil liberties representatives and to members and representatives of ethnic groups. But, because I do not claim to have a monopoly of wisdom in this area, I have sent a draft of my legislation to a wide range of interested groups and individuals and have invited their responses, which I will consider before this Bill reaches the Committee stage.

Also, I sincerely invite members opposite to make constructive suggestions on how, if at all, this legislation can be improved. It is very important when it comes to dealing with matters such as racism that there be a bipartisan approach. It is vitally important that we put aside our partisan concerns, point scoring and bickering in the public interest to make sure the best legislation comes out of this Parliament. It is our duty to send a clear message to the community that racial hatred, racial intimidation and racially motivated violence will simply not be tolerated in our community here in South Australia.

If the broad thrust of this legislation, like the New South Wales legislation, receives the support of all Parties, it will send that clear message to the community that we in South Australia will not tolerate racism, racial hatred and abuse, intimidation and harassment. I look forward to all members' contributions and support.

Ms GREIG secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ALDINGA WASTE WATER TREATMENT PLANT

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): I move:

That the fourteenth report of the committee on the Aldinga waste water treatment plant and re-use scheme be noted.

This report will address the SA Water proposal for provision of a waste water treatment plant and re-use scheme to serve the community in the Aldinga-Port Willunga area under build, own and operate arrangements. The proposal investigated by the committee described the intention by SA Water to enter into a long-term contract with a private company to finance, design, build, own and operate a waste water treatment plant and re-use scheme at Aldinga. It is proposed that a re-use scheme will use recycled water from the plant to benefit surrounding primary producers in accordance with the principles of ecologically sustainable development. Land for the site of the treatment plant was initially purchased on the western side of Main South Road, Aldinga. After consultation with the Willunga District Planning Group, the Southern Vales Water Resources Committee and environmental group Friends of the Earth, a new site was purchased for the treatment plant on the eastern side of Main South Road.

This is in keeping with the planning vision for the area, which is to maintain rural activities on the eastern side of Main South Road and urban development to the west. The cost to acquire the land for the treatment plant and the buffer zone taking in 90 hectares is estimated to be $900 000. It is envisaged that primary producers will establish vineyards and other irrigated crops to fully use recycled water from the plant. The SA Water concept design assumes the treatment plant will be constructed in three stages. The first stage assumes a 5 000 person treatment capacity, which can be expanded with two additional 5 000 person stages up to a total of 15 000 persons.

Currently, there are about 1 000 people connected to sewers in the existing limited sewerage scheme. At the current rate of sewer connections of some 20 persons per month the first stage will have spare capacity until the year 2011, at which time it may be necessary to construct stage 2. The private owner of the plant will be responsible to determine the staging for the provision of the plant but must ensure that future needs will be met.

On 4 April 1991, the predecessor to this committee, the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, recommended the provision of a limited sewerage scheme to serve parts of the existing townships of Port Willunga and Aldinga Beach at an estimated cost of $5 385 000 (in 1991 dollars). The former Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works envisaged that it would be necessary at some later time to construct a treatment plant to serve 10 000 people. At that time, the treatment plant was estimated to cost in the order of $6 to $7 million including $4 to $5 million for the land based disposal of recycled water from the plant.

It was initially economic to defer construction of the waste water treatment plant and to transfer waste water by road tankers for disposal at the Christies Beach treatment works.

The annual cost to tank the waste water is currently about $430 000. It has been demonstrated to the committee that it is now more economic to provide a local waste water treatment facility. It was also appropriate to defer the final selection of the site for the treatment plant until a long term planning strategy for the Willunga Basin had been developed and until pending changes to environmental legislation to protect the marine environment were enacted.

On 28 November 1994, Cabinet gave approval to call for expressions of interest from the private sector for the provision of a treatment and reuse scheme. As part of the process to improve the efficiency of the South Australian economy, the committee recognises that reforms and innovations in the provision of infrastructure are a major factor. A general policy of inviting the private sector to become involved in the provision of services is seen by the Government as one way of achieving efficiency gains while providing attractive investment opportunities for the private sector in areas that have been traditionally seen as the exclusive province of Government. It is proposed that this project will be provided under a BOO (build-own-operate) contract.

The possibility of transferring facilities to SA Water ownership at the end of the 25 year term of the proposed contract is an option that is not excluded. The principal reason for the proposed Government ownership of the land upon which facilities will be constructed is that it confers a degree of legal tenure by Government which gives it some future control of the facilities while not removing from the private sector investor effective control of management and operation. BOO projects are a form of partnering between the public and private sectors in which, as the name suggests, the private sector contracts to provide a service and in doing so undertakes to finance, design, construct and operate the facility in return for payment for the service from the public sector. The committee supports the concept of encouraging such private sector funding.

The private sector owner of the plant will be responsible for the quality of recycled water to ensure that its use on land is ecologically sustainable and will be required to have environmental diligence processes and monitoring programs in place to monitor soil and ground water conditions on properties using recycled water. The obligations of the BOO contractor involve the preparation of concept and detailed designs of all facilities necessary to transfer and treat waste water collected from the Aldinga limited sewerage scheme; obtain final development plan and consent for the project; construct the pumping, treatment and reuse facilities; finance the design, construction and ongoing management, operation and maintenance of the facilities; manage, operate and maintain the facilities; treat waste water to contracted requirements for quality, quantity and reliability; and ensure that all recycled water produced at the plant is used on adjoining properties in accordance with the principles of ecologically sustainable development.

The obligations of SA Water include the delivery of waste water to the contractor, payment for the availability of facilities and the treatment of waste water in accordance with the contract, and the acquisition and ownership of the land for the waste water treatment plant. The committee believes the commercial advantages of integration of financing, design, construction and operation of the treatment plant and efficiency in managing the beneficial use of recycled water, the reduced impact on the debt of SA Water through access to capital financing by the private sector and the provision of a source of water to enable expansion of irrigation in the Willunga Basin are significant. Evidence was given to the committee of agency and public consultation consisting of meetings and discussions with relevant Government agencies and local government.

The committee is satisfied that the proposing agency has conducted adequate consultation with a wide range of affected and interested groups of individuals, including nearby householders, and has answered all inquiries and questions of the committee in an appropriate manner. The treatment plant will be located on the site with a buffer zone of at least 400 metres to the nearest house. No construction traffic will enter the subject land from Plains Road; the lagoons will be sealed to prevent underground seepage; the site will be fenced and landscaped with mounding and trees to provide visual screening; and the developer must include site management measures which employ best available practice for mosquito control. A draft licence for the operation of the plant has been obtained from the Office of the Environment Protection Authority. It has been demonstrated by the proposing agency that no heritage sites or buildings will be impacted by the works.

With respect to Aboriginal heritage, an assessment of the impact of the proposed work is currently being undertaken by a consultant approved by the Department of State Aboriginal Affairs in accordance with the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988. The results of this assessment will be forwarded to the committee for consideration and the committee will monitor this matter and make a further report to Parliament, if necessary. Evidence has been provided to the committee that best practice has been incorporated into the project. The committee believes SA Water has conducted a process of project development and initiation consistent with industry best practice and in accordance with Government policies and guidelines.

On Wednesday, 12 July the Public Works Committee conducted an inspection of the site for the proposed Aldinga waste water treatment plant. The inspection supported the written and oral evidence provided to the committee and enabled committee members to gain a first-hand understanding of the project and its impact on the surrounding environment. In addition, some committee members inspected a working plant, similar to that proposed at Aldinga, which is in operation at Port Lincoln. This inspection demonstrated that odours emanating from the process were quite localised and not even remotely evident beyond the boundary of the plant. Evidence provided to the committee suggested there was a clear demand at this location for the provision of waste water treatment and disposal facilities essential for adequate protection of public health. The construction of a local treatment plant at Aldinga is more economical than continuing the current disposal method of transporting the waste water for disposal at the Christies Beach waste water treatment plant, which itself was implemented as an interim solution.

Revenue from this project can be expected principally as direct rate revenue to SA Water from the increasing number of customers connected to sewers. The estimated public sector total capital cost of the project is $1.795 million for the cost of investigations, purchase of land and negotiations of an agreement for the private sector provision of the plant. The total private sector construction cost is estimated to be in the order of $6.4 million over a 30 year period. However, this will depend on the private company staging of the plant

which, in turn, will depend on the rate of population growth in the area.

The present and prospective public or social value of the work, other than protection of public health, is the provision of a beneficial land based use of recycled water avoiding marine discharge and possible adverse environmental impact on Gulf St Vincent. The project will also provide a recycled water supply for expanding irrigated agriculture in the Willunga Basin. The existing ground water resources are fully allocated and any additional water resources will be advantageous to the existing irrigated agriculture in the area, as well as to the anticipated new developments.

With respect to financing, the committee has been given a guarantee by SA Water that the Government will assume no financial risk or guarantee on behalf of the private developer and allowance for the project has been incorporated into the SA Water budget. After a year of operation, the current Public Works Committee has been exposed to a number of BOO and BOOT proposals designed to elicit private investment in public infrastructure provision. While the majority of the proposals this committee has investigated are still in their early stages as at the writing of this report, the committee has accepted the concept and its advantages and looks forward to tangible and positive results for South Australians which reflect the enthusiasm of sponsoring Government agencies.

With respect to the Aldinga waste water treatment plant and reuse scheme proposed by SA Water, the committee concludes from its investigations that a clear demand exists for the provision of waste water treatment in the Aldinga-Port Willunga area. That it can be provided potentially at a minimum cost to the public has the support of the committee. The concept of reuse of treated waste water is endorsed by the committee and SA Water is encouraged to pursue this matter in other locations. The committee will follow the progress of this proposal pursuant to its statutory obligations and will report further to Parliament as and when the need arises and the committee will seek to verify that proper financial accountability is achieved. Pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 the Public Works Committee reports to Parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I support the motion and the project, which will bring about the improvement of effluent disposal in the area of Aldinga Beach. The project aims to minimise the cost to SA Water whilst providing an adequate service to consumers. It is a long-term contract with the private sector to finance, design, build, own and operate a waste water treatment plant at Aldinga. It will also make available recycled water from the plant for use on irrigation crops and vineyards by primary producers in the area, thus preventing the need to discharge effluent into the marine environment.

The arrangement stipulates that SA Water will pay the private contractor for the use of facilities (which will operate on Crown land) and the treatment of effluent. The advantage of the arrangement will be the reduced impact on the debt of SA Water through access to capital funding by the private sector, but the Government will continue to control the setting of rates for the service to the consumers.

This work will lead to an enhanced service for the people of the Aldinga Beach region, and I support that. However, I want to draw attention to the recommendations of the committee and its indication that, over the course of this project's development, the committee will seek to verify that proper financial accountability is achieved and maintained. This is particularly important given the mix of public and private sector financing. It is also important that I raise this issue now given the significant caution expressed by the Auditor-General in his 1995 report in this regard. The Auditor-General has much to say about the need for better accountability than we have seen from this Government and, with respect to build, own and operate schemes and build, own, operate and transfer schemes, he offers a strong caution about risk management. Clearly, a number of risks need to be carefully addressed prior to entering into these sorts of arrangements.

Regarding such schemes, the Auditor-General refers to risks relating to market or demand, design, construction, operations, inflation, taxation and, I suppose, political aspects. While the risks may vary with different projects, the Auditor-General warns that the allocation of risk must be set out in clear, specific terms, so that the risks undertaken by each party properly reflect a clearly agreed structure of risk and reward. That is, the provisions relating to ownership and project risk need to be interpreted clearly and concisely. The Auditor-General's message to parliamentary committees dealing with such matters and projects is that any scrutiny of these types of arrangements needs to consider aspects of asset management throughout the period of the arrangement and of transfer of the risk to the appropriate party.

These BOO/BOOT schemes will become increasingly common. It is important that this Parliament ensure that appropriate standards of accountability are applied to not only this but future projects. I will be pleased to see the Aldinga waste water treatment and reuse plant project proceed, as it will mean an enhanced service and standard of service to the people living in the Aldinga Beach region.

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): I also support this report, because the Aldinga treatment works is located in my electorate. I say at the outset that it is well and truly about time. As a long-term resident of Sellicks Beach (24 years), I have attended the announcement of the Aldinga treatment works by the previous Government on two occasions, and they were grand occasions. In 1985 I was on site to hear Mr Bannon announce the proposed Aldinga treatment works, but it never eventuated. In 1989 I was once again on site to hear the illustrious Susan Lenehan announce the proposed Aldinga treatment works, but it never eventuated.

I say it is about time, and I am pleased that a Liberal Government has finally stood up for the people of Aldinga Beach and decided to build the Aldinga treatment works. As a long-term member of the Willunga district council, I should mention that the council can take some credit, having on two occasions embarrassed the previous Government for not proceeding to build the announced treatment works. It did so simply by taking a survey of notifiable diseases in the Sellicks Beach and Aldinga Beach area. Those diseases were caused by sewage running down the streets. The illustrious Susan Lenehan's response to that in the newspaper was that it was not a health problem to have sewage running down the streets but that it just did not look nice. She was wrong. The Government has taken the right steps through this committee and it will build this treatment works, and it will be a successful project for the people in my electorate.

The member for Wright, as Presiding Member of the Public Works Committee, mentioned the political exercise that accompanied the 1991 decision to provide a limited

sewerage scheme for the people of Port Willunga and Aldinga Beach. That limited scheme was to apply only to those places where there was a high level of notifiable disease as recorded by the Willunga council. That was part of the embarrassment. The second part of the embarrassment arose from the political decision to connect people in that location to the system free of charge. I say that was a political exercise because people who live one block outside the limited scheme pay $2 500 to be connected to the system although their next-door neighbours are connected for nothing. That sort of political exercise has to stop in this State. It is absolutely appalling that everybody in Aldinga Beach is not treated equally because of a political decision by Don Hopgood, the former member.

The project, which has finally been announced, will be marvellous for my area. As mentioned by the Presiding Member of the committee, two sites had been allocated for treatment works in the Sellicks Beach and Aldinga Beach area. One site, which is at the end of Button Road, just happens to be the lowest point of Sellicks Beach from which everything conveniently flows out to sea. I am pleased that our Government has seen the light and will sell that site, because it is no longer acceptable to let sewage flow to the lowest point and quietly out to sea.

Coincidentally, the site chosen by the previous Government is right next to the Aldinga Scrub, which is a conservation area. The Labor Government was always keen to say that it protected such areas; yet it bought a site right next door on which to build a sewage treatment works. I find that absolutely appalling and I cannot understand that Government's attitude. I am glad that our Government has seen the wisdom of moving the site to the other side of the road and intends to zone the land around it so that it will remain rural forever. In that way the buffer zone will be protected from houses creeping up next to it. Like the Presiding Member, I have taken the opportunity to look at the Port Lincoln site and I concur that it is a great way to build treatment works, and I am sure it will be successful in our area.

For a long time, I have been an advocate of the eastern side of South Road remaining a rural area. I have also advocated the need for a wide variety of rural crops in that district and I am continually annoyed and perturbed that people equate the rural area of the Willunga Basin with vineyards. I put it firmly on the record that, if the Willunga Basin is to be a successful rural district, it must be economically viable: it cannot depend solely on vineyards. Many people in the district are offering alternatives. For example, a very successful aquaculture development is under way in the Willunga Basin. That could be expanded because of the location of the treatment works. Application has also been made by local residents to grow hemp, and that will be a success. As long as we look at a variety of types of agriculture in the Willunga Basin, I think it will remain economic and succeed. If not, and we take a narrow-minded attitude that it will be covered in vines, that will not be the best answer for the Willunga Basin in the long term.

As has already been mentioned, the first stage of the BOO scheme will service 5 000 people, with the intention that eventually it should be able to service 15 000 people. I worry about the staging process. To say that the economics will depend on how many people connect to it is a little like the chicken and the egg. As I mentioned, there is already in place a limited scheme which the Government, in its wisdom, has decided to continue because of financial constraints. Those who are on the limited scheme are connected free—there is not a lot of money in that; indeed, money is lost—and people outside the scheme are not being encouraged.

Debate adjourned.

TELEPHONE, TOLL-FREE CALLS

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I move:

That this House urges all Ministers to direct all departments and agencies established by statute to install a toll-free telephone number to provide STD callers with equal access to services provided by these agencies.

The motion, as it stands, speaks for itself. I could regale the House with scores of instances where I or, more particularly, my constituents and other people aggrieved by what has happened to them in various areas of South Australia outside the local STD area of Adelaide have called Government agencies or departments seeking explicit information or an audience with a senior member of that department to have a matter relevant to their interests and needs progressed, only to find that they are kept waiting for not just 20 or 30 seconds or a minute or two, but for as long as 10 minutes while the appropriate person is found. On the other hand, if they leave their name and telephone number, they wait and wait, it seems, interminably not for just an hour or two, half a day or a few days, but for weeks, and nothing happens. So they must call again and again to get the information that they are seeking.

It is galling to those who have been taught in school and believed all their lives that they live in a democracy, in which it is their legitimate right to expect access to Government agencies which have a regulatory effect on their lives, to be unable to obtain such access and when correspondence with them is summary in attitude and engages in no discussion about a matter of concern to them or a dispute that they are having. I have been motivated to bring this motion before the House to ensure that departmental and divisional heads and CEOs within Government departments and agencies understand the cost implications to citizens of their arrogance and indifference.

Most Government departments do have a toll free number now, although some do not. Several Government agencies have a toll free number for STD callers but many do not. I believe that it is only fair and legitimate that this matter be drawn to the attention of the CEOs of various departments, or divisions within those departments, or the agencies which are not departments but which are expected to provide a service to the public and that they indeed cop the cost so that they will know how it feels to budget for those expenses which arise in an extraordinary way—at present in the pocket of the citizen. I believe that all citizens would endorse the principle embodied in the proposition I now put to the House, namely, that no citizen should have to bear a disproportionate amount of expense just because they happen to be the object of indifference by a particular Government agency. All citizens ought to bear the cost equally through the taxation mechanism, whereby the Government agency itself allocates sufficient funds to enable its toll free number to operate effectively in the interests of those citizens.

More important than any of the remarks I have made, wherein I have implied that there needs to be equity and social justice, I now state that there must be. It ought not to matter whether the citizen lives within the metropolitan area or in the most distant part of the State. They should be able to make telephone contact for urgent consultations with the

person who has the power over their lives on any matter relevant to statute or service delivery by the Government. It is a basic fundamental principle that we do not discriminate against people just because they do not live next door to the office, as it were.

I commend the motion to the House and trust that it has swift passage and that, accordingly, agencies which currently stand outside direct control of a ministry and the Minister nonetheless are compelled by this proposition passing through the Chamber to provide the access—which is already provided here in the Parliament—for those who live outside the STD area of Adelaide.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION RESOURCES

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House condemns—
(a) the way in which the Minister for Education and Children's Services has broken the Government's election promises on education and embarked on a policy of cutting resources for education in South Australia;
(b) the reduction of 790 teachers and 276 ancillary staff between 30 June 1994 and 31 January 1995;
(c) the Minister's decision to cut a further 250 school service officer full time equivalents from January 1996 that will result in up to 500 support staff being cut from essential support work in schools; and
(d) the Minister's decision to cut a further 100 teachers from areas including the open access college, special interest schools and Aboriginal schools.

This motion is about education in South Australia. Education is the most important responsibility the Government has. At least that has been the view of visionary Governments in the past. This motion is about broken promises, fewer teachers and support staff, bigger classes, smaller curriculum, lower standards, budget cuts and no vision at all. This motion is about the dishonesty of the Brown Liberal Government. If modern societies are to be successful they require a first-class system of public education, and that is what the Premier promised when he stood before the electorate on 28 November 1993 and gave undertakings to all electors about how he would govern this State. Do members remember the promises? I quote:

> There will be no cuts to this year's budget and education spending will increase in 1994-95. This will ensure current class sizes are maintained. . . .A $20 million plan to rebuild our schools will reduce the serious backlog in school maintenance.

It further states:

> Our initiatives will see education standards lift through improved school maintenance and resources.

However, within nine months every one of these promises had been being discarded by a dishonest Government that set about to redistribute the State's income at the expense of our education system. The Premier talks about South Australia's becoming internationally competitive. If so, it makes no sense to follow the example of countries who are losers in the game of international competition by not investing in education. To be a successful country economically and socially we need to invest in our intellectual infrastructure. The Premier should have used his recent overseas tour to look at some of the successful economies in society because there is a direct link between the education and skills of the work force and the standard of living of a nation. Enterprises go where the work force is the most highly skilled. It is not a matter of choice for them but a matter of being competitive. Third world skills command third world wages.

At the last election the Premier promised that there would be no cuts to education and that spending would increase in 1994-95. The Government then broke this promise by budgeting for an annual cut of $40 million by 1997. Class sizes were increased and the number of teachers and support staff slashed. The 1994-95 budget required a cut of 372 full-time teaching positions and a further reduction of 50 other teaching positions—a total of 422 staff. The Minister gave an undertaking that this would be the limit of cuts required to meet the budget targets. However, in just seven months to January 1995 the department approved 930 separation packages and the total number of staff fell by 1 066.

In February the Minister for Education and Children's Services announced that falling enrolments would result in cuts of up to another 200 jobs. In June the Minister announced further cuts of 250 school service officers and another 100 teachers, a total of over 1 600 jobs in just one year. The latest decision to cut the equivalent of 250 full-time school service officers at the start of 1996 has been opposed by the entire education community.

The Minister tries to justify the cuts by saying that South Australia has more school support officers than the Australian average. It cannot be justified. The Minister is playing games with statistics in an attempt to fool the electorate. The South Australian level of one support officer for every 60 children is behind both Queensland (with one support officer for every 55 students) and Tasmania (with one for every 54 students). After the cut of 250 staff we will fall behind Western Australia and have the third worst level of school support in Australia.

South Australia might still be above the Australian average, but that is a commentary on the low level of assistance in Victoria and New South Wales rather than a reason to cut 250 staff out of our schools. On what grounds did the Minister decide to cut 250 school officers out of the formula and effectively sack 500 part-time employees? Did the Minister consult school councils, principals, teachers or parents before making this decision? Of course not! Was the decision made after an examination of the workload being carried out by school service officers? Again, of course not! Did the Minister consult with the appropriate staff associations or unions? Again, the answer is 'No.' The Minister made this decision on his own. It was his idea and even executives in his own department have complained to the Opposition that they were not consulted. School councils throughout the State have written to the Minister and the Opposition detailing the effects that these cuts will have on the quality of education they can provide. For example, the Adelaide High School expects to be cut by over 60 hours. I quote from what the school thinks of this Minister's decision:

> The staff at the Adelaide High School are extremely concerned about the low priority being given to education in this State. With fewer hours available next year, some programs will have to go.

Seaview High School expects to lose 45 hours. The school's newsletter told parents:

> The reduction in hours will mean significant changes to the provision of services. The school council believes that the consequences for students and parents are of such significance that all parents should be given the opportunity to guide the advice given by the council to the principal.

The staff at Salisbury Heights school wrote to the Minister and said:

We feel compelled to write to you to express our gravest concerns at your decision to cut 250 school service officers in addition to another 100 teachers.

The members of the Gawler High School Council wrote to the Minister and said:

The members of the Gawler High School Council wish to express the gravest concern about the proposed cuts to the hours of school service officers.

The Chairperson of Black Forest Primary School told the Minister that the planned reductions made no sense at all and said:

To reduce the quality of South Australian education to some Australian average is pitiful, and we are ashamed of a Minister for Education who has such an attitude.

There are hundreds of letters from schools throughout South Australia condemning the Minister for a decision he made all by himself, and he still will not listen. But the raft of oncers on the Government's backbench are listening. They are becoming very nervous. They know that this Minister has alienated the teachers, the support staff, school councils and parents at every school in South Australia. One of those oncers is the member for Wright. In fact, the member for Wright will have the unique distinction after the next election of being recycled not once but twice. The member for Wright became very agitated when he received a petition from students at the Maddison Park school and immediately wrote to the children who signed the petition and condemned the Minister's actions, as follows:

Like you, I am very well aware of the excellent service the SSOs provide to your schools and how necessary they are in helping both teachers and students. Because I am so aware of the vital work those staff undertake, I have had many discussions with the Minister for Education and written many letters to him asking that he reconsider his decision.

Then, in a confession that this arrogant Minister had completely ignored him, the member for Wright told the students:

Unfortunately, however, the Government does have to try and save money.

There you have it, kids; while the Government can spend millions on 'Going all the way', and millions on consultants to privatise our water supply, you can run your own first aid room and, if nobody answers the telephone at your school, then that is stiff. Thank you, the member for Wright!

Of course, the Minister was supported by Liberal MP, Joe Rossi, who wanted to enlist unemployed parents to carry out SSO tasks on a voluntary basis. The member for Lee said that parents sent their kids to school just to get rid of them! That is a magnificent contribution by the member for Lee and again will assist us greatly when we win that seat at the next election. These statements are both insulting and a delusion. Interestingly, these scandalous remarks were not rejected by the Minister. Not even a little rebuke like, 'Don't worry, it's only Joe again; he does not mean any harm.' The Minister condoned the views of the member for Lee by his very silence.

Given that the Government promised to increase spending on education, why have these decisions been made? This Government has reneged on all its major promises concerning education and cut $40 million from the budget to fund other priorities. Millions of dollars are being spent on programs such as 'Going all the way', changing logos on buses, and Government public relations at the expense of our children's education. Presiding over this charade is the Premier, who would have everyone believe his vision that South Australia's future is in information technology. He gives the impression that, for every information technology job he announces which comes to fruition, no South Australian who can use a keyboard will ever be unemployed again. What he did not announce was that last year the Government withheld the annual $360 000 grant to schools to buy computers.

This Government stands condemned by its own actions. To those members in the backbenches who are oncers and who are realising their mortality, I say: if you want to give yourselves any chance at the next election, you had better get hold of your Cabinet Ministers—in particular, this very arrogant Minister for Education—and overturn their decisions, not just to save your own skins and your own political future but for the sake of the education of the children of this State.

Mr BASS secured the adjournment of the debate.

GAMING MACHINES

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I move:

That this House calls on the Government to allocate sufficient funds from the taxation windfall that it has received from poker machines to fund fully the increase in demand for social welfare services and emergency relief that has occurred since their introduction.

Over the past few months, issues in relation to poker machines and their effects in our community have been widely canvassed in the media and in discussion. To some extent, my motion has been overtaken by some of those events. However, I wish to have this measure on the Notice Paper, to speak to it and have it debated. I had placed the motion on the Notice Paper in July but, unfortunately, it was not able to be debated in the last session. I first raised the issue of poker machines and their effect in relation to social welfare agencies in our community earlier this year around June, prior to the Estimates Committees, when I had been contacted by not only agencies in my own area but also social welfare agencies in the wider community, through my role as shadow Minister for Family and Community Services.

Issues relating to poker machines are very wide indeed. Over the past month or so, it is clear that the impact of poker machines has been large. It has impacted on community services, on charities and their ability to raise funds, on the ability of sporting clubs and other clubs of that nature to raise funds, on small business, on other gaming codes, and also on hotel business. Early last month, the Government—wisely and not before time—established an inquiry into the impact of gaming machines. As we all know, this inquiry will report at the end of October. As I said, to some extent events have overtaken this motion, but I want especially to take time to focus on the issues that certainly began my interest in this matter, that is, the issues in relation to community welfare agencies and their plight following the introduction of poker machines.

When the Gaming Machines Bill 1992 was being debated, there was a constant thread in the contributions of members from both sides of the House because, as we all know, this was a conscience issue, on which people had a free vote. As I read the contributions from all sections of the House, a constant theme came through that people recognised that with the advent of poker machines there would also be a down side. There would be some people in our community who would fall prey to the attractions on offer; they would find them hard to resist. The consequences of this would be a great detriment both to themselves in terms of their addiction

and also, and very importantly, to their families. Those consequences include lack of food; lack of ability to pay rent, electricity, water, rates, etc.; and a real desperation when people realise they have no money left and have a huge problem. In response to concerns that were raised in relation to the formation of that Bill, the Government established the Gamblers' Rehabilitation Fund. That fund was established in the latter half of last year and allocated $1.5 million. I note from the Auditor-General's Report that only $543 000 of that $1.5 million had been transferred by 30 June this year, so the use of this money has been late.

The $1.5 million was made up in the following way: $1 million came from the hotel and gaming industries themselves and $500 000 was contributed by the Casino. In this next financial year—1995-96—approximately $2 million has been set aside, again from those two sources. The point I wish to make is that the Government itself has not contributed anything. Not one red cent has come from the Government, but the greatest windfall—the greatest advantage—has gone to the Government because, since poker machines have been introduced, the Government has received an unprecedented windfall in terms of taxation, and it will continue to receive it. In the Estimates Committees earlier this year it was revealed that $53.2 million went to Government coffers in 1994-95, and estimates for this current financial year are now in excess of $80 million—about $210 000 per day. Some of this needs to go to alleviate the need that has now resulted.

I now wish to speak about that need and about organisations in my own area in the north. They are examples of what is happening across the board, but I will use those services to illustrate my point. In Elizabeth on 21 June 1995 there was a meeting of concerned charities and welfare agencies. These organisations are all major providers of welfare in the regions of Salisbury, Elizabeth, Munno Para and Gawler. At that meeting were: Anglican Community Services, the Salvation Army, the Elizabeth and Munno Para Community Fund, St Vincent de Paul, Ucare (Uniting Care) in Gawler, the Lone Parent Family Support Service, Morialta Trust, United Way North, the Shed Project, Midway Community House and Burton Park Community House. Those organisations agreed that the introduction of poker machines has had a twofold effect on all non-profit northern organisations: first, the demand on welfare and emergency relief services has increased out of sight; and, secondly, their ability to raise funds from bingo tickets, donations or corporations has decreased dramatically.

I would like to share in detail some of the issues relating to those agencies. The Anglican Community Services through the Elizabeth Mission is the largest provider of welfare relief in the area. The Elizabeth Mission has experienced a dramatic increase in requests for emergency financial assistance and food parcels. Its capacity to help has declined due to the effect of poker machines on the commercial sector, which is unable to donate cash or food and, therefore, it is having to give more refusals to requests for help. In the 12 months to June 1994 compared with the 12 months to June 1995 there has been an increase in emergency financial assistance requests to the Elizabeth-Munno Para Community Fund, of 34 per cent (all new clients). A comparison from June 1994 to June 1995 since the introduction of poker machines shows an increase in emergency financial assistance requests of 135 per cent. That agency has produced graphs, which show that when poker machines came in everything changed markedly.

In respect of the Salvation Army at Elizabeth, Goodwill donations and donations of food and clothing from retailers are disappearing; there has been an increase in the demand for welfare by over 20 per cent; the number of refusals has increased; and the amount of funds available to give away has been reduced. At Uniting Care in Gawler there has been an increase in direct assistance since November 1994 of 10 per cent and an increase in emergency financial assistance requests of approximately 20 per cent. Cash and goods donations are down, and there have been requests from local primary schools to host breakfasts for hungry children.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: They have, yes. In reply to the Minister's question, it's gone into the inquiry. Demand on Morialta Trust grant funds has increased greatly. Reports from groups expressing difficulty with fundraising have been received and commercial donations are down. Two community houses (Midway and Burton) have experienced an increase in the number of people seeking emergency financial assistance; their fundraising ability has been reduced; payments of fees and memberships are down; and there has been an increased demand for counselling. Finally, the Lone Parent Support Services group is closing due to lack of funds; FACS is not purchasing its services any more; and there has been an increase in requests for assistance. This is the picture that emerged from the meeting held at Elizabeth in June. It is typical of what is happening right across our community in terms of local welfare agencies. I am sure that members in all areas of our State will concur in what I am saying in this regard.

I am concerned that most poker machines are located in the north and the south. It is in the north that most community services have closed. Whilst there has been an increase in demand since the introduction of poker machines, there has also been an increased closure of our agencies, and our ability to deal with the situation has been reduced. The issues in relation to poker machines are complex.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: I agree. I understand that they are complex. A range of strategies will be required to tackle them, and I look forward to seeing the results of the inquiry that is being undertaken. I was heartened to hear yesterday through the media that community welfare agencies and the Australian Hotel and Hospitality Association recently discussed this situation to consider sharing the knowledge that all these organisations have regarding this matter. They also indicated that, together, they were willing to look at finding solutions to some of those issues. They spoke about training and informing staff in hotels and clubs on issues relating to gambling and helping staff to notice problem behaviour, and generally indicated a willingness to be proactive: not just to hold out their hand to community welfare centres saying, 'We need more money; give it to us', but saying, 'Yes, we do need more money, but we are also willing to work with others to look at the wide range of strategies that will be needed.' So, it was heartening to see from all sides that those agencies and the AHHA were willing to discuss the issue and to acknowledge that we need a comprehensive range of strategies to address all the issues in relation to gaming machines.

Finally, it is up to the Government to take a lead in this area. True, the Government has set up an inquiry and provided the opportunity for people from right across the spectrum to put their point of view. Presumably, the Government will be analysing the position and will be 'auspicing'

a range of strategies to deal with the issues that come out of the inquiry, but the Government needs to understand and acknowledge that it is receiving a huge windfall through taxation.

I believe that, when we are dealing with something that we know has a down side, the Government has an obligation to balance out some of this windfall and to return sufficient funds to the community welfare sector in order for it to deal effectively with that down side.

Mrs HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADELAIDE LIGHTNING

Mrs HALL (Coles): I move:

That this House notes the outstanding performance of Adelaide Lightning in winning the grand final of the National Women's Basketball League for the second year in succession.

In early September Adelaide Quit Lightning covered themselves in glory again, for the second year running. They sit atop the heap of the champions of the National Women's Basketball League. Their magnificent come-from-behind performance to take the title was witnessed by more than 7 000 people, almost all of them South Australians and keen Lightning fans. I am sure they ventured home just as happy but breathing more easily than they had done after the 1994 double overtime victory.

Sport has come a long way and has held an important place in Australian society now for many years. Sport provides entertainment for spectators and competition and physical exercise for all participants, but it is only relatively recently that sport's true potential has been recognised. Sport can provide an economic boon to our State. For example, this Government's initiative in relation to the Hindmarsh Stadium redevelopment will result in South Australia's securing preliminary rounds of the soccer competition for the Olympics in the year 2000—that truly magnificent international game of skill, I might say, and the top football code—and this will expose our city and State to tourist and television viewers all around the world. The potential value of that type of exposure must never be underrated.

The Office of Recreation, Sport and Racing, with its support of the South Australian Sports Institute, has been in the forefront of attempting to maximise the economic benefits of sport in South Australia. Its charter is about nurturing our athletes as well. The institute's emphasis is on working with different sports to support them in their development rather than trying to control them through restrictive and prescriptive policies. The results have been, as we know, at the very least, positive. In rowing, women's hockey, cycling, lacrosse and baseball our athletes have turned in significant and most impressive performances against the world's best. Of course, the Lightning's back to back titles clearly establish South Australia as the centre of excellence for women's basketball in Australia.

Adelaide Quit Lightning contributes heavily to the national team, the Goldmark Australian Opals. Raechel Sporn is one of the WNBL All Star Five and one of the world's top players. Michelle Brogan was the popular choice as the most outstanding player in the Opals' recent five game sweep of China. Jo Hill and Carla Boyd are other Lightning players who have recently earned Australian selection while guard Jae Kingi cannot be too far away. If you add to that line up the experience of former national team member Marina Moffa and top players such as Trudi Hopgood, Debbie Giles and Natasha O'Brien coming off the bench then you obviously have the potential for success.

To be sure, it is team work and not just the efforts of individuals who win championships. At the helm, binding it altogether into a winning team, was coach Jan Stirling. After losing four players from the 1994 team, other clubs and other coaches might have been content with a year of rebuilding, but not Jan Stirling and Adelaide Quit Lightning who have now strung together an imposing home court winning streak of 22 games without a loss. The Lightning are a proud organisation who are admired and feared around the league not just for their on court accomplishments. The strength of any organisation emanates from its leadership in the front office. The Lightning have experienced flair and know-how in their administration. Chairman Lyn Parnell, assistant coach Dean Kinsmen and all of the support team do a magnificent job in ensuring that the Lightning represent themselves, our city and our State with great pride.

Our heartiest congratulations go to the Lightning for their victory. Their efforts are worthy of our plaudits and indicative of the calibre of our sporting people in this State. The Lightning team has provided an example for our young people and, indeed, to all of us by turning a grand final deficit into victory. Long may they reign as Women's National Basketball League champs.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I, too, support the motion. I will not take very long because the member for Coles said everything that can be said. The outstanding achievements of Adelaide Lightning in winning the grand final for the second year in a row indicates the dedication and discipline of the team and of its support providers. It is always heartening to see women achieving at such a high level in sport, because I believe it gives great encouragement to our younger generations. Of course, it always brings a lump to our throats when a South Australian team does so incredibly well.

Motion carried.

CYCLING TEAM

Mr KERIN (Frome): I move:

That this House congratulates the South Australian members of the Australian Junior Cycling Team on their sensational performances at the Junior World Cycling Championships in San Marino, Italy.

Australia's previous best junior cycling results at the world championships were in 1994 in Quito, Ecuador, where Australia won three gold, one silver and two bronze medals. At this year's Under 19 World Championships in San Marino, Australia won six gold, one silver and one bronze medal. The overall results of the Australian team were outstanding as on six successive days Australian cyclists won gold medals. These results have amazed the cycling world, which consists of 167 countries affiliated to the International Union of Cycling. Australia has maintained its status as the number one junior cycling nation, and the gold medals won now set a new standard for future Australian cycling teams to aspire to at junior and senior world championships.

This was an absolutely world standard competition because all the European countries competed as did some Eastern Bloc, the Americas and the stronger Asian countries. South Australian representatives recorded sensational performances. In particular, in the 3 000 metre individual pursuit, Australia had two riders in the final, both of them from South Australia. Luke Roberts, a five times reigning national champion, rode a brilliant race to win the gold medal

with Port Pirie youngster, Matthew Meaney, winning silver. Tim Lyons teaming with Luke Roberts, Matthew Meaney and Ian Christison from New South Wales won gold in the 4 000 teams pursuit. After catching and beating France in the quarter-finals, the Australian team out-pedalled the German team in the final.

South Australia's Nino Solari was manager of the Australian team and Shayne Bannan was the coach. Team manager Nino Solari was very pleased with the results of the team and said, 'This is the best ever result by any country in the 21 year history of the Junior World Championships: not even the Soviet Union won this many medals during its hey day.' All five local lads in the Australian team, including Luke Kuss, who rode in the lead-up rounds of the 4 000 metre teams pursuit, and Matthew Sparnon, who was in the road team, are scholarship holders at the South Australian Sports Institute and their outstanding performance is a reflection of the excellent work being done by SASI coach, Ian McKenzie.

As I mentioned, Matthew Meaney lives at Port Pirie. The people of the city are certainly proud of Matthew, as he is a fine young man and an excellent ambassador for the city. Last year Matthew was awarded the Sporting Association of Port Pirie Sports Person of the Year Award. Matthew is clearly identified in Port Pirie as the city's greatest chance of being represented in the Sydney 2000 Olympics. He has been receiving tremendous support from many people in Port Pirie, and the community is closely following Matthew's progress. The Port Pirie Cycle Club is certainly proud of having their own junior world champion and when Matthew rides he certainly carries not only their total support but also their hopes and aspirations.

Whilst congratulating the entire Australian team, I particularly would like to congratulate those South Australian members of the team. I am sure members of the House, particularly our own former South Australian cycling champion, the member for Price, would join me in wishing them well in the next few years and we look forward to these cyclists providing South Australia with strong representation at the cycling events at the Sydney 2000 Olympics. Hopefully, the names Matthew Meaney, Luke Roberts, Tim Lyons, Luke Kuss and Matthew Sparnon will then be households names. We wish them well.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I have great pleasure in supporting the motion moved by the member for Frome and congratulate the South Australian riders in the world championship series: the results were sensational. I will put the team's success into context by paying a tribute to all the members of the Australian team who were predominantly South Australians.

Of course, the performances by the junior cyclists must take most of the plaudits, but their support team was part of the reason they did so well. As mentioned by the member for Frome, the Australian junior team won the gold medal in the 3 000 metre team pursuits championship. The team comprised four riders: Luke Roberts, Tim Lyons, Matthew Meaney from South Australia and Ian Christison from New South Wales. Luke Roberts went on to win the gold medal in the 3 000 metre individual pursuit title, with Matthew Meaney taking out the bronze medal. Traditionally, European cyclists have an enormous advantage and it is regarded as incredibly difficult for an Australian cyclist to travel overseas to compete against them and win gold medals at a world championship series.

It is an enormous job and, over the years, has been compared with an Adelaide league football club second team winning an AFL premiership at the MCG. It is just as difficult for Australian cyclists to compete against Europeans at a world series and win. As the member for Frome mentioned, the team was greatly assisted in its success by the South Australian coach, Ian McKenzie. Ian is a wonderful person, an extremely good road cyclist in his own right, and he has done a magnificent job with these riders. Shane Bannan is the national track endurance coach. Formerly from the Northern Territory, Shane has been domiciled in South Australia now for many years and has done a magnificent job with these riders.

Nino Solari from South Australia managed the team. Nino is a former Italian rider who was one of my team members on many occasions. His son is an international cyclist and dual Italian Olympian. Phil Mittiga from South Australia was the team mechanic. I believe this cycling success is a flow-on from the national coaching director, Charlie Walsh. Charlie's influence and the advent of the world-class cycling velodrome at Gepps Cross have been the two major factors in Australia's emergence as a top cycling nation in the world. It is a fabulous performance, and I fully support the motion moved by the member for Frome. Congratulations to the South Australian riders and team officials. It augurs well for the future of the sport not only in South Australia but in Australia.

Motion carried.

NETBALL TEAM

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): I move:

That this House congratulates the Australian netball team on winning the recent world championships in Birmingham, particularly noting the performance of South Australian players Kathryn Harby, Sarah Sutter, Natalie Avalino, Jennifer Borlase and captain Michelle Fielke.

The body and ball control, pinpoint passing, stamina and tactical acumen were the ingredients for Australia's 1995 world netball victory. Tremendous faith and strength of character were apparent, particularly by the captain and key defender, Michelle Fielke, and the outstanding goal shooter, Jennifer Borlase, who were afforded the opportunity to play in the grand final. Three others from South Australia also played major roles in Australia's success with their skill and fierce desperation in the lead-up to the games. They were Natalie Avalino, Sarah Sutter and Kathryn Harby, who also cherish their gold medals. Michelle Fielke, Sarah, Kathryn and Jennifer were former SASI scholarship holders.

Australia defeated New Zealand by one goal midway through the competition and outplayed South Africa 68 to 48 in the final. The value of spirit, commitment and relentless pressure were evident throughout the tournament in Birmingham, England. Fielke, captain of the victorious team in Sydney in 1991, also was an exemplary captain, showing her will to win. Jennifer excelled as vice-captain, but star goalkeeper, Vicki Wilson, suffered a knee injury against New Zealand, which was unfortunate. With 313 goals to 29 quarters, at a conversion rate of 89.7, Jennifer emerged as one of the world's top goal shooters. She has left no doubt of her worth by performing so well in tough, tight situations.

Michelle Fielke combines year-long netball commitments with club team Garville in South Australia and her calling as Assistant Manager of the Fun, Sport and Action program based at the Office of Recreation, Sport and Racing at

Kidman Park. Jennifer and Natalie also play with State champion team Garville, while Kathryn and Sarah play with Contax. Netball is one of the highest participation sports in Australia, and I congratulate the team wholeheartedly.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I support this motion and endorse the comments of the honourable member opposite. I am particularly pleased to speak to this motion because the success of the Australian netball team at the recent world championships in Birmingham is due to its members' hard work and their great commitment to their sport, and I have said that about other teams in the past. Commitment and team spirit play the ultimate role in any sporting success. The Australian netball team has shown again that it has the dedication needed to achieve at the highest level. In addition, they give encouragement to the younger generation, particularly to young women, to strive to achieve their own life goals.

Ms HURLEY (Napier): I support this motion as I also support the previous motion about the Women's Basketball League. The statistics show that many young girls play sport but that, at the age of 16, the level of participation drops off dramatically. It is important that, in these teams, we have role models for girls, showing that they can succeed in sport, that it is worth while to succeed in sport, and that sportswomen attract the same accolades and attention as sportsmen. I am pleased to note that much more media attention has been paid to women's basketball and netball. We all know that netball is played and enjoyed by many women and that it has not received sufficient attention by sportswriters. However, the performance of the Australian women basketballers and netballers adds a great deal of impetus and interest for sportswriters and will result in further coverage of those sports.

We are particularly proud of the Australian netball team because so many South Australians were represented in it and performed excellently. In our State they will be a great role model for our young girls who want to play sport. My niece, who lives in the Northern Territory, is coming down for an Australia-wide netball competition next month, I believe, and I will be very interested to see these under 16-year-old girls playing this sport. I hope that many of them continue to play beyond the definite cut-off point of 16 years. I am particularly pleased to note that many members of the Australian netball team go out into the community to encourage girls to play sport. They are very community minded and Kathryn Harby and Michelle Fielke, in particular, have done sterling work to encourage girls to get involved.

Motion carried.

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

WATER AND SEWERAGE OUTSOURCING

A petition signed by 466 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to legislate to retain public ownership, control, management and operation of the supply of water and the collection and treatment of sewerage was presented by the Hon. G.A. Ingerson.

Petition received.

URBAN BUSHLAND

A petition signed by 53 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to ensure that effective legislation is enacted to protect urban trees and/or bushland from destruction was presented by the Hon. G.A. Ingerson.

Petition received.

SCHOOL SERVICES OFFICERS

A petition signed by 62 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to restore school services officers' hours to the level that existed when the Government assumed office was presented by Mrs Greig.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal—Report, 1994-95

By the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)—

South Australian Totalizator Agency Board—Report, 1994-95.

GARIBALDI SMALLGOODS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I rise to provide the House with further information on the prosecution of Garibaldi and its directors. On 9 February 1995 I indicated that the Government was determined to pursue prosecutions of Garibaldi and its directors as soon as evidence became available. That was the day that the Government's additional resources for the Coroner's inquiry were announced.

Health Commission officers had already been collaborating with a number of other bodies, including the National Food Authority and the Trade Practices Commission, in their assessments of possible offences by Garibaldi. Both State and Federal authorities refrained from instigating legal proceedings at this time. The inquest was given priority. The coronial inquiry was an independent inquiry looking at the actions of all participants, not just the Garibaldi company.

The Government had to consider a range of possible avenues to hold Garibaldi's directors responsible for their actions. First, there was the probability of legal action being launched against Garibaldi by parties other than the State Government. The most likely action, of course, was that of the customers of Garibaldi to pursue civil damages. The Trade Practices Commission was also known to be interested.

Secondly, there was the avenue of pursuing prosecutions to the full extent of State law, for instance the Food Act, with its narrow focus and small penalties—penalties which I have indicated already will be subject to review. Thirdly, the Government was determined to facilitate a full and thorough public inquiry into all aspects of the matter through the Coroner's Court. The Government gave pre-eminence to the Coroner's inquiry and made available resources accordingly. Had the Government acted as the Opposition now suggests and prosecuted the company at the earliest opportunity, we

would most likely still not have finished that court case, in which circumstance the coronial inquiry would not have commenced and the civil actions of the families would have been postponed indefinitely.

I remind the House that the maximum penalty for the relevant offences under the food legislation is a $2 500 fine. By taking the course as outlined we have successfully completed the coronial inquiry, the families are in a position much earlier to pursue civil remedies and the State is in a position to work with other authorities to pursue other remedies.

As far as the Health Commission is concerned, the primary mode of action is the Food Act 1985—legislation introduced by the former Government. Although Garibaldi appointed a provisional liquidator, the individual directors of Garibaldi remained liable to prosecution under the Food Act. As I indicated previously, the South Australian Health Commission and the Trade Practices Commission have been collaborating since early February. The Trade Practices Commission indicated yesterday afternoon, now that the inquest has finished and it has examined its findings, that it is considering action against Garibaldi for its failure to properly label its products. I quote from a letter to me from the Chairman of the commission, received this morning, as follows:

> I understand that you may be commenting today on the possible role of the Trade Practices Commission in the Garibaldi matter and, in view of this, I would like to inform you of the commission's current position. The commission has recently examined the finding of the inquest by Coroner Chivell into the death of Nikki Robinson and, as a result of that examination, considers that proceedings under the product liability provisions of the Trade Practices Act are likely to be warranted. The commission is likely, subject to receiving affirmative legal advice, to commence representative proceedings on behalf of the affected parties under Part VA of the Act. Proceedings under these provisions are civil and are for damages in respect of losses suffered by affected parties.
>
> However, before the commission would be in a position to progress any such proceedings it would require the written consent of at least seven of the affected parties. The commission is presently proceeding to obtain that consent on the basis that it is likely to proceed with the matter. If the commission did not obtain that consent it would be unable to institute any court proceedings on this matter.

The Trade Practices Commission has sought the Health Commission's cooperation, and this morning the commission has written to the Trade Practices Commission and indicated its willingness to provide whatever assistance is necessary. Unlike the $2 500 limit to the relevant offence under the Food Act, both the Trade Practices Act and civil remedies do not have a limit on damages, nor is there a six-month time limitation for action. They are much more effective responses to the damage that has been done.

In addition, I have been advised that the South Australian Police Department is referring the Coroner's findings to the Director of Public Prosecutions, seeking his view as to whether the evidence is sufficient to prosecute under the criminal law. As I indicated yesterday, I am keen to explore amendment to the Food Act to allow the institution of proceedings in a more realistic time frame. Further, I will be considering increasing the penalties under the Food Act. I am amazed that, following the 1991 and 1992 incidents, the former Government did not see the need to amend its Food Act to bring the penalties into line with the importance of public health issues or to provide the Health Commission with appropriate powers and sanctions to ensure good manufacturing practice.

I assure the House that the Government will continue to pursue these matters to hold Garibaldi's directors responsible for their actions and to highlight to industry the importance of public health.

QUESTION TIME

GARIBALDI SMALLGOODS

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Did the Premier take any action when he became aware of the likelihood of Garibaldi's going into receivership or liquidation in order to limit damages to the company? The Premier said that his discussions with the directors of Garibaldi about the HUS epidemic on 4 February included whether the company was likely to go into receivership and the possibility that it might be put into liquidation. On the following Monday, the Director of Public Health attended a further meeting with Garibaldi and the provisional liquidator when liquidation was identified as necessary to limit damages.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I understood the question to be (and I may have misunderstood its exact nature): did I in any way act to encourage the company to go into liquidation to limit damages, or was I aware of that? The answer is 'No, in no way whatsoever.' I certainly would not be party to such an action; it would be inappropriate to do so. When it came to the meeting on 4 February, the company simply indicated that it was considering this action. There was absolutely no discussion about whether or not it was appropriate for the company to go into liquidation or receivership. It would have been inappropriate to do so.

The directors of the company understood their responsibility, and that responsibility is put down by Federal law. There is the point, though—and I think the honourable member should be aware of this—that, under Federal law, you can trace back and secure the assets of any company that goes into liquidation, or any assets that have been transferred out of the company, and you can generally go back six to 12 months to achieve that. In a number of areas, it is the directors who are responsible, so whether or not the company is in receivership is entirely irrelevant, because the directors themselves can be had up on criminal or some other charges. Therefore, whilst I saw the speculation yesterday that there had been some attempt by the company to limit damages by going into receivership, I can give an assurance that that matter was never discussed in my presence.

It would have been inappropriate, and I would not have supported any such action taken by the company. Any discussion about going into receivership was entirely the prerogative of the directors of the company and their advisers. I also indicate that the Government would and still does preserve its right, even though the company is in liquidation, to go after the directors as individuals. The honourable member's question is somewhat ignorant of Federal commercial law, because she would realise—and she did not point this out to the House—that under Federal commercial law there is considerable protection for those who are suing a company that is in liquidation or receivership.

EMPLOYMENT

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education provide details of the latest labour force figures for South Australia?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: What we have seen today regarding figures is the highest employment peak that has been reached since July 1990.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: These are not my figures; these are ABS figures. We now have 660 200 people employed in South Australia compared with the previous high of 657 700 in July 1990. Some very important points should be made about today's figures. We have seen some job shedding in the manufacturing sector—the whitegoods area, the automotive area and other related manufacturing areas. As we know, South Australia is highly dependent upon manufacturing, and when consumer demand falls in those areas South Australia feels the effect. That is what has happened, and the impact has been particularly on women, many of whom work part time. This reinforces the justification of this Government to diversify employment options in this State. That is why we are pursuing information technology and supporting aquaculture, tourism and other significant areas of development, including the wine industry. We need to diversify in South Australia so that we do not have all our employment eggs in the one basket.

This just reinforces the push by all Ministers, particularly the Premier and the Minister for Infrastructure, to generate new industries for South Australia so that we are not totally or largely dependent upon a manufacturing base. Other factors that are not helping South Australia include the fear of an interest rate hike. The community had its fingers burnt a few years ago, and any whiff of an interest rate hike sends fear through the consumers of Australia. That is reflected in their not buying cars or whitegoods, and South Australia suffers as a result. The other fear is the fear of the imposition of a higher wine tax by the Federal Labor Government. We want an assurance in that regard. People will be reluctant to invest in that industry if they face the prospect of a wine industry hike by the Federal Government.

Recently, the Federal Government put up the sales tax on motor cars. That was a real kick in the guts for South Australia, as that is one of our biggest employment industries. Coupled with a downturn in the building industry throughout Australia in terms of housing, we will see less demand for wall ovens, tumble driers and refrigerators, the sorts of things that South Australia manufactures. So, the figures today indicate an increase in the total level of employment but an unemployment level that is far too high, and we are determined to try to get it down. However, as I said yesterday, the Commonwealth Government is a main player. We can do our part, but we do not control fiscal or monetary policy or tariffs: those fall particularly in the court of the Federal Government. I suggest to members that, in the context of these figures, we have seen again this week an increase in the number of companies seeking employees in South Australia. We must marry up the unemployed with those job vacancies.

Finally, I make a plea to those people who can afford to and who need to update their whitegoods in their home or who need a new car, to buy South Australian, to get out there and buy those products. There are many people, particularly in the mature age bracket, whose refrigerators, stoves and motor cars are becoming a bit dated. I urge them, if they can afford it, to get behind the State and buy South Australian products. I urge the Opposition to get behind positive developments in South Australia instead of being a mob of knockers trying to undermine every positive development in tourism and other areas that we are seeking to promote in order to create jobs for South Australians.

GARIBALDI SMALLGOODS

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. On what date did the Minister receive advice that Garibaldi had committed an offence under the Food Act relating to meat substitution and incorrect labelling of mettwurst, and did he consult with the Premier or Cabinet before deciding not to proceed with prosecution?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am unclear as to the exact date, but I will get back to the honourable member on that point. One of the real dilemmas in this whole matter is that the labelling requirements regarding the type of meat that is put into these various products are quite specific. Indeed, the very test which allowed the diagnosis of this epidemic to be made on 23 January at noon (the PCR test, Polymerase chain reaction test) which identified the actual genes within the chromosomal analysis of e-coli 111, was utilised to determine what meats were actually in the mettwurst.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth has asked her question.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: As I said, I am happy to determine when that advice was available, but that took some time to get to me.

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Elizabeth not to continue to interject.

ROAD FUNDING

Mr BUCKBY (Light): Will the Minister for Tourism inform the House of the State Government grants made to local government which will be used to upgrade roads in tourism regions of the State?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I am pleased to announce that some $559 000 of funding through the Government's 1995-96 tourism road grants will be made in the next few days. Most of the grants have been supplemented by local councils, but it is important that Parliament be made aware of this progressive road funding program which will enable more tourists to come to our State. It is as follows: Seal Bay Road, Kangaroo Island, $385 000; Springton Road, Barossa Valley, $29 000; Cape Bauer Drive, stage 3, Streaky Bay, $53 000; Sacred Canyon Road, Flinders Ranges, $50 000; access road to Lake Gilles National Park, District Council of Kimba, $24 000; and Collaby Hill/Church Roads, District Council of Port Pirie, $18 000. This contribution to road funding is very important in terms of the tourism development of our State, and it is with great pleasure that I recognise and recommend these grants to the country road program.

GARIBALDI SMALLGOODS

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Will the Minister for Health table the advice from Crown Law which advised him as follows:

> If we had instituted a prosecution—which I was keen to do—the directors at Garibaldi would have had every opportunity to stop the proceedings of the Coroner's inquiry.

The Opposition has received legal advice that a prosecution under the Food Act relating to false labelling would not have provided the directors of Garibaldi with any opportunity to stop the inquiry.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member was clearly commenting. I ask the Minister to ignore that part of the question.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Again, this is a little bit like a number of discussions we have had in relation to FOI requests and Coroners: if you get two lawyers, you get two opinions. There is absolutely no suggestion other than the fact that my advice was that to institute proceedings under the Food Act would have given the directors an opportunity to stop the prompt dispatch of the Coroner's inquiry.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): My question is directed to the Premier. What is the South Australian Government's attitude to the draft legislation circulated by the Commonwealth for leasing of major airports, and what action is the Government taking to develop proposals to upgrade the Adelaide Airport terminal?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I can indicate that the State Government has now received draft legislation from the Commonwealth Government. We find that draft legislation particularly unfavourable for South Australia.

Mr Foley: Funny about that.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, it is. The honourable member says it is funny that the Labor Government in Canberra should come out and specifically want to disadvantage places like Adelaide. We know the extent to which it is trying to win votes in Sydney and Melbourne but it is willing to sacrifice States like South Australia. Let South Australians take up that point at the next Federal election and give due justice to that Federal Labor Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The members for Ridley and Hart are out of order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Under the draft legislation, the Federal Government has proposed that Adelaide Airport will be leased out after Brisbane, Sydney, Melbourne and Perth airports, and I find that completely unacceptable. The legislation contains no provision for State input into the airport master development plan or rebuilding proposals, and the criteria for Commonwealth approval do not include consideration of Adelaide Airport's place in the regional economy. Also, the States are excluded from any involvement in the leasing process.

I find it totally unacceptable that the Federal Government, first, wants to completely ignore the Adelaide Airport, even though it is responsible for its poor state and neglect over the past 11 or 12 years and, secondly, is not willing, as part of the leasing out process, to consult very closely with the State Governments. I also indicate that the State Government is now embarking on a program to bring forward, as quickly as possible, the development of the airport terminal passenger facilities. As part of that program we have had and will have ongoing discussions with a number of interested parties.

If possible, we propose to bring together the international and domestic terminals. A development in excess of $100 million is likely if the Federal Government lets us lease out the airport as quickly as possible and allows some State Government consultation as part of the redevelopment program. We also believe there is a chance to include in that development the installation of air bridges. The proposal announced by Mr Howard in Adelaide on Tuesday would allow this redevelopment to proceed at least 18 months ahead of what would occur under the Federal Labor Government's proposal and draft legislation I have just mentioned.

I stress to all South Australians, but particularly to the Labor members, that, when their Federal colleagues visit Adelaide—as the Prime Minister did just over a week ago and as Laurie Brereton did at the end of last week—they well and truly screw their ears about the need to make sure that Adelaide Airport can be leased out as quickly as possible, and to support this State rather than wanting to put it at the end of the queue, as they have done for the past 12 years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I would suggest to all members that interjections cease forthwith.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is out of order. The Leader of the Opposition.

HUS EPIDEMIC DOCUMENTS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Given the Minister's statement that the Government has not held back any documents relating to the HUS epidemic, why was the copy of the diary, kept by Ms Carolyn Walker, changed before it was provided to the Opposition under freedom of information laws? On 10 October, the Health Commission forwarded to the Opposition a copy of a diary of events that occurred in relation to the HUS epidemic for the period 16 January to 27 January kept by Ms Carolyn Walker, a clinical nurse at the Health Commission.

This document, provided to the Opposition under freedom of information laws, comprised five pages with no page numbers. A copy of the same document held by the Coroner shows that the original diary had 19 pages and all were numbered. However, 14 pages of the diary provided to the Opposition under FOI law were missing.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I will look into the particular matter but I reiterate what I said yesterday: the Coroner's constable was given *carte blanche* of the Health Commission files. So, every relevant document that the Coroner believed important is on the public record. As I have said on at least two previous occasions, I have been assured and reassured, following further investigations by the Health Commission, that all relevant documentation has been provided.

EXPORTERS CHALLENGE SCHEME

Mr WADE (Elder): Will the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development explain the benefits to South Australia of the new exporters challenge scheme administered by the Business Centre?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The new exporters challenge scheme is an excellent one, because it bridges the gap between zero cost of exporting and the cutting of support by the Commonwealth Government. A number of years ago, when I was a member of the Senate, the Commonwealth Government lifted the threshold for support for accessing export markets to $30 000. That significantly disadvantaged small-medium businesses in Australia and South Australia. As a result, a scheme was put in place picking up the zero to $30 000 to ensure that small-medium businesses were not disadvantaged.

The scheme is working successfully in supporting exporters. In the past year 95 businesses were assisted. There was a 252 per cent increase over the previous year through utilising the scheme. I guess that is why 41 per cent of our

manufacturers are in the export market—a higher percentage than in any other State in Australia. It is also why exports out of South Australia last year grew by 2½ times the national average.

In South Australia 150 businesses have received financial assistance under the scheme to a total of $577 833. Firms receive a retrospective grant to cover export market development costs in any one financial year, the companies themselves having to spend the first $5 000 in promotional expenses towards that scheme up to $30 000.

The types of goods and services being exported under the scheme are water disinfection equipment, audio loudspeakers, computer software, industrial weighing machines, educational health services, conveyer systems, gourmet food, tourism and cargo barriers.

I should like to draw three outstanding successes to the attention of the House. High-tech loudspeakers, involving a company established only two years ago which sought an expansion of its domestic market, now have an export market with sales to the United States, United Kingdom, Japan, Korea, China, Indonesia, Vietnam, Malaysia and New Zealand, accounting for 30 per cent of total sales.

Modular wine racks are another product in question: all production imports are recycled, and there has been a 160 per cent increase in export sales due to overseas marketing activities underwritten by the State Government's scheme.

Orchid plant growers established a register of orchid growers to target export markets, and we are now exporting orchids to Asia, South Africa, USA, UK and the Netherlands. It is much the same as a South Australian company exporting pasta to Italy, which it is now doing.

This clearly indicates that South Australian business operators can access the international marketplace and that we can mix and match it with the best in the world with our products going to those marketplaces. The State Government has a whole series of schemes in place, not the least of which is trade missions to assist these companies to go to the overseas markets. Those trade missions are designed to help small companies, which do not have export managers or the resources of a large company, identify and access other markets. We are attempting to facilitate their opportunities to go into those markets by removing almost the daunting task involving the first step necessary for some of these small-medium businesses to look at, go in, attract and access those export markets. If we can develop this export culture out of South Australia on the same growth path as we have seen in recent years, particularly the past year, it will bring contracts and business back to South Australia, and that means jobs in South Australia.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Given the Minister's answer to the member for Kaurna today, how does he explain the inconsistency between his answer and the fact that South Australia now has the highest level of unemployment in Australia at 9.8 per cent, notwithstanding that interest rates affect all States of Australia; and why has he used the trend figures of the labour force statistics rather than the seasonally adjusted statistics which he has used in the past?

Today's ABS release shows that in September employment in South Australia fell by 7 000. In the period since the December 1993 State election, employment grew by 15 000 or 2.3 per cent, while in Australia employment grew by 470 000 or 6 per cent. Further, since the election of the Brown Government full-time employment in South Australia has fallen by 10 000, whilst over the same period full-time employment for Australia as a whole has risen by 266 900.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting and is out of order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I should explain to the Deputy Leader that the trend series is based on seasonally adjusted figures. The trend line is a more refined version of the seasonally adjusted figures and gives a more accurate underlying trend of where we are heading. The monthly figures—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and I also warn the member on my right who was interjecting.

An honourable member: The member for Unley.

The SPEAKER: I would not be surprised if it was. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Thank you, Mr Speaker. You might like to seasonally adjust the member for Unley. The trend figures are based on the seasonally adjusted figures and give a longer term perspective, whereas the monthly figures giving a snapshot: one photograph compared to a feature film. As I mentioned, South Australia is very dependent on manufacturing. If there is a downturn in demand for consumer goods, affecting whitegoods and the automotive industry, we suffer. The ABS figures indicate that there has been a decline in the manufacturing sector, and that has been reflected in both part-time and full-time work, particularly affecting women.

There has been a reduction in new house constructions in the housing industry throughout Australia: that will involve fewer purchases of new ovens, washing machines and tumble driers in those areas, and that will flow through to South Australia. We are always affected by a downturn in domestic demand for whitegoods and automotive industry commodities. The hike in the sales tax on motor cars has meant that one of our manufacturers has a stockpile of 2 500 cars. One day recently it sold 16 compared with the normal 200, and that was because the sales tax hike sent a bad message to the rest of Australia. That is the consequence of silly policy adjustments by the Federal Government.

WOMEN PRISONERS

Mrs HALL (Coles): My question is directed to the Minister for Correctional Services. What progress has been made in meeting the Government's election commitment to provide separate prison accommodation for women who are convicted of minor offences? I have received complaints from constituents who inform me that, because segregated facilities have not been provided for women prisoners, fine defaulters, remandees and low security prisoners, they are being forced to mix with hardened criminals, therefore placing them at risk.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: As the member for Coles correctly points out, this issue has been of concern for many years in South Australia. Despite that concern and the fact that in the Northfield Women's Prison complex minor offenders have been mixed with hardened offenders and despite the fact that the previous Labor Government spent $180 million on prison capital works, no attention was ever paid to that problem. As Minister for Correctional Services,

I am aware that there has been a disproportionate number of attempted suicides among women inmates compared with their male counterparts in the prison system.

I was not prepared to tolerate that situation any further. The situation is now about three weeks away from being rectified. There is an ironic twist to how this occurred. Members will recall camp holiday—Stalag 13—Labor's fine default centre. It was a fine default centre which, I was pleased to announce, this Government closed on 3 August. It was closed by transferring fine defaulters to Yatala Prison. That facility was next door to the Northfield Women's Prison.

Since its closure, secure perimeter fencing has been erected around the old fine default centre to the extent that it now has a 3.6 metre fence, topped with razor wire and complete with electronic security surveillance equipment and camera equipment that is presently being installed. That will allow that part of the prison to become fully integrated with the Northfield Women's Prison, creating a new Adelaide Women's Prison.

The previous 60-bed fine default centre has become a 28-bed add-on to the existing women's prison. Included now in the facility are cooking facilities to enable women prisoners to cook their own meals, allowing easier integration back into the community when they leave prison, reducing the cost of providing their meals and making them more responsible for their daily routine in the prison.

Of the 28 accommodation spaces in that prison, four have attached facilities for young children. Members would be aware that one of the common problems facing prisons throughout the world is the fact that female inmates often have young babies. Therefore, for the first time, there will be adequate accommodation to enable infants up to the age of six months to be cared for by their mothers to at least commence the bonding process while the mothers of those infants are incarcerated. As a consequence of this move, which cost $320 000, the women's prison has been expanded from 45 to 70 beds. That means that we now have sufficient accommodation for women prisoners in this State. Members would be aware that, regrettably, many women prisoners have had to be accommodated temporarily on mattresses on the floor or on folding beds while the prison accommodation was being expanded.

In addition, two hectares of land has been added to the women's prison enclosure, as well as the accommodation space, which for the first time provides meaningful industry and, therefore, work opportunities within the women's prison. The expanded women's prison will therefore provide for the first time an opportunity for women prisoners to work and the opportunity for prisons to be managed appropriately, to separate hard core offenders from low security prisoners and to move them through a regime.

The accommodation is slightly better in standard than was previously the case for women prisoners, so to obtain this better accommodation they must be of a low or, at highest, a medium classified prisoner, must be demonstrated to be drug free, must have demonstrated appropriate good behaviour in the prison for at least three months prior to moving into that area and must have a commitment to the philosophy of their incarceration of attempting to stop their offending behaviour. The changes to this regime are a credit to all staff involved. The Northfield Prison staff have been closely involved in setting up the new regimes, in making changes to the accommodation and in creating a new prison environment.

In closing, it is interesting to note that the current number of fine defaulters today in the prison system housed at Yatala is just 12. The Labor Government built a 60-bed fine default centre—a 60-bed holiday camp—which has now been converted by this Government to a proper prison system. The figure itself—12 fine defaulters—demonstrates that, instead of taking the easy way out, offenders are better able under this Government to pay their fines or work them off, and that is what they are doing.

BUILDING MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Is the Minister for Tourism concerned about the fact that for the past two years the Auditor-General has drawn attention to inadequacies in the accounting and financial controls of the Department of Building Management? The Auditor-General has pointed out that independent audits of the Department of Building Management have only been able to provide qualified opinion, citing inadequate documentation on the value of the department's plant and equipment and inventories. The Auditor-General notes that contracting out and other factors have increased the need for tighter financial controls.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I am not concerned at all about the Auditor-General's Report, and the reason I am not concerned is that the Auditor-General has sat down with the new management in the department and worked with the department to set up new systems. Over the accounting period at least 30 issues needed to be resolved, and every one has been resolved. We are very happy and will continue to work on all occasions with the Auditor-General. The Department of Building Management has been totally restructured in the past two years. We have totally changed the method and operation of the department. It has been scaled down, and we are now using private sector methods in terms of accounting for all the contracting out; and, as far as I am aware, the Auditor-General, at least until a couple of weeks ago, was very satisfied with the direction the department is taking.

AUSTRALIAN SPORTS INSTITUTE

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Will the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing comment on recent press announcements made by the Australian Sports Commission relating to the new role of the Australian Sports Institute? Does the Minister have any concerns about the new role?

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I certainly have some concerns about what is happening over there with the ASI, particularly because I see an attempt by the Commonwealth to hijack some of our high performance athletes away from the SASI sports programs and across into the Commonwealth. The Australian Sports Commission used a press conference last Thursday to release several new initiatives relating to high performance sport in Australia in the context of assisting Australia's elite athletes in the run up to the Atlanta and Sydney 2000 Games.

One of the initiatives relates to an internal restructuring of the commission to allow all those components of the commission linked to elite sport to come under the control of the Director of the Australian Sports Institute. Another initiative relates to the manner in which some Commonwealth funds will be distributed to high performance athletes throughout Australia.

It is intended that SASI athletes currently receiving a living allowance through the Sports Commission will now be

paid the same allowance but in the form of an ASI scholarship. These athletes will now be seen as Australian Institute of Sport scholarship holders and will be required to wear the AIS symbol on their uniforms. This would appear to be an attempt to gain additional visibility for the AIS at the expense of the South Australian Sports Institute. It has the potential to harm our ability to have prominent recognition for the South Australian Sports Institute and, indeed, all State institutes, especially in terms of marketing, promotion and sponsorship opportunities.

Take, for example, an outstanding South Australian swimmer who was a member of the South Australian Sports Institute's swimming program: he is coached by the South Australian Sports Institute's swimming coach and has access to services provided by our local institute: psychology, physiology, sports medicine and personal development courses. His travel and accommodation expenses for swimming competitions throughout Australia are paid by SASI on behalf of the South Australian taxpayer. However, because he is receiving a living allowance from the Commonwealth Government he will soon be seen as an Australian Institute of Sport scholarship holder.

There is also concern about the consultation process used by the commission to determine these concepts. No State Minister—certainly none with whom we have been in contact—was consulted before this press conference was announced. Whilst we have to acknowledge that the prime focus in these matters is always to do with the well-being of the elite athlete and the support service for them, I have written to the Federal Sports Minister (Senator Faulkner), registering the strongest protest at what has been done and at the lack of consultation. This matter will be raised by me at the next Sports Minister's conference nationally so that we can get some resolution of the matter to ensure the integrity of the South Australian Sports Institute (which, after all, was the first sports institute in Australia) and to ensure that our athletes remain identified with the South Australian Sports Institute and are not hijacked by the Commonwealth.

CHICKEN GROWERS

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Will the Minister for Primary Industries provide to the House details of any guarantees he has given to South Australian chicken growers to ensure that they have the ability collectively to bargain with processors and that a framework will be in place to resolve disputes between growers and processors? I have been approached, as has my colleague in another place (the shadow Minister for Primary Industries) by concerned chicken growers seeking protection from any deleterious effects of deregulation and assurances that they will continue to have the right to bargain collectively and to resolve disputes.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I have had several meetings with chicken growers from South Australia, including a meeting last week with the chicken growers representing the Australian industry. They say that they are having tremendous difficulties in negotiating reasonable contracts with the processors not only in South Australia but in other States. I have offered to the chicken growers in South Australia a person to mediate as they negotiate those contracts for the next 12 months, because things have been at a stalemate in this State for two years. I offered that to the South Australian chicken growers three months ago. They have not come back to me for an independent person to give them some help.

I reiterated the offer to the Australian chicken growers when they met with me last week. They, too, have said that they would like someone to help break any deadlocks between chicken growers and the processors, and I got them to put forward some names. I am asking them to write to me and give me the name of a person who is suitable to them to be an independent arbitrator and negotiator, to make sure that the contracts they sign with the processors are in the best interests of all producers and processors and of the industry in South Australia. That is where the matter rests.

RABBITS

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Will the Minister for Primary Industries give the House the latest details on the difficulties facing CSIRO and primary industry researchers following the release of the rabbit calicivirus from the quarantine area on Wardang Island, as announced by the Minister to this House yesterday?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I thank the honourable member for his question and for his concern on this matter. It is always rather difficult on a Thursday morning when we have private members' time. When there are members in the corridors of this place for three or four hours before Question Time, rumours and innuendo start up. The rumours were rife this morning, and I want to clear the matter up in Question Time this afternoon. It is factual: there has been another death of a rabbit on Wardang Island. That rabbit has now been transported, post haste, to the animal health laboratories in Geelong, and this morning I have had some several conversations with Dr Keith Murray about the situation. He assures me, as he has assured his Minister, that the situation is well under control.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I can assure you that it is. The surveillance on Wardang Island is in place. Of course, there is absolutely no evidence that the latest tragic death of this rabbit on Wardang Island is anything to do with the calcivirus. However, that is in train, and I will report to the House later on that. On a more serious note, I have written to Senator Cook to the effect that he has the support of the South Australian Government in ongoing research on this matter on not only the calicivirus but other matters with the Australian health laboratories. It is imperative that we do not stop this research because of a minor glitch—a possible escape of the virus into an unprotected area. Dr Keith Murray has been assured of the support of the Department of Primary Industries in South Australia, and he is most thankful for that. I will keep the House informed next week.

TRANSPORT, MODBURY

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport. The Minister for Transport will commence a three-month trial beginning in late October this year for a bus to run from the Modbury Interchange to the city, between the hours of midnight and 5 a.m. on Sunday morning.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I am anxiously waiting for the question. I thought that convention in this Chamber was to ask a question and then seek leave to give an explanation.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ridley is correct. I suggest to the member for Torrens that she ask her question then, with leave, she is entitled to explain it briefly.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Thank you, Sir. The question is: what provisions will be made to ensure that the driver of the bus will be supported in the event of a breakdown or attack? We have been informed that the radio control room closes at 1 a.m. and that the mechanical service section will not be operating during the time of midnight to 5 a.m. Given the latest spate of rock attacks, this is now a serious safety issue.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister for Transport and bring back a considered reply as soon as possible.

GREENHOUSE GASES

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources say what steps are currently being taken in South Australia to reduce ozone depleting substances? I understand that some recent scientific reports have indicated that the hole in the ozone layer is growing at an alarming rate and, therefore, that issue needs to be addressed more urgently.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The State Government's ozone protection program closely follows strategies that have been set down and put in place under the Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council recommendations. Several steps are under way to help overcome this problem relating to ozone depleting substances. The manufacture and import of all prescribed ozone depleting substances—except HCFCs and methyl bromide—will be banned in Australia after 31 December this year. Those currently used are subject to tight quota restrictions.

For the first three months of this year, South Australian industry used less than 20 per cent of the CFCs consumed in the first three months of 1986, which shows an 80 per cent reduction in the past nine years. That is a very good sign. All owners of major cooling plants, such as multi-storey building owners and hospitals, have been individually contacted and assisted with plans to cope with the phase-out of CFCs used in their equipment. In fact, every owner of a major CFC chiller plant has now indicated that they have plans in place for conversion or replacement with a non-CFC plant. I believe that no other State in Australia is so well prepared for the national phase-out of CFC manufacture and import at the end of 1995.

All owners of registered, fixed halon fire suppression systems, such as in computer rooms, fishing vessels and so on, also have been individually contacted and assisted with plans to cope with the phase-out of halons. Every owner of a fixed halon fire protection system has now indicated that they have plans for conversion or replacement again by the end of 1995. New vehicles no longer use CFCs in air-conditioners, and workshops, via the Environment Protection Authority and the Motor Trade Association, have greatly assisted the after-market vehicle air-conditioning installation and service sector to understand conversion requirements of existing systems.

I would like to commend the Motor Trade Association for the positive role that it has played in this campaign. South Australia leads the nation in all motor vehicle conversion expertise—something of which we can all be proud—and the phase-out of the use of CFCs in dry cleaning machines and solvents is well on target to meet the requirement of the end of 1995. As the honourable member can see—and I hope the House realises—South Australia is well up front in this area, and a number of steps are being taken in this State to reduce ozone depleting substances. I am pleased to be able to provide this information to the House.

L'DACE COACHLINES

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I direct my question to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport. Will the Minister advise the House of the details of the proposed contract given to the private bus company, L'Dace, for arterial commuter transport from the three-month trial of the Adelaide busway midnight to 5 a.m. service, and from which budget will the money be made available? I have been informed that L'Dace will allegedly be paid $1 000 per night for the commuter transport and that the contract was not put out to tender but was an internal arrangement.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I will take the question posed by the member for Torrens, refer it to the Minister for Transport and ensure that a detailed reply is made available.

ELECTRONIC CLASSROOMS

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education say how TAFE South Australia's electronic classrooms compare with the rest of the world in the delivery of education?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I thank the member for Ridley for his question. He has a longstanding interest in matters relating to education. We all know that he is a significant contributor to the Council of the University of Adelaide. Today, we are again making clear to everyone how effective the TAFE electronic delivery program is. TAFE came second in the world ahead of the Mobil Corporation and some of the biggest universities and other organisations throughout the world. Institutions were invited to present to a selection panel what they were doing in the way of electronic delivery of learning materials through video-conferencing and so on. The organisation that won is called LAM Research Corporation, a multi-national billion dollar organisation. So, TAFE gained second place to that organisation. This reflects highly the pioneering work that is being done in South Australia in TAFE in order to provide a better service for people throughout the State.

Currently, we have 19 interactive video electronic classrooms in the State, and more will be added during this financial year. This is part of a commitment to ensure that people throughout the State can access programs easily without having to travel long distances. As I say, this reflects very well on TAFE, its staff and the pioneers within that organisation. It is appropriate, therefore, that I link that very good news with other good news today; that is, that Cabinet and Executive Council have appointed Brian Stanford as the Chief Executive Officer of DETAFE. He is an internationally recognised educationist with 27 years experience; a consultant to UNESCO; and he has been involved in projects and consultancies in 11 countries, including Malaysia, Pakistan, Turkey and the Philippines.

In 1990, he was seconded to the United Kingdom National Training Authority and has worked as a consultant to the National Training Council of Fiji and other countries; he is a visiting specialist to the Colombo Plan Staff College. The CEO's position was obtained through open advertisement, and I am delighted that he has taken up that position in DETAFE. We will see even greater achievements in TAFE as a result of Brian Stanford's appointment today, and I wish him well in his position.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Given the Minister's answer to my question today on the latest unemployment figures, when he used the ABS trend labour force statistics to support his case, why did he use the ABS seasonally adjusted figures in February this year when he said in this House:

> It is a good news day for South Australia when we can focus on a very important issue, namely, employment—

when he announced that unemployment had gone below 10 per cent for the first time since 1991, when the ABS trend figures at that same time showed an unemployment rate in excess of 10 per cent?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The Deputy Leader should be worried about the trend in his own Party, which is downhill.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I explained earlier to the Deputy Leader that the trend line series is based on seasonally adjusted data. I can arrange for a briefing by Peter King in my department, if he likes, at no charge. He will speak slowly and use small words to explain that the ABS trend line figures are based on seasonally adjusted data.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I thank the Deputy Leader for giving me the opportunity again to raise this subject. Simon Crean, the Federal Minister, was interviewed at 12.10 today on the ABC's *The World Today*. He was asked by the reporter, David Pembroke:

> Simon Crean, do you agree that the figures suggest that the employment cycle may have peaked?

Simon Crean replied:

> I think what it suggests is that the rate of employment growth has certainly slowed, David, but that was what the strategy, the economic policies have been about doing, and that is consolidating the labour market growth.

When you take out the jargon, what he is saying is that the Federal Government was trying to put the brakes on the economy. We in South Australia are very vulnerable when the Federal Government puts on the brakes, because our economy was coming out of the recession and then it whacked on these interest rate hikes and put up sales tax on cars. In that interview, Simon Crean also said:

> . . . the monthly figures need to be treated with a bit of caution.

That is your Federal ministerial colleague saying—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I have always said that the monthly figures are volatile. You get a good representation from the trend line, and the reason that we seasonally adjust is to take out the bumps. The trend series goes one step further in taking out even more of the bumps. I know that the Deputy Leader is in for a bumpy road within the Labor Party, but I hope that he takes advantage of my offer and accepts some tutoring by my staff.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is absolutely defying the rulings of the Chair. He has had some experiences—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I will certainly name a couple of members if they again show disrespect for the Chair. I do not want to have to talk to the Deputy Leader again during Question Time. The member for Wright.

GARIBALDI SMALLGOODS

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): Will the Minister for Health provide the House with any further information that he now has in relation to the Freedom of Information request by the Leader of the Opposition regarding the Garibaldi HUS epidemic?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Earlier today, the Leader of the Opposition inquired yet again about freedom of information legislation and a number of other matters, but I note—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Members ask where the Leader is. I am not sure, but I make the observation that his question indicated that the information that was provided to the Coroner contained the complete documentation. The answer to the Deputy Leader's question is that the Leader of the Opposition was provided with the latest print-out of the information that was available as at 8 February 1995, the date on which he made his FOI request. In fact, I am informed that the diary was provided as a generous view of the Leader of the Opposition's request. At no stage in his freedom of information request did he actually ask for diaries, and the fact that the diary was provided at all is indicative of the open way in which the Health Commission handled his application. I repeat: in relation to this matter, the Leader of the Opposition indicated that the Coroner had been provided with full information rather than the latest print-out that was available as at 8 February. Again, as an indication of how open the Health Commission was, I reiterate that a Coroner's constable was given *carte blanche* to go through every possible document that the Health Commission and the Public and Environmental Health Division of the Health Commission had.

Mr Cummins interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: As the member for Norwood says, they were privileged documents. There was no question that the Coroner was not provided with complete information to the extent that all the files were opened up, and every single one of those files that the Coroner could possibly have wanted for his inquest was provided not at the Health Commission's instigation but at the absolute instigation of a Coroner's constable. In other words, we in the Health Commission made no judgment whatsoever as to what document was appropriate to provide to the Coroner and what was not. We actually said to the Coroner, 'You come into the Health Commission and look at the files, and you determine which files you want.' Every single file that the Coroner's constable determined was important for the Coroner to see is on the public record.

GLENELG SHOOTING

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Ms STEVENS: Yesterday in this House the Minister for Health made certain statements in relation to me that were

false, and for the record I wish to correct those statements. The Minister was asked a question by the member for Mitchell about the tragic shooting incident at Glenelg in which the member for Mitchell said that I suggested on radio yesterday morning that the shooting was due to a failure of community mental health services. The Minister for Health was wrong. During the radio interview between me and Keith Conlon on 5AN we did not discuss the Glenelg shooting, nor did we discuss mental health services in Glenelg or anywhere else in Adelaide. The interview concentrated on the current burdens placed on volunteer groups, missions, church groups and other welfare groups given the savage funding cuts in the health and family and community services—

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the honourable member that she purely make a personal explanation and not enter into debate which is ruled out of order.

Mr Cummins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Norwood is warned for the first time.

Ms STEVENS: Should the Minister require a transcript to confirm this fact, I will be very happy to supply him with one.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): I wish to highlight some of the excellent programs being run under the Government's new Early Years strategy within the Department for Education and Children's Services—

There being a disturbance in the Gallery:

The SPEAKER: Order! The sittings of the House are suspended.

[Sitting suspended from 3.13 to 3.22 p.m.]

Mr LEGGETT: Last year the Minister announced that $10 million would be allocated to a range of initiatives under the Early Years strategy. The basis of this strategy is the notion that it is vital that our very young children receive all the help and assistance they need in their schooling as early as possible. For years students have slipped through the system without having their problems and special needs identified, and it has sometimes been only at secondary school, or even in further education and training, that these problems have been picked up. An enormous amount of research has indicated that it is often too late to help these students and that remedial bandaid assistance at secondary schooling is expensive and can be ineffective.

Cornerstone is a major part too of the new strategy. Over two years $4 million has been provided for this program, which involves training every teacher of four to eight year olds in our schools. By the end of this year, some 4 000 junior primary and pre-school teachers will have received training in how to identify children with learning problems in their classrooms, and also how they can assist them over their problem.

First Start, another successful initiative, is a home-based program, where field workers visit the family homes of economically disadvantaged young children up to three years of age who may be at risk of developing learning difficulties. Parents are also taught how to encourage and support the literacy development of their children. Following a pilot project, the Minister recently announced that First Start will be extended to a further three locations with the additional allocation of $185 000.

Earlier this year the Government also announced the appointment of 50 new literacy enhancement officers (LEOs) to be placed in schools to support the Early Years strategy. These LEOs are working with children, school and pre-school staff in tasks such as reading to children, listening to children reading, and helping to develop students' early writing, motor, drama, art and music skills.

The introduction of basic skills testing for all students in years 3 and 5 in Government schools is another element of the Early Years strategy. The tests will provide another measure of student achievement which, in conjunction with ongoing classroom assessment by teachers, will help to identify students who may be having trouble with literacy or numeracy. We must ensure that all our students have the essential building-block skills they will need throughout their lives. For years we have wasted millions of dollars on catch-up programs in secondary schools. We know that resources put into the care and education of young children have long-term benefits for children and for the whole community, and that is why the Government has decided that the Early Years strategy must be the number one priority in their education.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Prior to addressing the issue of employment figures, I refer to the incident that occurred at the conclusion of Question Time. I want to make clear to you, Mr Speaker, and to this House that the Opposition had absolutely nothing to do with that stunt. I have explained to some members on both sides of the Chamber that a Labor Party staff member earlier today received a call from a person (whom I do not know) requesting that I ask a question in this House about the Hindmarsh Island royal commission. The caller said a group of people would be in the gallery.

I thought about that request and believed there was a possibility of a stunt being pulled and that the Opposition could be blamed for that arising, if it did arise. Hence, I refused to do so and sought to have our staff member contact the person who had contacted him originally to say that, if there were any suggestion that those people, if they came into the gallery, would cause a disruption or a stunt to disturb the proceedings of this Parliament, we would have absolutely nothing to do with them. That conversation did not take place simply because our staff member could not speak to the person concerned.

Mr Bass interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: I did not know whether a stunt would occur, in answer to the member for Florey. I just had a sixth sense, and no more than that. Fortunately, my sixth sense prevailed. I want to make it quite clear because, given rumours in the corridors of this House, I understand that the Premier has suggested that the Opposition, and in particular the Leader of the Opposition, had something do with that stunt. There is no truth in that whatsoever.

Members interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: The member for Frome also knows who showed those members of the public into the gallery: it was no member of the staff of the Opposition or any member of the Labor Party in this Chamber or another place, and the Premier ought to have the good graces to apologise to us for that.

I turn my attention now to the employment figures and, in particular, the answers given today by the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. The Minister used trend figures on this occasion, and I am not necessarily blaming him for using those figures if they are identified as such when the statistics are used in the first instance. If one starts using a set of statistics, one should at least be consistent and not shift the goal posts when it happens to suit a particular argument. Clearly, in February 1995, when the Minister said, 'It is a good news day for South Australia', and pointed out that South Australia's unemployment figures had fallen below the 10 per cent figure for the first time since 1991, he failed to use the trend figures at that time, which showed an unemployment figure in excess of 10 per cent.

There is some validity in the Minister's arguments, but he should be consistent in his approach to the use of those statistics. He should identify the statistics he is using and keep them on a consistent month-by-month basis, otherwise we are comparing apples with pears. We know that this month's unemployment figures for South Australia are very poor. South Australia has the highest rate of unemployment of any State in Australia. If the figures were as good as the Minister suggested, he would not have been giving that news to us: it would have been the Premier. The good news Premier would have stood up to make those announcements but, as on so many other occasions when there is bad and gloomy news that proves that the Government's economic policies are failing, it is not the Premier who stands up and delivers the bad lines, to the chagrin, I should imagine, of the Ministers in his Cabinet: it is their responsibility to take the bucketing and to deliver the bad news. It is the Premier's responsibility, apparently, to be seen all mighty and all glorified with respect to announcing only good news. In many instances, the good news is a direct result of the very positive efforts of some of his Ministers, but the Premier takes the credit.

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

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Last Wednesday I heard on the radio that public housing in Australia was about to celebrate its fiftieth anniversary. Of course, the history of public housing in South Australia dates back a decade earlier than this to the days when debate began in this very House, which set up what is known today as the South Australian Housing Trust. Today, in 1995, public housing is at the crossroads, and this is the subject of my grievance speech today.

When Bob Hawke came to power in 1983, he promised to double the size of the public housing stock across Australia over 10 years. It is fair to say that the Labor Government made a good start. However, since 1986-87 the value of the Commonwealth's contribution to public housing has been on the decline. Indeed, even if the Commonwealth's contribution remained constant between 1986-87 and today, South Australia's share of the CSHA would be worth more than $230 million. The actual figure that South Australia should get from the Commonwealth this year is $87.5 million, such is the magnitude of the decline. Unfortunately, we will not even get $87.5 million. The actual figure is worse due to the previous Government's decision to forward spend funds between 1992 and 1994. In 1995 South Australia will receive only $73.9 million from the Commonwealth. So what we see is a trend of diminishing funding which in itself brings the trust close to the crossroads.

Of course, constituents in our electorates are probably interested more in houses than in dollars. On that front the picture also looks pretty grim. Whereas in 1986-87 the trust built in excess of 2 300 houses, this year the building program will see fewer than 410 houses completed.

During this time the trust has continued to experience a very high demand for its services. At the end of last June more than 3 700 South Australian households were on the waiting list. All members will have spoken to constituents in a very desperate situation looking for whatever help they can get to assist their application.

Last year, of all new applicants almost 85 per cent were dependent on the Commonwealth for income support. The decline in the economic circumstances of trust tenants is stark. Whereas in the early 1970s only one in five Housing Trust tenants was dependent on a pension or benefit, today that figure is closer to four in five. This has enormous implications for the trust's income base.

Today the rent revenue forgone as a result of needs based rather than market based allocation exceeds $130 million. This means not only that the trust is hamstrung in areas like maintenance, community services, and so on, but it also finds it increasingly difficult to obtain money to build new houses and to meet existing debt commitments. Indeed, while the Government's objective is to reduce the level of commercial debt, due in part to the policies of the previous Administration, today that figure stands at $264 million, which attracts annual fixed interest payments of nearly $28 million.

The trust faces many challenges to secure its future and to continue to provide the housing needs of South Australians. First, it must reduce its debt to a level that it can sustain in the long term. Secondly, it needs to keep an eye on the business of ensuring that it is housing South Australians who are unable to access other housing choices. Finally, in recognition of its increasingly social role, it needs to ensure that in doing all those things it does not further disadvantage South Australians who, by virtue of their circumstances in the first place, face economic hardship. It must follow the leads of initiatives such as the Rosewood and Hillcrest redevelopment to ensure that public housing remains part of the mainstream community.

I understand that the State Government is currently in the midst of negotiating a new housing agreement with the Commonwealth to commence on 1 July 1996. I only hope that the Commonwealth will see fit to commit the level of funding and provide the necessary flexibility to take the trust through the crossroads.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): What a disappointing event we saw in the Chamber a short while ago. What particularly disappoints me is that a member of the other place, the Hon. Sandra Kanck, apparently led the delegation into this Parliament today. I also understand that events similar to the one that occurred in this Chamber took place in the other Chamber. I further understand that the Hon. Sandra Kanck led the delegation out of this Parliament. No doubt you, Sir, as a member who likes to uphold standards in this Chamber, will consider what the Hon. Sandra Kanck did. It is deplorable for any member of Parliament to be involved in such a debacle, particularly the Democrats who profess to uphold the democratic principles of this State and country. It is deplorable and disappointing and it brings Parliament's procedures to a very low ebb when we consider what took place in this House earlier.

I refer now to some of the misrepresentation about locking in interest rates and protecting the State during vulnerable times. Yesterday I heard a lot of propaganda from the Opposition about how we should have continued to play the short-term money market and further risk the ultimate opportunities for the people of South Australia and their children. In order to prove how wrong the Opposition is on this matter and the fact that it did not represent the full context of the Auditor-General's Report to South Australians, one only has to look at the headline in the *Advertiser* this morning: 'Mortgage rates "may hit 12 per cent"'. Quoting a leading economic forecaster, the article states:

> Variable mortgage rates are set to climb to an average around 12 per cent over the next decade.

Considering South Australia's massive debt and vulnerability, how can we risk the recovery and new direction that we have to implement when leading economic forecasters say that there are problems with interest rates, thanks to the Federal Government?

We need only look at the other warning from the Federal Government's top housing advisory body, which predicted a decline in new housing starts in 1995-96. Yet we hear Paul Keating saying that the housing industry is not relevant to economic development growth and prosperity in Australia. How out of touch is Mr Keating, with his $2 million house, when he makes statements like that? Many people in my electorate who are battling to develop and maintain their lovely new homes and look after their children know damn well that the biggest thing that is biting and making it hard for them is the increase in interest rates caused by the Federal Government's lack of recovery plans and the fact that it is blowing out, day in, day out, a massive public debt which is the highest in Australia's history, and Keating knows it. That is why our interest rates are so much higher than those of our OECD trading partners.

The South Australian Labor Party says that we should put all that money—$9 billion—on the short-term money market or over at the Casino and hope to survive in that way. That clearly identifies the fact that the Government has done the correct thing by locking in interest rates. Given the $90 million extra interest having to be found every year with a 1 per cent rise and given the forecasts here and the vulnerability of Australia because of our massive debt and the lack of true policies and plans of the Keating Government, we had to lock them in. I am pleased to say that has now been substantiated by some of the nation's leading economic forecasters.

Ten years is not a long time when we have a $9 billion debt to pay off. That is why for once we have a Government which has looked at the long, medium and short term and selected the correct approach. Rises in interest rates also mean that people in my electorate have had to opt out of private health cover, thanks again to Paul Keating, and that has put a massive burden on our public hospitals around Australia. Gordon Bilney, Carmen Lawrence and Paul Keating know that.

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

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I put on record the transcript of the radio interview I did yesterday on 5AN in order to clear up the misconceptions that were created in this place by the Minister yesterday. I will quote directly from the transcript as follows:

> Keith Conlon: You want to react to Brian's words?
>
> Lea Stevens: I think what he said had a lot of sense in it, Keith. One of the things that I see is that in our communities we actually need to build in safety valves; safety valves that can cope with pressures that occur for various people, various troubled people, and in the past those safety valves have come in the form of volunteer groups, missions, church groups, other welfare agencies, the police (when they have the resources to do it), and those people on the ground—they provided places for people to go and worked alongside them. Unfortunately, what is happening through savage cutting, both in the health area and in the family and community services area, is that a lot of those organisations have had funding cuts and they are no longer able to perform that role. That means that you don't have the safety valves and you will have a greater incidence of pressure blowing out of control.
>
> Keith Conlon: Let's hope that doesn't get to the stage of shotgun blasts down any main street, but you're getting to the point of, say, at least rows, arguments, violence, people to people.
>
> Lea Stevens: Yes, Keith. I guess that you can never be sure that you're going to be able to stop that completely, but I think what you have to do responsibly is to try and build in, as I said, safety valves.
>
> Keith Conlon: But I mean, you're obviously saying this and asking the Government to deliver on this. But, I mean, this all started under Dr Don Hopgood. I can remember asking him time and time again, 'Where's the back-up, where are the safety nets now you're closing the institutions?'
>
> Lea Stevens: I'm not saying it's only this Government that's at issue in relation to this. What I'm saying is that we have a problem before us.
>
> Keith Conlon: You reckon it's a community issue?
>
> Lea Stevens: Yes, I think it's a community issue. Don't let's get into whose fault is this and who didn't do it then and there. Let's face the fact that we have an issue before us and let's solve it. What I'm saying is, when you make decisions in relation to funding, you have to look at the whole picture. You have to say that, if you are going to cut this, this will mean that in other areas there are going to be consequences. I'm just pointing out that in a community we have to have safety valves in place.

I wanted calmly and in a reasonable atmosphere to put that on the record because I believe that what happened in the House entirely took that out of context and the Minister used that to race off in a direction which suited his purposes at this time when he is under a lot of pressure on another issue. Rather than the Minister accusing and condemning me for prejudice and recklessness with the facts, I have placed those facts on the record, and I believe that it was a balanced explanation—a balanced and reasoned interview with Keith Conlon—about very important issues with which we all have to deal in our community.

Finally, as part of the answer to me yesterday, the Minister started his answer with the following words: 'Just hang on, baby', and then he went on. I make a point about that statement and the nature of that statement made by a Minister—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: Yes, I am sure because I have checked it out with people and I will be interested to see the final authorised *Hansard*. I have the book and I have checked with members and people heard it. I believe that it was a sexist and inappropriate comment; a comment not befitting any member of this House, let alone a Minister of the Crown.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): I enjoy following the member for Elizabeth, who is seen to have learned from the master fabricator in this House. The member for Elizabeth would have to be one person who can stand up with a particular document and pretend that it does not say what it says. I listened to the member for Elizabeth when she spoke to Keith Conlon on the radio, and the guts of her interview with Keith

Conlon was that funding cuts in the health and family and community services area resulted in this despicable act at Glenelg. The member for Elizabeth telephoned, following the comments of the Mayor of Glenelg, with the deliberate intention of saying—

Mr Foley interjecting:

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

Mr CAUDELL:—that the actions of the Minister for Health and the Minister for Family and Community Services resulted in this act. The member for Elizabeth was quite deliberate in what she wanted to say about funding cuts. Yet, she stands up in this Chamber at the end of Question Time to make a personal explanation and then trots out of here at a great pace. Sit down and hear the rest of it! She trots out of here at a hell of a pace to do the television interview. Sit down, because I want to fix it up with the other question you asked earlier. She trots out of here at a hell of a pace and then comes back into the Chamber and makes a grievance speech.

Mr FOLEY: On a point of order, Sir, I ask your ruling on the Standing Order that I understand requires a member to address his or her comments through the Chair as against addressing the member directly.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The Standing Orders state that members will direct their remarks through the Chair. The member for Mitchell.

Mr CAUDELL: Not to be outdone, the member for Elizabeth then arranged for a member of the ALP Morphett branch to telephone Keith Conlon in the name of the Mayor of Brighton (Rosemary Clancy) and take the issue further on behalf of the Brighton-Glenelg social welfare council down at the Brighton council chambers. The biggest problem there is that the Mayor of Brighton cannot get the Marion-Brighton-Glenelg health and social welfare council into order and operate in a proper manner.

The other issue, to which I wanted the member for Elizabeth to sit down and listen, related to the question she asked of the Minister for Health earlier about criminal prosecutions associated with the Garibaldi case. With great perception she said that he had legal opinion that criminal prosecution could take effect while the coronial inquiry was under way. I remind the member for Elizabeth of four different sections of the Coroner's Act of 1975. Section 16 provides that a person is not obliged to answer a question under this section if the Coroner is satisfied that the answer would tend to incriminate that person, or that a person is not obliged to produce any books, papers or documents if the Coroner is satisfied their contents would tend to incriminate that person. Under section 16(2), if criminal proceedings were proceeded with against that person they would not be required to answer any questions or table any documents.

Sections 22 and 23 of the Coroner's Act relate to the provisions of the rules of evidence and the coronial inquiry is not bound by the rules of evidence. Under section 26 of the Coroner's Act the Coroner must not proceed with an inquest where a person has been charged in criminal proceedings with causing the event that is, or is to be, the subject of an inquest. The Coroner's Act is quite specific that, if criminal proceedings are to commence, the coronial inquiry will have to stop. What the Minister for Health said in this House today was absolutely correct, but the member for Elizabeth continues to have these perceptions, trying to convey to the community that what she is saying is correct and that the Minister for Health is wrong. The member for Elizabeth fails continually to give the true facts to this Parliament and deliberately continues to try to deceive this Parliament with perceptions that have no relationship to the facts at hand or to anything contained in the Coroner's Act.

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

OPAL MINING BILL

The Hon. R.B. Such for the Hon. D.S. BAKER (Minister for Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to regulate prospecting and mining for opals and other precious stones; and to make related amendments to the Mining Act 1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The purpose of this Bill is to introduce new legislation relating to opal mining which is currently contained within the *Mining Act 1971*. It has been prepared as a stand alone Bill partly because of the specialist nature and requirements of opal mining and partly because the opal miners have requested separate legislation.

The Government has determined that the Bill should encourage further opal prospecting and mining development within South Australia in order to reverse the trend over recent years of declining opal production. The South Australian opal fields comprising Coober Pedy, Andamooka, Mintabie and Stuart Creek were collectively the world's major source of opal for many years but have now fallen behind the New South Wales fields in terms of the value of opal produced annually. Production in South Australia is estimated to have declined by 40% since 1988 to a mine output of less than $40 million per year. No new fields of major significance have been found in South Australia since the discovery of Andamooka in 1930.

The major deposits of opal in Australia are located around the south and south-western margins of the Great Artesian Basin in South Australia, New South Wales and Queensland. The potential for undiscovered large fields within this region is considered to be high. A new discovery of the size of Coober Pedy would have an in ground value in excess of $1 billion.

The legislation is therefore designed to encourage opal miners to prospect and explore in new areas away from the established workings in order to discover new deposits leading to increased production and the processing of opal for the benefit of both miners and the wider community. The Bill proposes to achieve this by introducing the concept of multiple claims per person and opal development leases which provide larger areas for prospecting and may lead to larger claims for mining.

The Bill will allow the participation of corporations in the search and development of opal by permitting their presence on the proclaimed precious stones fields generally under the same terms and conditions as for individual miners.

Associated amendments to the Mining Act will provide, for the first time, the introduction of Exploration Licences for opal. This will allow corporate large scale exploration, including over special 'opal development areas' designated by the Minister for Mines and Energy, within the proclaimed precious stones fields.

The Government believes that the collective provisions associated with this Bill will introduce flexibility to the legislation by allowing the involvement of corporations and create a climate for increasing investment in the opal industry while at the same time protecting the interests of individual miners and their smaller mining operations.

The major provisions of the Bill are as follows:

· Multiple Claims

Under present legislation a person can hold only one precious stones claim. Under the new legislation it will be possible for a person to hold two precious stones claims in his or her name.

This amendment reflects the needs and requirements of the opal mining industry.

It will also be possible for a person to hold, in addition to the above, one lease for the purpose of prospecting called an opal development lease.

An opal development lease will be granted for a short term (3 months) to encourage prospecting over new ground within a slightly larger area (200m x 200m), thereby reducing the possibility of being 'pegged-in' by others.

This was introduced specifically at the request of miners from Coober Pedy.

After the expiry of 3 months the opal development lease is either relinquished or a precious stones claim is pegged within the area of the lease. Obviously if a new claim is taken up, one of the two previously held claims must be relinquished as only two precious stones claims can be held by one person at the same time.

· Opal Development Leases/Larger Claims

A larger precious stones claim (200m x 100m) may result from an opal development lease, but only if the lease is pegged in a 'designated area'. Designated areas will be areas specified by the Minister for Mines and Energy in consultation with appropriate mining Associations and will be located away from the established workings in order to encourage prospecting over new ground.

If not in a designated area an opal development lease may not be pegged within 500m of another registered tenement or over ground previously disturbed by mining operations.

· Involvement of Corporations

The present legislation discriminates against the involvement of corporations in the search for opal by not allowing them to obtain a precious stones prospecting permit which prevents their access to the proclaimed precious stones fields.

The Government believes that such discrimination should be removed as part of its overall policy in promoting the mining and development of the State's mineral resources and that opal should not be excluded from this program.

The new legislation therefore allows a corporation to obtain a precious stones prospecting permit and to peg a precious stones claim under the same terms and conditions as an individual miner.

The one exception to this is in the case of a corporation the permit does not allow the pegging of a precious stones claim on land within 500 metres of another registered tenement, unless the land is within a designated area.

However, in general, corporations will now be able to involve themselves in small opal mining operations under the same conditions as an individual miner if they so wish.

· Exploration Licences

Present legislation prevents the granting of Exploration Licences for opal.

This Bill will amend the *Mining Act 1971* such that Exploration Licences will be available for opal under the Mining Act and under certain conditions.

For example, an Exploration Licence applied for within a precious stones field must be confined to an 'opal development area' and cannot exceed 20 square kilometres in area, (unless otherwise specifically determined by the Minister).

Opal development areas will be carefully defined and located away from established workings and will be declared by the Minister, in consultation with appropriate mining Associations, and be notified in the Gazette.

The Coober Pedy proclaimed precious stones field in particular lends itself to such exploratory activities being 5 000 square kilometres in area, with less than 10% effectively prospected or worked.

Exploration Licences applied for outside of precious stones fields will not be allowed on land that is within an 'exclusion zone' under the *Opal Mining Act 1995*. Such exclusion zones will include areas such as those at Lambina, where miners are currently active.

In the event that a corporation is successful in its exploration program and wishes to proceed to mining development, such development will be conducted under the Mining Act as currently applied to all other minerals. This will involve the granting of a Mining Lease together with all the other responsibilities under the Mining Act including the submission of six-monthly production returns and the payment of royalties on the opal recovered.

The Government believes that the measures contained in this Bill will provide a much needed stimulus and incentive for further investment in the industry to once again establish South Australia as the major opal producing centre in the world.

I commend this Bill to Honourable Members.

Explanation of Clauses

PART 1

PRELIMINARY

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

The measure will come into operation on a day (or days) to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3: Interpretation

This provision sets out the definitions to be used for the purposes of the measure. Many of the definitions are the same as comparable definitions in the *Mining Act 1971*. 'Precious stones' will mean opal, and any other minerals declared by regulation to be precious stones for the purposes of the Act. A precious stones tenement will be either a precious stones claim, or an opal development lease (see especially Part 3 for provisions about these forms of tenement).

Clause 4: Declaration of precious stones field or reserved land

The Governor will be able to declare land to be a precious stones field. The Governor will also be able to reserve land from the operation of the Act.

Clause 5: Declaration of designated area or exclusion zone

This provision will enable the Minister to declare land within a precious stones field to be a 'designated area', and to declare land to be an 'exclusion zone' for the purposes of the Act. The relevant provisions on these matters are contained in clause 11.

Clause 6: Exempt land

This clause relates to 'exempt land' and is similar in many respects to the exempt land provisions of the *Mining Act*. While land is exempt land, a person is not authorised to prospect for precious stones on the land without specific authority under clause 6.

PART 2

PRECIOUS STONES PROSPECTING PERMITS

Clause 7: Application for permit

The concept of a precious stones prospecting permit is retained by this clause. However, it will now be possible for a corporation to hold a permit. A person under the age of 16 cannot hold a permit. A person may be disqualified from holding a permit under the regulations.

Clause 8: Nature of permit

A person may only hold one precious stones prospecting permit. A permit cannot be held jointly and is not transferable.

Clause 9: Terms and renewal of permit

A precious stones prospecting permit will remain in force for a period of one year (as is the case with the current Act). A permit will be renewable from time to time for a further period of one year.

Clause 10: Rights of holder of permit

A precious stones prospecting permit authorises the holder of the permit to prospect for precious stones and to peg out an area for a tenement under the Act. Any pegging will be required to comply with the regulations.

Clause 11: Qualifications to permits

This clause sets out various rules that qualify the operation of a precious stones prospecting permit. (Note, there are other qualifications as well; for example, there may be a requirement to give notice of entry to land before prospecting can occur—*see clause 31*). A person will not, under a permit, be able to use declared equipment or explosives (other than for the purposes of sinking a prospecting shaft). If land has been granted in fee simple, or is subject to native title that confers an exclusive right to possession of land, a person will not be able to peg out an area under a permit without the written consent of the owner of the land. Special rules will apply with respect to the operations of corporations, and the pegging out of an area for an opal development lease. A person will not be able to have pegged out at the same time *(a)* more than one area for an opal development lease; *(b)* more than one area for a precious stones claim in a precious stones field if outside a designated area (unless the pegging arises from an opal development lease); or *(c)* in any event, more than two areas for precious stones claims. A person will also be unable to peg out an area if to do so would be contrary to the regulations.

Clause 12: Area to be pegged out, etc.

As with the current legislation, there will be rules as to the shape, dimensions and size of areas pegged out under a permit.

Clause 13: Notice of pegging

Notice of pegging within a precious stones field will need to be given under the regulations.

Clause 14: Effect of pegging an area

The lawful pegging out of an area for a precious stones claim within a precious stones field will entitle the person to conduct certain mining operations on the land, and to apply for registration of a tenement within 14 days. In any other case, the lawful pegging out of an area will entitle the person to apply for registration of the appropriate tenement within 14 days.

Clause 15: Ballot may be conducted in certain cases

This clause entitles the Minister to conduct a ballot for the allocation of areas in certain cases. It is based on (and substantively the same as) current section 51B of the *Mining Act*.

Clause 16: Pegging may lapse

A pegging will cease to have effect if an appropriate application for registration of a tenement is not made under the Act within 14 days after the day on which the area is pegged out, or if an application for registration is refused.

Clause 17: Offence to contravene this Part

It will be an offence for a person to peg out an area for a tenement if the person is not the holder of a valid tenement, to peg out an area in contravention of these provisions, or to carry out unauthorised mining operations within an area.

PART 3

PRECIOUS STONES TENEMENTS

Clause 18: Application for registration of tenement

This clause sets out the procedures and requirements for making application for the registration of a tenement under the Act.

Clause 19: Registration of tenement

This clause sets out the registration procedures. Special mention is made of an application to register an opal development lease as, in such a case, the Mining Registrar must refer the application to the Director for an inspection of the area and the preparation of a report. The Mining Registrar will be entitled to refuse registration of a tenement if the relevant area is the subject of an application for an exploration licence under the *Mining Act*.

Clause 20: Maximum number of tenements

This limits the number of tenements that a person may hold, in a way that is consistent with clause 11(10).

Clause 21: Term and renewal of tenement

The initial period of registration of a precious stones tenement will be three months. A person will be able to apply from time to time for the renewal of registration of a precious stones claim (for an additional period of 12 months). The registration of an opal development lease is not renewable.

Clause 22: Rights conferred by a tenement

The holder of a registered precious stones claim has an exclusive right to conduct mining operations for the recovery of precious stones during the term of registration, and to sell those stones. The holder of a registered opal development lease also has an exclusive right to recover and sell precious stones (for three months), and to peg out one area for a precious stones claim.

Clause 23: Tenement non-transferable

A precious stones tenement is not transferable.

Clause 24: Unlawful entry on tenement

This clause restricts the ability of persons (other than authorised persons) to enter land comprised in a registered tenement.

Clause 25: Caveats

This clause sets out a scheme for the lodgment and consideration of caveats against the registration of a tenement, or an instrument affecting a tenement or an interest in a tenement.

Clause 26: Power of Mining Registrar to cancel tenement

This clause sets out a scheme for the cancellation of the registration of a tenement if it should not have been registered. The Mining Registrar will need to give to the holder of the tenement appropriate notice of his or her proposed course of action. The holder of the tenement will be able to apply to the Warden's Court for a review of the Mining Registrar's actions.

Clause 27: Surrender of tenement, removal of posts, etc.

The Mining Registrar will be able, on receipt of an application from the holder, to cancel the registration of a tenement. However, for land outside a precious stones field, the cancellation will not occur until the land has been rehabilitated in accordance with the requirements of the Act.

Clause 28: Removal of machinery

When a registration lapses or is cancelled, the owner of any machinery or goods that have been brought onto the relevant land must ensure that they are removed within 14 days.

Clause 29: Maintenance of posts

The holder of a tenement must ensure that all posts, boundary indicators and markers are maintained in accordance with requirements prescribed by the regulations.

PART 4

ENTRY ON LAND AND DECLARED EQUIPMENT

Clause 30: Entry on land

This clause sets out the powers (and limitations) of a person to enter land to conduct prospecting or other mining operations.

Clause 31: Notice of entry

A mining operator will (generally speaking) be required to give to the owner of land at least 21 days notice before first entering land to carry out mining operations. A notice will need to be validated by an authorised person before it is given. The owner of the land will be able to object (to the appropriate court) to entry onto the land, or to the use of the land for mining operations. Notice will not be required if the land is in a precious stones field, if entry is authorised under an agreement or a native title mining determination, or if the entry is to continue mining operations lawfully commenced on the land before the commencement of this Act.

Clause 32: Duration of notice of entry

A notice of entry will remain in force for six months from validation and, if a tenement is pegged out on the relevant land during that time, for the duration of the tenement.

Clause 33: Use of declared equipment

A person will not be able to use declared equipment (as defined) in the course of mining operations except on land comprised in a registered tenement within a precious stones field, or with the written authorisation of the Director. A mining operator will be required to give notice of the proposed use of declared equipment, other than where the land is within a precious stones field or where the Warden's Court, or the ERD Court, has determined conditions under which the equipment may be used. Where notice is given, the owner of the land may lodge a notice of objection with the Warden's Court and the Court will be able to review the matter.

PART 5

REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION

Clause 34: Rehabilitation of land

An authorised officer will be able to require the holder of a tenement to rehabilitate land within the tenement that has been disturbed by mining operations. A requirement will be able to be directed to mining operations carried out before the particular tenement was pegged out or registered, and may extend to operations carried out by another person on the land. The Minister may order that a person not peg out another area until the person has complied with the terms of a notice under this provision. In a case of default, an authorised officer may cause the necessary work to be carried out, and the costs and expenses incurred in doing so will be recoverable from the person in default.

Clause 35: Bonds

The Minister will be able to require that an applicant for, or the holder of, a tenement enter into a bond, unless the relevant land is within a precious stones field. The bond will need to be lodged with the Mining Registrar, and the Mining Registrar may delay the registration of a tenement until the bond is lodged.

Clause 36: Application of bonds

The Minister will be able to forfeit an amount under a bond if a person fails to fulfil an obligation under a tenement, fails to rehabilitate land within a tenement, or acts (or omits to act) so as to breach a term of a bond. The amount will be forfeited to the Crown and may be applied by the Minister towards the rehabilitation of land or in respect of liabilities incurred on account of mining operations on the land.

Clause 37: Compensation

The owner of land on which mining operations are carried out will be entitled to receive compensation for economic loss, hardship or inconvenience suffered on account of the mining operations.

PART 6

OPAL MINING CO-OPERATION AGREEMENTS

Clause 38: Interpretation

This clause defines two particular terms to be used under Part 6 of the Act. In particular, a 'mining operator' will include a person who is seeking to carry out mining operations on land.

Clause 39: Nature of agreement

This clause explains the concept of an opal mining co-operation agreement, being an agreement about how mining operations are to be carried out on land, other than native title land, outside a precious stones field.

Clause 40: Parties to an agreement

An opal mining co-operation agreement may be made between the owner of land, and a mining operator or an approved association (*see* clause 95).

Clause 41: Content of an agreement

An agreement may provide for a variety of matters, including access to land (including exempt land), notice of entry, the use of declared equipment and the rehabilitation of land. An agreement may provide for the payment of compensation to the owner of the land. An agreement must comply with any requirements prescribed by the regulations.

Clause 42: Registration of agreement

An opal mining co-operation agreement must be lodged for registration with the Mining Registrar. The Mining Registrar will be able to refuse registration if the land is within a precious stones field or native title land, or if the Mining Registrar believes that the agreement has not been negotiated in good faith, that the agreement is inconsistent with the objects of the Act or the best interests of opal mining in the State, or that there is some other good reason why the agreement should not be registered. An agreement will have no force or effect until registered.

Clause 43: Agreement may be varied or revoked

The parties may agree to vary or revoke an agreement. A party may also withdraw from an agreement, although the approval of the Mining Registrar will be necessary.

Clause 44: Appeal to Warden's Court

A party to an agreement will be able to appeal to the Warden's Court against a decision of the Mining Registrar relating to agreements.

Clause 45: Persons bound by agreement

An agreement is binding on the original parties to the agreement, and on successors in title to the land, a person who carries out operations on behalf of a party to the agreement, the members of any relevant association, and the holders of tenements covered by the agreement.

Clause 46: Enforcement of agreement

An agreement will be enforceable by application to the appropriate court.

Clause 47: Restriction on mining operations by third parties

This clause relates to various restrictions that may apply to mining operations conducted by persons who are not members of an approved association where the approved association is a party to an agreement.

PART 7
NATIVE TITLE LAND

This Part makes comparable provision in relation to opal mining and native title land to Part 9B of the *Mining Act*, as it applies to mining operations on native title land under that Act. Some minor, consequential drafting changes have occurred due to differences in terminology under this Act. However, the effect of these provisions is the same as the relevant provisions under the *Mining Act*. The effect of the relevant clauses is briefly summarised below.

Clause 48: Qualification of rights conferred by permit

A precious stones prospecting permit does not authorise mining operations on native title land unless the operations do not affect native title (in any respect), or a declaration has been obtained that the land is not subject to native title.

Clause 49: Limits on grant of tenement

A tenement may not be registered over native title land unless the relevant operations are authorised by an agreement or determination under this Part, or a declaration has been made that the land is not subject to native title.

Clause 50: Applications for tenements

It may be agreed that the registration of a tenement is contingent upon the registration of an agreement or determination under this Part.

Clause 51: Application for declaration

A person may apply to the ERD Court for a declaration that land is not subject to native title.

Clause 52: Types of agreement authorising mining operations on native title land

This clause describes the agreements that may be entered into under this Part.

Clause 53: Negotiation of agreements

This clause says who may seek an agreement with native title parties.

Clause 54: Notification of parties affected

This clause describes how negotiations are initiated.

Clause 55: What happens when there are no registered native title parties with whom to negotiate

A proponent may apply to the ERD Court for a summary determination if there are no relevant native title parties.

Clause 56: Expedited procedure where impact of operations is minimal

A proponent may apply to the ERD Court for a summary determination in certain (limited) cases where the impact of the operations will be minimal.

Clause 57: Negotiating procedure

Parties will be required to negotiate in good faith.

Clause 58: Agreement

This clause regulates the content of an agreement.

Clause 59: Effect of registered agreement

This clause describes who will be bound by a registered agreement.

Clause 60: Application for determination

Application may be made to the ERD Court if agreement cannot be reached within a specified time.

Clause 61: Criteria for making determination

This clause specifies the criteria that the ERD Court must take into account when requested to make a determination.

Clause 62: Limitation on powers of Court

This clause restricts the powers of the ERD Court in certain cases.

Clause 63: Effect of determination

A determination of the ERD Court must be lodged with the Mining Registrar for registration.

Clause 64: Ministerial power to overrule determinations

Subject to this clause, the Minister will be able to override a determination of the ERD Court if the Minister considers it to be in the best interests of the State to do so.

Clause 65: No re-opening of issues

A determination of the ERD Court cannot be overruled by an agreement without the authority of the ERD Court.

Clause 66: Non-application of this Part to Pitjantjatjara and Maralinga lands

This Part does not affect the operation of specific land rights legislation.

Clause 67: Compensation to be held on trust in certain cases

Any compensation payable under a determination of the ERD Court must be paid into the Court and applied under the provisions of this clause.

Clause 68: Non-monetary compensation

Compensation may take the form of non-monetary compensation in certain cases.

Clause 69: Review of compensation

It will be possible to apply for a review of the compensation that is payable under a determination.

Clause 70: Expiry of this Part

The new Part will expire two years after the commencement of the Act.

PART 8
SPECIAL POWERS OF WARDEN'S COURT

Clause 71: Disputes relating to tenements

The Warden's Court has a general dispute-resolution jurisdiction under the measure, including jurisdiction to make a declaration about the validity of a permit, claim or tenement.

Clause 72: Cancellation of permit

The Warden's Court will be able to cancel a precious stones prospecting permit, and prohibit a person from holding or obtaining a permit.

Clause 73: Cancellation of pegging

The Warden's Court will be able to cancel a pegging in specified situations.

Clause 74: Forfeiture of tenement

The Warden's Court will be able to make an order for the forfeiture of a registered tenement in specified situations.

PART 9
MISCELLANEOUS

Clause 75: The Mining Register

The Mining Registrar will be required to establish a distinct part of the Mining Register for the purposes of this legislation.

Clause 76: Appointment of authorised persons

This clause provides for the appointment of authorised persons, and sets out specific powers that can be exercised in connection with the administration, operation or enforcement of the Act.

Clause 77: Delegations

This clause gives the Director a specific power of delegation for the purposes of the Act.

Clause 78: Exemptions

The Minister will be able to exempt a person from an obligation under the Act, other than Part 7 (Native Title Land). An exemption may be granted on conditions determined by the Minister.

Clause 79: Passing of property

Property in precious stones is vested in the Crown. However, property passes if the precious stones are lawfully mined.

Clause 80: Acts of officers, employees and agents

This clause ensures that an employer or principal is, in an appropriate case, responsible for the act or default of an employee or agent.

Clause 81: Offences

This clause sets out various specific offences for the purposes of the Act.

Clause 82: Proceedings for offences

It will be possible to prosecute offences against the Act in the Warden's Court.

Clause 83: Prohibition orders

The Warden's Court will be able, on the application of the Director, to order that a person not enter, or remain on, a precious stones field if the Court is satisfied that it is necessary to do so in order to keep, or to restore, good order.

Clause 84: Power of Mining Registrar to require pegs to be removed

The Mining Registrar will be empowered to require the removal of unauthorised pegs.

Clause 85: Compliance orders

The ERD Court will be able to make compliance orders against persons who act without proper authority under the Act.

Clause 86: Evidentiary provision

This clause is intended to facilitate the proof of certain matters.

Clause 87: Avoidance of double compensation

This clause establishes a principle to prevent double compensation.

Clause 88: Disposal of waste

This clause will make it an offence to allow overburden and other material to extend beyond the boundaries of a relevant claim or tenement without the written authority of an authorised person.

Clause 89: Persons under 18

This clause is included because a permit may be granted to a person who is 16 years of age (or older).

Clause 90: Safety net

Except in a case involving an opal development lease, land must not be simultaneously subject to more than one tenement.

Clause 91: Land subject to more than one tenement

The Minister may grant a person a preferential right to a new tenement in case an existing tenement is declared invalid due to circumstances beyond the person's control.

Clause 92: Interaction with Mining Act

As a general principle, this measure will not regulate any mining operations carried out under the *Mining Act*. It will be possible in certain cases for land to be subject to tenements under both Acts (being where the original tenement holder agrees to the registration of the tenement, or where the Warden's Court gives it authority).

Clause 93: Interaction with other Acts

This Act is not intended to derogate from the operation of certain other Acts.

Clause 94: Public roads and access routes

This clause protects the interests of road authorities.

Clause 95: Approval of associations

This clause provides that the Director may, for the purposes of the Act, approve associations that represent the interests of mining operators. A decision of the Director under the clause is, on application by the association, subject to review by the Minister.

Clause 96: Immunity from liability

This clause protects officers and employees of the Crown, and other authorised persons, from personal liability for any act or omission in the administration or enforcement of the Act.

Clause 97: Powers of attorney

This clause prevents a person acting through a power of attorney in various circumstances.

Clause 98: Regulations

The Governor will be empowered to make various regulations for the purposes of the Act.

Schedule 1: Transitional Provisions

This schedule sets out various transitional provisions for the purposes of the measure. In particular, existing permits, claims and procedures relating to precious stones under the *Mining Act* will have effect under this Act.

Schedule 2: Amendments to the Mining Act

This schedule makes various consequential amendments to the *Mining Act*. New section 7(3) will provide that, except in an opal development area, this Act will not regulate mining operations for the recovery of precious stones if the operations are carried out under the *Opal Mining Act 1995*. An opal development area will be an area within a precious stones field, declared by the Minister, in which a person carrying out mining operations will need an authority under the *Mining Act*. Accordingly, except for an opal development area, a person will be able to choose whether he or she mines for precious stones under the *Opal Mining Act 1995* or the *Mining Act*. If the person proceeds under the *Mining Act*, royalty will be paid on any stones that are recovered. In the case of exploration licences, it will now be possible to obtain such a licence for exploratory operations for precious stones, but the holder of a licence will not be able to explore for opal within an exclusion zone. Furthermore, a licence for operations within an opal development area will be limited to an area of 20 square kilometres. The Minister will be unable to grant a licence if to do so would be inconsistent with a public undertaking given by the Minister to the mining industry.

Mr QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. S.J. Baker:

That the report of the Auditor-General 1994-95 be noted.

(Continued from 11 October. Page 214.)

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Many issues are brought into the open through the Auditor-General's Report. The Auditor-General has pointed to issues that I and others have long held to be in the domain of the public interest, and ones that this Government has seen fit simply to brush off with great arrogance and an attitude of, 'We are the Government, and we will do as we please.' It simply asks us to trust it. Let us talk about accountability. The Auditor-General has made this perfectly clear in the report, particularly in the area of public accountability. In recent years, we have seen the privatisation agenda of the Government materialise with the sale of the management of services such as Modbury Hospital, and now our water system is to go down that same path.

The thing that we, the people's representatives, in this Parliament have to glean from this report is that the pace of this change necessitates that the Government must be far more open in how it conducts its business. South Australia is not the only State that has ventured down this path. As the Auditor-General quite correctly points out, there have been various royal commissions into this very matter, and he makes the pertinent point that 'excessive secrecy could be unsafe because public interest could be prejudiced.' I am of the opinion that there needs to be a balance between commercial interests and parliamentary scrutiny, but it must always be remembered that we are here to serve the public interest and not only that of business. It is fundamental that the balance that the Auditor-General and others on this side of the House have spoken of should always fall on the side of parliamentary, and thus public, scrutiny.

As I have said, there is ample credible information in his report to guide us in this matter, and we should make use of it. If the Government is intent on persisting with the total destruction of our Public Service, then I urge the Government to adopt as a matter of urgency the Auditor-General's suggested approaches regarding 'a legal framework in which a summary of all arrangements entered into, that extend over more than one financial year and are over a specific minimum dollar value, be required to be tabled in Parliament.' While I have no doubt that the privatisation of the services that the Government is pursuing is not in the best interests of the people of this State, and that the public will ultimately vent its anger on this very issue at the ballot box, the Government of the day should and must be held accountable to parliamentary scrutiny on the issue of public finance.

Indeed, the Auditor-General must be encouraged to take a more active role in this regard and, if more resources are required, to make them available. If we fail to adopt these recommendations, we risk being swallowed up by circumstances over which we have little or no control. This also must be the case when the contracting out of public sector activities is examined. The Auditor-General has said:

> There must involve due process and appropriate accountability mechanisms.

The Auditor-General makes several points here, and I suggest that they are quite correct. To begin with, the Auditor-General makes the point that the 'contracting out initiatives are significant, and will extend over a period of several years, requiring ongoing management, monitoring and reporting.' He goes on to restate that there needs to be adequate provision of information to the Parliament. It makes sense to me—and I am sure to everyone else, except the Government—to provide the resources and scope to the Auditor-General so that he can monitor this on an ongoing basis. Of particular interest to me was the Auditor-General's mention of the Executive Government's ignorance of the law. Perhaps this could be due largely to the arrogance that I mentioned before.

It really is a matter of Parliament's accountability to the public of South Australia, particularly that of the Government. Even more important is the responsibility of the Government, the people of this State. It is a case of the fundamental principle of Executive Government being responsible to the Parliament and, as the Auditor-General notes, as a general rule, ignorance of the law is not an excuse. I could not agree more with the Auditor-General when he cites the findings of the Royal Commission and demonstrates the relative ease with which catastrophe can be born. While his report finds no deliberate intention to act contrary to the law, it points to the manner in which, for example, a Minister, in the case of the South Australian Tourism Commission, acted outside the bounds of the legislation. Essentially, it goes to the heart of what the Auditor-General terms 'continued public confidence in the integrity of Government administration'.

Along with the privatisation of this State is the rapid change to Government expenditure. The Auditor-General has addressed an important issue here when he pointed to the dramatic changes in the way the State's wages and salaries have varied in recent times. Further, the way Government purchases goods and services has changed. The importance of our legislative and administrative framework's keeping up with the changing circumstances around us is more fundamental than perhaps at any other time in our history. Indeed, to forget the lessons of history is to risk that history repeating itself.

I turn to the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, because there are a number of points here to be addressed as well. By exploring the functions of groups within the department, it is possible to see how effective the department has been as a whole. We need to look no further than the marine park in the Great Australian Bight to see that the responsibility of the department has not at all times been completely fulfilled. The management of the State's public lands, such as the costal regions, parks and outback area, and indeed the protection of our environment, would seem to be a priority of the department. This is not always the case when business interests conflict with this issue.

In the north-eastern metropolitan area, in the year of the Torrens, great expense and time has been wasted on the preparation of an environmental impact statement when it was clear to most that there should never have been a mega-dump or, for that matter, any dump sited in the Highbury area. Had it not been for the actions of the local residents, this dump would have gone ahead without any environmental impact statement at all. This is yet another area where I believe the Auditor-General's brief should be expanded and should monitor the actions of Government.

On that point, it appears to me that the Auditor-General should have wider scope for gathering information from departments. To be more precise, areas of departmental budget should be broken down further so that proper scrutiny of where all the money is being used can be fully assessed. The Cooper Creek RAMSAR is an example. I understand that Federal Government grants have been passed on to the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, but as yet they have not been fully utilised. With clear and accountable policy direction, the Auditor-General should be able to report on and monitor events.

It is of continual amazement to me and to the public that this Government persists with the concept of cost saving by reducing the size of public sector employment. To reduce the size and expertise of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources by 75 employees and hand it over to consultants does not stand up to scrutiny. The cost of this consultative process has increased from $3.498 million in 1984 to $6.551 million in 1995. It is not too difficult to work out who benefited from the swap. It is obvious that the Auditor-General has an important role to play. I call on the Auditor-General to widen the scope of his report and to look at the performance indicators for Executive Government. I suggest that the Government's theoretical program will fail the test in the real world.

Members opposite claim that the Auditor-General does not criticise the budgetary processes of this Government. Those members should read the report minus their rose coloured glasses, be wise and heed his warnings. The Auditor-General has carefully couched his criticisms but, make no mistake about it, they are, nonetheless, damning criticisms. It was a shame that last night during the debate Cabinet Ministers, and indeed the Premier, were not present, not willing to face the scrutiny of the Parliament. Their absence from the Chamber was notable.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: The member for Unley might have missed them. I can't say that we on this side benefit much from having them here, but I think it would have been wise for them to be here to listen to what members on this side, and indeed members on his own side, had to say.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: The public certainly noticed it. This reinforces the belief in the community that this is a very arrogant Government, one that is not interested in listening to the community.

I will not take up much more time of members, but in closing I commend the Auditor-General on his report. Obviously, it has been prepared with the greatest of integrity and diligence and with the interests of the State and our public as the central components. As the Auditor-General notes correctly, 'Parliament and the Auditor-General is a partnership based on a shared commitment to truth and accuracy in public expenditure.' I urge the Government to heed the advice that has been presented.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): When this debate started, I was disinclined to join it, but I have sat in and listened carefully to the musings of members opposite, and I feel prompted by the member for Torrens and others to aspire to reply to some of their criticisms. From the outset, I stand here today humbled. I did not realise the intellectual capacity of the member for Torrens, what a giant she is amongst her peers who sit opposite, but today in her speech she has uttered some profound words, words that I commend to the whole of the South Australian public, especially her own Party because, if members opposite listen more to the member for Torrens, they may not wander in the wilderness for the decades to which they appear destined at present.

However, I start by reminding the member for Torrens that she comes here as a result of a most unfortunate by-election. If she casts her mind back to the advent of the last election, she will recall that the voters in her electorate decided not to re-elect a Labor member to her seat. That is a clear indication of the anger within her electorate with the actions of the previous Government. I remind the member for Torrens of that because, with her intellectual capacity, she will have already grasped my drift, which is this, and I quote her words: to forget the lesson of history is to risk history repeating itself. That is exactly what she said, and I will quote it again: to forget the lesson of history is to risk history repeating itself.

I ask the member for Torrens and every member opposite to take careful heed of the lesson of history. The people of South Australia have never forgotten the lesson of history, especially the recent history of this State and the reason why the Government has presented the budget that it has and why the Auditor-General makes some of the comments that he makes.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Torrens says that it is all about the Auditor-General. Let us then look at the Auditor-General: let us do as she says. The honourable member said that we simply asked them to trust us. She says that we should talk about accountability and public scrutiny. So, let us talk about public accountability as it is now and as it was under the previous Government; and let us talk about public scrutiny as it is now and as it was under the previous Government. The contributions of members opposite remind me of the lion tamer in ancient Rome who, when he discovered that the Emperor had converted to Christianity, realised that perhaps persecutions were off the agenda, so he raced out and applied to the Christian church to become a bishop on the ground that he had lots of experience in dealing with Christians.

That is the lesson of history, and that is the con trick that members opposite are trying to perpetrate on the people of South Australia. They come here more converted than Paul on the road to Damascus. They presided over the least accountable and most disgraceful period of public accountability in the history of this State. They lost billions of dollars, and they were converted on the road past the last election. They now come in here bleating and screaming about public accountability. I must tell those opposite who are notable by their absence that the people of Australia have always mistrusted zealots. The Opposition is in danger of not only being dubbed hypocritical but, even worse, extremist zealots, because many of those members—including their Leader—who now call for public accountability and public scrutiny, who bleat and moan and carry on about the public's right to know, are the very ones who regaled members on this side for four years with 'You don't need to know; it isn't your right to be told' and various other things.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I am talking about the Auditor-General's Report, and the Auditor-General's Reports for the past five years.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass): Order! The member for Unley has the call.

Mr BRINDAL: I would like to congratulate the Opposition members and give them this measure of credit at least: they have performed in this debate more credibly than I have heard them perform during the past two years. Most members did their homework and made at least some commonsense in some of the points they made. This is the first time I have heard the Opposition members even sounding like an Opposition. It is little wonder that the media in this State look more often to the Government back bench for constructive criticism of Government policy than to the irrelevant rabble opposite. If by this debate we are helping them to develop into a decent and constructive Opposition—and I emphasise the word 'constructive'—well and good. I commend them. It looks as though two years down the road they might at least be starting on that track.

I acknowledge that some of the points members of the Opposition made were valid criticisms, as have the Premier and the Government. The Premier said from day one when he picked up the report that there were aspects of this report which we should take up and which will improve Government performance. Neither the Premier nor the Treasurer have run away from such criticism as is valid within the report. The Premier has never shirked his responsibility to be accountable to the Parliament. He comes in here day after day and is accountable, as is every Minister. Those criticisms that the Premier or his Ministers are not accountable are invalid. Some of the criticisms in the Auditor-General's Report may well be valid, but only of most note if the Government is, as the Opposition claims, falsely, too arrogant to act on them. That tooth has already been drawn, because the Government has already committed to act on such aspects of the report as will create better accountability for the financial management of this State before this Parliament and before the people of South Australia.

I do not know what the Opposition can expect of a Government more than that. I again question as entirely relevant the background from which members of the Opposition argue, because people have an absolute right to judge others not only for what they say but for what they do. I put to this Parliament that what they say is, in this case, a very long way from what they consistently did over a decade of the mismanagement of this State. I know that, if the member for Torrens were to talk to some of her colleagues who had the privilege of sitting on the backbench in those days, they would tell her that they as a backbench were far less informed and far more kept in the dark than the Government backbench on this side of the House is in its worst nightmare. They were treated with absolute contempt and with absolute arrogance.

I become angry when people who should know better regale us with words like 'contempt' and 'arrogance'. If they had wished to see arrogance, they should have seen the performance on this side of the House in the last four years of the previous Government: it was arrogance personified. It even exceeded the current performance that we see in Canberra from people whom the member for Torrens calls her colleagues. Again, let us concentrate on the wisdom of the

member for Torrens, who says, 'The absence of the Premier and the ministry at various times last night might have been construed to reinforce in the public mind the perception of arrogance.' I wonder whether that is true. If it is on the radio it must be true because, after all, everything the *Advertiser* prints is true.

The member for Torrens and others come in here day after day and applaud the *Advertiser* for its truthful reporting of all the facts. The member for Torrens says it is true but I hope for her sake it is not true, because it would I am sure upset the Premier to think he was regarded as something he is not. I have heard him called lot of things, and 'arrogant' is not one of them. I am sure that most of the Ministers—especially the Minister present in the House at the moment—would agree that to describe him as 'arrogant' is really a bit of buffoonery, because you do not know him if that is what you call him.

I hope that for the sake of members opposite it is wrong, because the Ministers of which Government deign to roster themselves on at Question Time? Which Prime Minister deigns not even to attend the Parliament except at his behest? One can imagine the words: by imperial request the Prime Minister will appear today—now sitting in Canberra: Prime Minister Paul Keating. He wanders in and out of the Parliament as if it is some sort of court in which he gives the elected representatives of the people of Australia his divine blessing to attend. Divine Caesar had nothing on Paul Keating and his arrogance. Yet the Opposition sits here and says that, because the Premier may have had a delegation or two or have been otherwise engaged than to sit here listening—given that every word is written down and given that he has probably read every word including some of the rubbish uttered opposite—

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Have we now descended to the fact that it would have been courteous for the Premier to be here? Let me tell the member for Torrens that I would prefer a Premier who is paid not for his courtesy but for his attention to the detail of running this State than to a Prime Minister or a Premier who has nothing better to do than sit in here and be courteous to the member for Torrens. I believe that he is elected to do a job and that he should do that job. Within his doing that job I—and I am sure every member of this House—am very well aware that he is as courteous as is possible given the time available to him.

If we even concede the point made by the member for Torrens, I might ask—and it would be rather churlish of me to do so—where the Leader of the Opposition is most of Question Time every day? The Leader of the Opposition wafts in out of the House like you would not believe. Generally, I have the decency to believe that the man is perhaps working hard, looking at questions and getting them up. But, if that applies to the Leader of the Opposition, why then does it not apply to the Premier? It smacks of double standards in this House.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: So this is the Government that must answer questions; this is the Opposition that must sit there and listen to the answers; or is this the Opposition that governs this place by press release? A good question. As I said, Federal Labor members do not even bother to turn up at Question Time. Instead, they have a roster and take turns honouring the Federal Parliament with their presence. Never have I seen that in this Chamber among members of either side of the House. So do not come in here and preach to me about arrogance, distain and people who believe they are born to the purple. It amazes me that in this country those who claim to represent the working classes sometimes are the quickest to put on the purple robe and the imperial crown and to carry the sceptre. Some believe they are born to greatness on the backs of the workers, and they do not sit on this side of the House.

The Opposition's pretend outrage is not about adequate opportunity to question the Government or the Auditor-General's Report: it is about its all consuming desire for publicity—to get a quick grab of seven seconds on the media. Its so-called tactics are driven by media requirements and time frames, not the interests of the South Australian taxpayers or the public. That fact has been noted by commentators in this State time and again. We are dealing with the Murdoch tabloid opposition. It has worked out the old news formula for successful media, and it is now operating at full speed.

Mr De Laine interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I welcome the member for Price, and I am glad that I have stirred him up enough for him to interject: this is, indeed, a notable day.

Mr Condous interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Price is more than a page 3 picture opportunity: he is an honourable gentlemen. If that endorsement helps the member for Price to get on in his current faction—whichever one it may be—I am most pleased to have helped.

Mr Condous interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I will not respond to the interjection of the member for Colton except to remark that the Leader of the Opposition is always attempting to help various members on this side of the House obtain greater opportunities on the front bench, I sometimes think with malice aforethought or malice afterthought, so we would do no less to help them.

Question Time provides the opportunity to question Ministers in relation to the report, but the Opposition has not done that. We have had this report for some time, and the Opposition has chosen—rightly—to make other questions its priority. But I point out to the Opposition that, if the Auditor-General's Report is so important, it can ask 10 questions a day, each of which can be focused on the Treasurer, the Premier or on any other Ministers and each of which can be answered. The Opposition also has the time honoured opportunity to put questions on the Notice Paper, and there is, generally, an acceptance that Ministers will answer questions put on the Notice Paper. I say 'generally', because I remember when I was asking several questions year after year—and I was here only four years before the Parliament was prorogued—and the then Premier had not answered several of them in four years. I am saying that it is a general custom not necessarily always accepted, especially when the Opposition was in Government.

The Deputy Leader bemoans the fact that the Opposition has not had the opportunity in the budget Estimates Committees to question Ministers on the Auditor-General's Report. This is simply laughable when one considers that the Estimates Committees this year had to be wound up earlier than scheduled on more than one occasion because the Opposition ran out of questions. Indeed, this was the case when the Deputy Premier and the Treasurer appeared before the Estimates Committee. The session was wound up early due to lack of interest by the Opposition. In fact, a senior Labor member and former Treasurer, the member for Giles, was seen on occasions to be reading a newspaper during the Committee hearings. So much for his interest.

Mrs Geraghty: That is a terrible remark.

Mr BRINDAL: I will make some more, if the honourable member listens. Just some days before the 1993 election—and I remind members that the member for Giles was then Treasurer—a $577 million blow-out was revealed in the State debt. Incredibly, the Treasurer of the day, the member for Giles, attempted to dismiss it as a 'superficial increase in State debt'—$577 million, and it was written down as a 'superficial increase'. The revised debt, he said, was 'merely the result of new budget presentation requirements'. At that time the member for Giles, as reported in the *Advertiser*, went on to say, 'Apart from a few hours—

Mrs GERAGHTY: I rise on a point of order. Sir, I ask what relevance the member for Unley's comments have to the Auditor-General's Report?

The ACTING SPEAKER: I was probably thinking close to the same thing myself. I ask the member for Unley to return to the Auditor-General's Report.

Mr BRINDAL: The relevance is that the Opposition, in questioning this report, has stood like Caesar's wife, pure and unsullied, and attacked this Government for arrogance. It is therefore most relevant always to question the standpoint from which it is coming, and that I believe is relevant to the debate. The then Deputy Premier and Treasurer could not be bothered, and said:

> Apart from a few hours I have not been here in the past five weeks. You will have to ask the Premier's staff.

He went even further and admitted—

Mrs GERAGHTY: I rise on a point of order. Again, the honourable member is digressing. He is not dealing with the Auditor-General's Report.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! It is correct that it is my decision. The honourable member should put the point of order and not make a statement. I do not accept the point of order but I do ask the member for Unley to keep his remarks relevant to the Auditor-General's Report. The member for Unley.

Mr BRINDAL: As I have only a minute left, I sum up that point by saying that, in the past, we had a Deputy Premier who chose to give figures to this State that he believed it deserved. He did not worry about what the actual figures were; he did not worry about public accountability. He said, 'Really, the State can have those figures which I think the State deserves to know.' I contend that that is relevant because we now have that same Opposition—the inheritors and, in fact, the member for Giles who still sits here—as it is now, saying, 'You must be fully and publicly accountable.' It cannot do one thing one day and another thing the next.

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

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr BUCKBY (Light): I commend the Auditor-General on his commitment to providing this Parliament with a very good report. The Leader of the Opposition has again shown his penchant for distortion of the facts. He selectively quotes information without understanding the full facts. He uses this debate to try to re-establish his credibility, not to the people of the State but to his parliamentary colleagues, which is really a waste of time because they are too busy in factional warfare at the moment. However, his turn will come in the final round of blood-letting when they realise he is incapable of leading Labor into the future—if, indeed, Labor has one.

The Leader of the Opposition is an expert at rewriting history. His own weaknesses were exposed in a special report from the Auditor-General on the Northern Adelaide Development Board tabled in this place in the first sitting week. He was exposed yet again. He simply cannot be trusted with the public's money. In July 1990, while the Leader was Minister for Employment and Further Education, he entered into an agreement for $1.3 million for employment programs. The Auditor-General described the agreement as a 'political compact' as well as other comments, such as:

> The agreement and schedule between the parties was inadequately prepared.

The Auditor-General further stated:

> The project was handicapped by the failure to establish clear lines of accountability and responsibility.

The Auditor-General went on to add that the records maintained in relation to the project were 'inadequate'. I note that the Leader of the Opposition did not detail these comments from the Auditor-General in his display of hot air to the Parliament last night, during which he accused this Government of slick accounting. Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition claimed that the Auditor-General was forced to criticise this Treasurer's attempt to use funds intended for interest payments for some other purposes. But what the Leader of the Opposition forgot to say was that the Auditor-General also stated that the legality of the transactions was not being questioned. Indeed, Treasury had agreed to reverse the proposed transactions.

Seven years ago the previous Government introduced significant improvements in the way interests costs were shown in the budget papers. At the time financial commentators praised the then Government for this initiative. The Auditor-General is now questioning the adequacy of legislative framework. No doubt this will be addressed by the Government in due course.

Let us now deal with the specifics of the Leader's litany of distortion. First, this Government's budget papers provided more information than any other Government previously. This Government is not afraid of scrutiny, because the Government's financial strategy is working. The Auditor-General makes specific comments on the need for further improvement in the presentation of the budget data, some of which has been selectively used by the Leader of the Opposition. The Government welcomes these suggestions, and the House will be aware that the Premier has established a group of the Government's most senior officers to review these recommendations. One matter that the Leader of the Opposition conveniently failed to mention was that the Auditor-General had recognised the Government for the publication of forward estimates information.

Unlike the previous Government, which lurched from year to year with no forward vision, this Government does have a clear direction of restoring the State's finances after a decade of disaster under Labor.

How can we forget that great monument to political ineptitude, Labor's 'Meeting the challenge' document from the hands of the Leader's predecessor? It was full of hollow promises—promises to sell assets—that were not fulfilled. I will quote a couple of examples: the land under the shopping centres at Elizabeth and Noarlunga and the bulk grain loading elevators. When this Government came to office, sure

enough, virtually nothing had been done— rhetoric but no action and no substance. There was no chance that 'Meeting the challenge' was ever going to work because the Leader and his former colleagues simply could not face the challenge, unlike this Government.

I note that the Leader seeks to highlight the apparent failure of the Government to provide a comprehensive balance sheet of assets and liabilities. The reason for this goes back to the lack of accurate asset valuations and proper asset registers under the previous Government. The asset value information was so unreliable that any balance sheet would have been misleading and of limited value. This Government's current asset register project will remedy this matter.

The Leader of the Opposition last night stated that the Auditor-General had complained about the one-sided data on the financial position of the State. The presentation in the 1995-96 budget documents is consistent with ABS Government finance statistics standards adopted by all States and Commonwealth Treasuries and agreed by all State Premiers and the Prime Minister. What more can we do?

To present optional formats would, I am informed, be confusing and would attract criticism from economic and financial commentators. The alternative presentation of data by the Auditor-General is selective and clearly a deviation from the ABS concept. Singling out particularly 'lumpy' items included in the budget and treating these as 'abnormal' factors significantly diminishes the importance of the non-commercial sector concept and distorts the underlying deficit trends to the extent that it would be difficult for commentators to confirm whether the Government was on track to achieving the overall budget strategy on a sustainable basis.

Let us now move to asset sales. The Leader is mystified by the Government's approach to asset sales. The Government's asset sales process has been clearly outlined from the start. The Leader has questioned the Government's approach to the sale of the Pipelines Authority of South Australia. Again, and as usual, he has lost the plot. First, the Government made it quite clear prior to the election that PASA was to be sold. We said that in our election documents. Secondly, legislation to allow the sale was put before this House and was open to debate. Where was the Leader then and where were the questions on the process? He was not to be seen. He was probably out giving a press interview at the time. Thirdly, the Auditor-General reported favourably on the process, on page 79 of the Part A 'Overview', stating:

> The audit of the Asset Management Task Force included a review of the sale process and consideration of whether the process addressed fundamental steps appropriate to the sale of assets. In doing so it was recognised that the sale process had been derived and developed from wide consultation with parties experienced in similar processes both interstate and overseas. In addition, it was evident that the AMTF had sought appropriately skilled personnel to achieve its objectives, while at the same time ensuring that the process allowed the Government to maintain full control of the process by requiring approval at each stage.

The Auditor-General had no problem with the process that this Government has undertaken to ensure that all safety standards are met in selling off the State's assets. Fourthly, the State achieved a more than fair price for PASA—$304 million—vital funds which can be used to repay debt.

That brings me to the matter of debt management. I have listened to the Leader, the member for Playford (better known as the trainee Treasurer or, should I say, Leader in waiting) and the member for Hart (another Leader in waiting) talk about debt management.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

Mr BUCKBY: Absolutely! Both would do a better job than the present Leader. It is frightening that after the debacle of the Labor decade of debt they still cannot understand the basics.

Mr Condous: They never will.

Mr BUCKBY: I agree. Selectively they quote the Auditor-General's Report on the issue of debt management and tentatively contend that the actions of this Government have cost the State at least $160 million. Let me remind the Leader and his colleagues of history before I try to teach them something about economics.

The Leader was one of those hapless individuals who sat around John Bannon's Cabinet table. Let us go back to June 1989 when South Australia's net State debt stood at $4 165 million. At the same time, the alarm bells started ringing about problems in the State Bank. The Leader joined his colleagues in burying their heads in the sand, at great cost to this State. They did not want to hear those bells and, believe me, they did not.

In February 1991 the then Labor Government announced the first State Bank bail-out. Eight months later there was a second, followed by another two in 1992, taking the Government's total losses to $3 150 million. And let us not forget that in August 1992 the Government also had to chip in $350 million to prevent the collapse of SGIC, brought about largely by mismanagement and the famed 333 Collins Street deal.

At this point let us revisit the Leader of the Opposition and his statements on the State Bank debacle. During February and March 1989 the Liberal Party asked a series of questions in the Parliament about the obviously emerging problems at the bank. That prompted the Leader, on 13 April 1989, to move the following motion:

> That this House condemns the Opposition for its sustained and continuing campaign to undermine the vitally important role of the State Bank of South Australia in our community.

In moving the motion, the Leader made the following statements:

> The State Bank is one of South Australia's greatest success stories. . . No-one of significance in the Australian financial community would not acknowledge that the success of the new bank is, in large part, due to the brilliance of its Managing Director, Tim Marcus Clark. His appointment in February 1984 was a major coup that stunned the Australian banking world; it was a major coup for this State.

He went on to say:

> There is hardly any aspect of South Australia's social, cultural and economic life which is not touched by and is not better off because of the activities of the State Bank.

It is almost laughable, Mr Acting Speaker.

Mr Ashenden: Except that it is so serious.

Mr BUCKBY: Except that it is so serious, as the member for Wright says. The final quote is:

> Our bank is entrepreneurial and aggressive as well as careful, prudent and independent.

Careful, prudent and independent—what a joke! I wonder whether the Leader is now prepared to repeat those statements.

Perhaps I might add my own experience from that time. I spoke with the General Manager of an organisation in Queensland which is the equivalent of SGIC. I said that I was doing some research on State Bank figures at the time, because when a bank grows by 25 per cent in one year one has to question why it is happening. The General Manager of

Suncorp in Queensland said, 'We knew two years before the bank fell over that this was going to happen, because they slinked into Queensland, took up debts which none of us would touch with a 10ft barge pole, and we all knew that they were going to fall over.'

So, what of this careful, prudent and independent manager of the State Bank? Instead of working on cutting its cloth to suit the new demands on the State's finances, what did the previous Government do? It went out and borrowed to meet day-to-day recurrent costs, and then exceeded its budget by borrowing even more. So, by June 1993 the State debt stood at $7 869 million—almost double its level of 1989. Shameful! It was not until 1993 that the previous Government even recognised that it had a problem with its finances. We saw the production of the infamous 'Meeting the challenge' document. In that document there were no forward estimates beyond 1993-94 to back up Labor's claim that it would eliminate the recurrent deficit in 1995-96 and no information on the so-called substantial savings to be achieved from departmental restructuring. It was a hollow document.

As I mentioned earlier, there was no will to achieve even the most basic financial reforms. The previous Government had consistently failed to achieve its public sector employment targets. It was only when this Government came in that we achieved what we said we had set out to do. When this Government came to office it was faced with a financial shambles of disastrous proportions. The State was spending $350 million a year more than it earned and the Leader and his mates in waiting all had a hand in that, one way or another. The Government used its central borrowing authority (SAFA) to use creative methods of funding its budgets—a process that simply could not be maintained.

The Commission of Audit provided the South Australian community with a clear outline of the financial problems faced by this State and outlined that additional measures were necessary to deal directly with the fundamental imbalance between what the Government spent every year and the revenue it received. This Government then embarked on a broad program of reform of the public sector to eliminate the budget deficit by 1998. That program is under way; it is on track and will be achieved. Indeed, the Government's strategy has been confirmed by the actual outcome of the 1994-95 financial year where the deficit for the non-commercial sector came in $36 million under previous forecasts.

Let us return to the issue of debt. When this Government took office it set about financial reform, including that of debt management. For years the previous Government had used SAFA as the plaything on financial markets. SAFA was used to bail out the Government using creative financing and tax driven dealings such as the power station transactions. The former Government was so desperate to plug the holes that it did what no other central borrowing authority in Australia has done: it pushed its debt portfolio from a balanced medium-term duration down to less than six months.

Simply, this meant that the Government had more than $8 000 million dollars in debt exposed to the volatility of short-term interest rates but, worse, investigations revealed that the previous Government had borrowed over $2 000 million to play the markets. It borrowed at short-term rates and invested in longer-term securities, taking the margin as profit. This left the State in an untenable position. When short-term interest rates rise, the cost of refinancing the debt exceeds the return from longer-dated securities.

The previous Government was chasing short-term interest savings in desperation and placed the State at considerable risk. Any extreme interest rate position, such as the trading strategy adopted by the previous Government, brings with it the possibility of huge gains or huge losses. That is why the liability and funds management industries generally operate within conservative parameters that preclude the kind of high risk strategies employed by the previous Government. Numerous financial market participants observed at the time that SAFA had moved away from conventional fund management principles, and many expressed concern at the aggressive strategy that had been adopted. For the long-term benefit of this State it was essential that SAFA move its portfolio back within conservative bounds, consistent with the principle of diversified portfolio management, to provide some predicability and stability in the State's interest costs.

Indeed, the Auditor-General in his 1993 report commented on the previous Government's short-term strategy as follows:

> While there are benefits from this position, there are also risks to be monitored and managed. For example, a high reliance on short-term debt could cause difficulties when raising new borrowings concurrently with rolling over existing debt, especially when there are disruptions in the market or market confidence. Short-term interest rates are also subject to greater volatility, which can cause budgetary problems for highly indebted borrowers.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.45 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 17 October at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 10 October 1995

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

NOARLUNGA TO CAPE JERVIS ROAD

3. **Mr ATKINSON:** When will the Department of Transport study, in conjunction with the District Council of Yankalilla, plans for the Noarlunga-Cape Jervis Road?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: In March 1995, the Department of Transport, in collaboration with the District Council of Yankalilla, undertook a joint safety audit of the Noarlunga-Cape Jervis Road.

A number of measures are planned for this road to improve safety, viz., passing lanes, slow vehicle turnouts, widening of the pavement. The Government is committed to upgrading this road over the next 5 years and $6.5m has been allocated for such small scale works which will provide benefits to the travelling public. In 1995-96 design and construction of two slow vehicle turnouts, as well as pavement widening, will be undertaken between Yankalilla and Normanville. Drainage works will be undertaken in Yankalilla and Wattle Flat. Normal maintenance works will also be undertaken on the road.

Funding priorities do not permit significant realignment of the road in the foreseeable future. The small scale works proposed will provide significant benefits and enhance safety for the travelling public.

Consultation with Council will be ongoing as planning proceeds for further improvements.

RETAIL SHOP LEASES ACT

6. **Mr ATKINSON:** Does the Government intend to move to amend the Retail Shop Leases Act to include the words 'or registered conveyancer' after 'lawyer' in sections 15 and 16 of the Act and if not, why not?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: As the honourable member will be aware, a Joint Committee on Retail Shop Tenancies has been appointed to inquire into retail shop leasing issues under the Retail Shop Leases Act. Being a member of the Committee, the honourable member will have read the written submissions prepared by the Australian Institute of Conveyancers and will know that the committee will be considering if any amendments are required to the wording of Sections 14 (lease preparation costs) and 16 (lease documentation) of the Act.

I presume that the honourable member was referring to Sections 14 and 16 of the Act, as Section 15 deals with premiums and does not refer to lawyers.

As the Act presently stands, Section 14 uses the words 'legal or other expenses'. This is a broad phrase which could cover work done by registered conveyancers. The Section goes on to state that 'preparatory costs include' a number of items. This does not purport to be an exclusive list and, as such, a registered conveyancer's costs could be deemed to be 'preparatory costs'.