

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 14 November 1995

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

WATER, OUTSOURCING

A petition signed by 30 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to retain public ownership, control and operation of the water supply and the collection and treatment of sewerage was presented by the Hon. Dean Brown.

Petition received.

WESTBOURNE PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL

A petition signed by 1 144 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to ensure Westbourne Park Primary School oval is preserved for use by current and future residents was presented by the Hon. S.J. Baker.

Petition received.

EDUCATION BUDGET

A petition signed by 21 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to stop any further reduction in the public education budget and provide sufficient funds to restore class sizes and curriculum choices to previous levels was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

A petition signed by 94 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to install traffic lights at the intersection of Diagonal and Dunrobin roads was presented by Mr Caudell.

Petition received.

EXPLORATION LICENCES

A petition signed by 662 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to introduce legislation establishing exploration licences for the Coober Pedy Proclaimed Precious Stones Field or legislation establishing 40 000 square metre opal development leases with an exclusion zone from a registered lease of only 500 metres was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

SCHOOL SERVICES OFFICERS

A petition signed by 148 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to restore School Services Officers hours particularly at the Para Hills Junior Primary and Primary Schools to the level that existed when the Government assumed office was presented by Mr Quirke.

Petition received.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

A petition signed by 3 409 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to privatise the management of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was presented by Ms Stevens.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

BUILDING MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Ms HURLEY (Napier)** 12 October.

The **Hon. G.A. INGERSON**: Ms A. Hurley MP asked me the following question in Parliament on 12 October 1995 and I provided a response at that time:

'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.'

It would be appreciated if you could arrange for the following supplementary response to be tabled in Parliament:

'The department has over the last two years worked continuously with the Auditor-General's Department to improve the financial systems which were originally a cash accounting system converted to accrual accounting in July 1992.

The Auditor-General is now satisfied with the financial reporting of the department except for two minor areas which do not represent a material amount in terms of the overall performance of the department. In addition, the department is providing project management facilities to agencies and managing the costs and payments of those projects and this is not in question. The Auditor-General's criticism does not relate in any way to the project management component. It is only the recognition of the fee charged as income to the department that is questioned and the depreciation value of our fixed assets.

The department has been contracting out services for many years and has very stringent controls over payments to contractors. There is a strict approval system and payments are made within the terms and conditions of the contract. This area has been audited continuously by the Auditor-General who is satisfied with our procedures.

The two qualifications in the financial reports contained on pages 96 and 97 of the Auditor-General's Report are:

- Inventories—Work in Progress (Design and Client Services)
- Plant and Equipment

The comment on other Current Liabilities—Prepaid Contract Revenue relates to a 1993-94 qualification which has now been addressed and no longer relevant.

The qualification for Plant and Equipment relates to assets purchased prior to 1 July 1990 before accrual accounting was introduced and a value of those assets cannot be accurately determined. The qualification is not significant in value and represents only 5 per cent of the written down value of DBM assets. However, the qualification will remain until the asset's useful life has been fully depreciated. This is a problem many agencies who currently operate on a cash-based system will have as they convert to accrual accounting.

The qualification for Inventories—Work in Progress relates to the foreseeable losses that may occur to DBM for project design work as at 30 June 1995. This is the result of the closing of the design offices and the subsequent reletting of contracts to the private sector for the completion of the projects. That is, it was not possible to determine the profit or loss until formal tenders and contracts have been let to the private sector.'

HOUSING TRUST PROPERTIES

In reply to **Ms HURLEY (Napier)** 17 October.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: I believe that the trust does have an asset strategy which is well developed and clearly understood.

The trust has done considerable work in determining its approach to the management of its assets and the results are contained in various reports, policies and other documents.

For example, in March 1994 the Trust Board considered and approved a redevelopment policy together with a redevelopment strategy which set priorities for the period 1994 to 2007. In September 1994, the Trust Board reviewed and amended its house sales policies and endorsed a sales strategy for the financial year 1994-95 which also set objectives for the next five years; given the need to respond to constantly changing market conditions, this is reviewed annually. Similarly, the trust has a capital program for the acquisition and upgrading of its stock which is also updated on an annual basis.

I have asked the trust to consolidate these various asset policies and strategies into one document. By the end of the year the trust will have prepared an asset management plan covering the financial years 1995-96 to 1997-98. This will define the scope, timing and priority of major acquisition, upgrading, redevelopment and sales programs. The trust will then expand this into a comprehensive 10 year asset management strategy which will reflect anticipated changes in the Commonwealth/State Housing Agreement, long term funding guidelines and forecast housing needs. The trust aims to complete this by the middle of 1996.

HOUSING TRUST SALES

In reply to **Ms HURLEY (Napier)** 17 October.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: Further to my previous reply, I advise that during 1993-94 a total of 1 362 Housing Trust homes were sold, which included 83 progressive purchase and 333 sales to the Defence Housing Authority. During 1994-95, a total of 1 376 Housing Trust homes were sold, including 53 progressive purchases.

The total stock as at 30 June, 1994, was 62 322 and the total stock as at 30 June, 1995 was 61 359, representing a net reduction in stock of 963 properties.

In the context of the South Australian Housing Assistance Plan 1995-96, reference is made to the need to reduce Housing Trust stock levels to approximately 55 000. Sales levels are under review and are likely to be negotiated in the context of the new Commonwealth State Housing Agreement. The Trust expects to sell 900 properties during 1995-96.

RENTAL SUPPORT PROGRAM

In reply to **Ms HURLEY (Napier)** 17 October.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: The honourable member can be assured that activity statistics for the recently re-named Private Rental Assistance Program (PRAP) are being kept for the 1995-96 financial year and are readily available. Some statistics so far for 1995-96 are:

Month	Number of households interviewed	Number given PRAP assistance	\$ value of assistance
July 1995	2 536	1 446	660 754
August 1995	2 736	1 791	780 306
September 1995	2 554	1 612	686 186

RENT RELIEF

In reply to **Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens)** 25 October.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: The income limit of \$300 referred to in the member for Torrens' question relates to the primary determinant of eligibility for rent relief provided to low income private tenants through the Housing Trust. In order to qualify for assistance under this scheme, an applicant's gross income must be less than \$300 per week, and they must be paying at least 40 per cent of that income on rent.

The income limit applies to all applicants irrespective of their source of income, and it has never been linked to CPI adjustments, in DSS pensions or benefits. Applicants who are approved for assistance have their circumstances reviewed at regular intervals, and where their income rises above this limit of \$300 per week, rent relief would normally be terminated.

However, the Trust is aware that some pensions and benefits (notably those paid to couples) have now reached this level and is currently reviewing the income limit with a view to establishing an equitable mechanism that ensures those on statutory incomes can continue to access the program.

OMBUDSMAN'S REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Ombudsman 1994-95.

Ordered that report be printed.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. D.C. Brown)—

Auditor-General's Department—Report, 1994-95

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

Public Trustee—Report, 1994-95

Listening Devices Act, 1972—Report on the Operation of, 1994-95

Regulations under the following Acts—

Conveyancers—Educational Program

Second-hand Vehicle Dealers—Principle

Summary Offences Act—Road Block Establishment and Disaster Area Declarations—1 July 1995—30 September 1995

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

South Australian Asset Management Corporation and its Controlled Entities—Report, 1994-95

ETSA Contributory and Non-Contributory Superannuation Schemes—Report, 1994-95

Treasury and Finance, Department of—Erratum—Report, 1994-95

South Australian Superannuation Board—Report, 1994-95

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

Australian Major Events—Report, 1994-95

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

Libraries Board of South Australia—Report, 1994-95

South Australian Women's Advisory Council—Report, 1994-95

Regulations under the following Acts—

Harbors and Navigation—Restricted Areas—Thevenard

Motor Vehicles—Written Authorisation

Road Traffic—Clearways—North Terrace

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

Enfield General Cemetery Trust—Report, 1994-95

Local Government Act—Regulations—Parking—Spaces and Offences

By-laws—District Council—

Eudunda—

No. 2—Animals and Birds

No. 3—Dogs

Tanunda

No. 8—Moveable Signs on Streets and Roads

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

Racecourses Development Board—Report, 1994-95

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

Pipelines Authority of South Australia—Report, 1994-95

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

Dairy Authority of South Australia—Report, 1994-95

South Australian Meat Corporation (SAMCOR)—Report, 1994-95

Australian Barley Board—Report, 1994-95

Soil Conservation Boards—Report, 1994-95

Regulations under the following Acts—

Fisheries—Rock Lobster

Stock—Identification by Tagging

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

Environment and Natural Resources, Department of—
Report, 1994-95.

EDS CONTRACT

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Following the successful conclusion of the Government's negotiations with EDS for the contracting out of the Government's data processing operations and the creation of a new information technology industry in South Australia, questions have been raised about litigation between EDS and the State of Florida. I obtained information about this litigation at the time I visited the United States during August and September this year. At that time, following hearings which exhaustively examined all the issues through what is called an alternative dispute resolution process, there were rulings by William Webster (a former Federal Court judge) that EDS was owed considerable sums by the State of Florida.

Subsequently, the State of Florida sought to have this resolution process dissolved, but in mid-September this motion was denied by a Florida judge. The State of Florida appealed against this decision, but a further ruling on 24 October cleared the way for the entry of a final and binding decision which is expected soon in the circuit court in Leon County. In the meantime, the Attorney-General of the State of Florida has initiated further action which effectively amounts to an attempt to reopen and relitigate issues that have already been dealt with in the alternative dispute resolution process.

As background information for members, in May 1989 EDS entered into a contract with the Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services for the design, development and installation of a large computer system to determine eligibility for various entitlement programs throughout the State of Florida. This system was turned over to the State of Florida in May 1992 but the State has since refused to pay any moneys owed for the equipment on the grounds, claimed by the State of Florida, that the system has unacceptably long response times and insufficient capacity. EDS initiated litigation against the State of Florida in August 1992. Accordingly, the litigation was on foot for all of the time that the Leader of the Opposition was attempting to secure a memorandum of understanding with EDS. If the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Hart have a genuine concern about EDS and its performance in Florida, why were they so desperate to sign a deal with EDS in November 1993?

The Hon. S.J. Baker: Two Cabinet decisions went down for the count.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have obtained records of the outcome of the reports and recommendations issued as a result of the alternative dispute resolution process. In this process, 12 claims and counterclaims have been finalised in favour of EDS, and four in favour of the State of Florida. As a result, EDS has been awarded in total almost \$US42.4 million as recovery for unpaid bills plus interest to date of just over US\$6 million—a total of \$US48.4 million to be paid to EDS. On the other hand, the State of Florida has been awarded just over \$US4.7 million in counterclaims. That

means that there is a net finding in favour of EDS to the extent of \$US43.7 million.

The Opposition has questioned the role of EDS in this matter following a finding in the alternative dispute resolution process relating to communications between EDS and the State of Florida about the capacity of the system developed by EDS. The outcome of the process so far indicates that any failure by EDS in this respect is vastly outweighed by failures which are the direct responsibility of the State of Florida. To ensure that the House and the public are properly informed on this matter, it should be pointed out that, in a written report on this matter dated 14 August 1995, the Special Master who conducted the alternative dispute resolution process, Mr Webster, had some less than favourable things to say about the State of Florida. For example, the Special Master found that the State of Florida coerced a consultant, who was involved in giving advice, to provide comment adverse to EDS on the threat of not being paid for its work and that the State of Florida refused to assist the consultant to obtain work with another State. The Special Master found that the State of Florida had exerted 'improper pressure' on the consultant to reach a conclusion more favourable to the State of Florida. Other comments by the Special Master include:

- State personnel had failed to take full advantage of training offered by EDS prior to turnover of the system;
- routine system maintenance was largely ignored by the State resulting in poorer system performance after EDS left the site;
- the failure of the State to particularise system problems until well after the litigation commenced, which undermined the validity of the State's warranty claims;
- many of the performance related problems were attributable to a case load growth and the lack of proper maintenance after EDS left the site, not a defective design.

The Special Master concluded that EDS had proved that, at the time of the complete system turnover in May 1992, the central processing unit was in conformity with the requirements of the basic contract and possessed the capacity needed to handle the originally projected case-load. After becoming aware of the State of Florida's decision at the end of last month to initiate its own legal action, I wrote to the State's Attorney-General, Mr Robert Butterworth.

Mr Foley: That was a bit late.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, I had seen the other findings. It was not 'a bit late'; he had initiated the action only the previous week. How can the honourable member say that it is a bit late when he had taken the action only the previous week? I know he does not like the facts, but let us have the facts, because we certainly will not get them out of the member for Hart.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart will be more than late. I warn the member for Hart for the first time.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have received a response from Mr Butterworth which, essentially, seeks to justify this latest litigation on the ground that EDS concealed information from the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services. Mr Butterworth has also sent me selected extracts of the report by Mr Webster. I asked Mr Butterworth to send the full judgment of any final decision that had been taken, but he sent me selected extracts of the report by Mr Webster. Interestingly, they do not include any of the comments adverse to the State of Florida to which I have just referred. I asked for the full judgment, but I got just 13 pages from Mr

Butterworth out of a total judgment of 62 pages. To be entirely even handed, I also sought and received information from EDS which denies all the allegations made by the State of Florida.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I should have thought that it was appropriate to ask both parties involved in the litigation for their response. I might add that the member for Hart has been offered a briefing on this matter by EDS and has refused to receive that briefing, but I know that at the same time he has been running around with material from the Attorney-General for the State of Florida.

As I said, I asked both parties to the litigation for their assessment and full documentation of any judgment that had been handed down. It is not for the South Australian Government to intervene in the litigation in Florida or to make any judgment about it. EDS has more than 7 000 customers worldwide. To the extent that this litigation with a single customer is in any way relevant to the presence of EDS in South Australia, the contract that we have signed provides for damages up to \$10 million for a single breach and up to \$50 million for multiple breaches of that contract. The South Australian Government's view is that the State's position is very strongly protected.

I should also say that the Federal Government in the United States has recommended to other States that they install the EDS system provided to Florida. So far two States, Ohio and Wisconsin, have done so. Members should also be aware that yesterday the Federal Minister for Industry, Science and Technology, Senator Peter Cook, signed with EDS a \$300 million Partnerships for Development agreement following the finalisation of the South Australian Government's contract with EDS. I presume that Senator Cook, a Labor Senator and Federal Minister, would not sign an agreement with someone in whom he did not have complete confidence.

The Federal Government's Partnerships for Development program is designed to encourage international information technology and communications companies to undertake sustainable, strategic and commercial activities in Australia which are integrated into the global business strategy of the parent company. In an endorsement of the EDS investment in South Australia, Senator Cook announced that EDS had proposed a substantial Partnerships for Development plan for the next seven years, which comprises exports, research and development, local industry facilitation, including quality standards and export assistance, and infrastructure building.

In closing, the manner in which the Opposition has raised questions about the activities of EDS in Florida suggests it believes that no Government should have any dealings with any company involved in litigation. The signing of the Partnerships for Development plan shows that the Federal Government does not share that point of view. Do Opposition members in South Australia, with their small minds, suggest that, because the BHP company is involved in a current major litigation over the Ok Tedi mine dispute, the Government should close down the company's Whyalla operations, which are subject to Government indenture arrangements? Does the Opposition suggest that the Government should close down Roxby Downs when Western Mining Corporation is involved in litigation?

It is an inevitable fact of commercial life that companies, large and small, will become involved in litigation from time to time, particularly over contractual matters. It is the Government's responsibility, in any contract it writes, to

maximise protection of the State's position. I assure members of the House we have done that in our contract with EDS.

GARIBALDI SMALLGOODS

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On the last day of sitting, 26 October, the Leader of the Opposition asked me to assure the House that property transactions undertaken by the directors or the secretary of Garibaldi Smallgoods would not reduce the capacity of victims of the HUS epidemic to obtain compensation. In asking this question, the Leader referred in particular to action by Mr Neville Mead to transfer a property from him to his wife on 3 February 1995. This was not a new issue. It had been raised during the inquest on 10 and 11 August this year with the Coroner. I refer to pages 5276, 5340, 5396 and 5397 of the transcript of evidence given to the inquest.

Obviously, the Leader obtained his information by simply going through the evidence presented to the inquest and then trying to beat it up as a story in this House. Those pages of transcript show that matters raised by the Leader all were referred to at the inquest. However, the Leader attempted to dress up this issue as some new, startling revelation. Moreover, the Leader was asking me to intervene in processes which were already well under way and which would be entirely inappropriate for me to seek to influence in any way whatsoever.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: You said you would write to them and you invited me to write to them.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Just wait.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not Question Time.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: However, the Leader, typically, sought to grandstand in this House when a simple inquiry with the liquidator for the Garibaldi company would have established the full position. After the Leader asked the question, I immediately wrote to Mr Stephen Young, liquidator of Garibaldi Smallgoods Pty Ltd, as the Leader could have done at any time during the 10 weeks since these matters had been raised at the inquest. I now inform the House of Mr Young's reply, which is dated 1 November 1995:

I refer to your letter of 26 October 1995. The particular transfer of property referred to will only reduce the capacity of the victims of the HUS epidemic to obtain compensation if:

1. They can substantiate a claim for compensation directly against Mr Mead; and

2. The value of Mr Mead's equity in the property transferred to his wife cannot be recovered.

If there were a direct claim against Mr Mead, which was not met by him, then it is likely that bankruptcy proceedings would be initiated. A trustee appointed to administer his bankrupt estate has very strong powers of recovery, particularly in circumstances where property has been transferred to avoid creditors' claims. Accordingly, in those circumstances, it is likely that the value of Mr Mead's equity could be recovered.

That is exactly what I had told the House. The letter continues:

I have referred the Coroner's report on the HUS epidemic to my solicitors to determine whether the company has any right of claim against any party—including directors and officers of the company. In conducting my investigations to date I have not become aware of any claims against Mr Mead. I therefore have no reason to pursue

Mr Mead, however, should information become available which changes those circumstances, for example, as a result of my solicitors' review of the Coroner's report then I will act according to their advice.

In fairness to the only person named by the Leader in his question, I also advise the House of the following letter I received from Mr Mead's legal representatives. The letter states:

We act for Mr Neville Mead, who was formerly the financial controller at Garibaldi Smallgoods. Certain media reports and statements in Parliament have suggested that Mr Mead was a director of Garibaldi Smallgoods. Please be advised that Mr Mead was not ever a director or shareholder of Garibaldi Smallgoods and any suggestion or implication to the contrary is false and misleading and may cause our client to take appropriate legal action to ensure that the true position is clearly made public. Mr Mead was at all times—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: You have parliamentary privilege. That is what he was hiding. Continuing with the letter:

Mr Mead was at all times an employee of the company and save for his employment—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —has never had any financial interest in the company Garibaldi Smallgoods.

I have put these matters on the public record in light of the Leader's question. As I indicated in my response at the time, there are clearly established processes to prevent the avoidance of financial obligations which may arise in these circumstances. Those processes would be assisted by the Leader's providing any information that he may consider relevant to the appropriate authorities.

INDOCHINESE AUSTRALIAN WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yesterday, I received a letter signed by five women who recently sought election to the management committee of the Indochinese Australian Women's Association. The terms of the letter, its wide circulation to members of Parliament and others, and the prominent report of its contents in today's *Advertiser* warrant this public and immediate response. At the outset, what should be made clear is what this morning's *Advertiser* report unfortunately failed to reveal, namely, that the five signatories to this letter were unsuccessful candidates for election to the management committee at the annual general meeting of the association on 2 November 1995. The names of all five were on a voting ticket—and members should listen to this—distributed at the meeting by, among others, Tung The Ngo, who is the subject of the following reference in a document signed by the Leader of the Opposition:

Tung represents the strongly held Labor north-west ward of the City of Enfield and we are delighted that he is currently working in the Labor movement.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In case members did not hear me, the document states:

... and we are delighted that he is currently working in the Labor movement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call to order the member for Peake, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Newland.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I can assure the House that we are not attacking an individual; we are attacking here the ethics of the Labor Party—

Mr Meier: It's trying to take over every organisation—

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am advised that this election represented an attempt by the Labor Party to gain control of the Indochinese Australian Women's Association for Federal election purposes. In fact, I found out this morning that this is the fourth attempt by the Labor Party in the past few weeks to snatch control of ethnic associations.

Mr CLARKE: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Ministerial statements are provided for under Standing Orders to set out matters of public importance and Government policy and are not for debate or argument.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot uphold that point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many comments from my right. The matter is one of public interest: it received prominence in this morning's newspaper, and the Premier is quite within his rights.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: As I was saying, this is apparently the fourth association of which the Labor Party has attempted to snatch control and failed in the past few weeks. I have spoken to the Hon. Julian Stefani about this letter. His absolute denial of the conduct alleged is supported by the following correspondence I have received today. The first is a letter, signed by Mrs Pat St Clair-Dixon on behalf of the Full Executive Council of the Indochinese Australian Women's Association, which states:

At a specially convened Executive Council meeting today, Monday 13 November, it was unanimously agreed to write to you—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. Baker: This is the whole executive, isn't it?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: This is the whole executive. It would appear that the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition are not prepared to accept the word of the Executive Council of the Indochinese Australian Women's Association. That is a pretty serious slight—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —upon this entire association after a democratic election, especially as the Labor Party was attempting to seize control of this association for political purposes. The letter states:

At a specially convened Executive Council meeting today, Monday 13 November, it was unanimously agreed to write to you in support of Mr Stefani, who has served our association in an honorary capacity for many years.

The AGM was attended by well over 300 members of the ICHAWA. The chairmanship of the meeting left a lot to be desired and we were disappointed at the overt political tones that the evening assumed. This not from Mr Stefani but others including men using overbearing and intimidating tactics. The executive is not an activist political organisation. We are here to serve the ICHAWA—not a political Party. Mr Stefani has always supported and guided ICHAWA in an apolitical way and on the evening in question his

behaviour as always showed dignity and the ethics of a true Christian.

Mrs St Clair-Dixon has also sent me a letter with some of her own observations of events at the AGM in which she states:

To suggest Mr Stefani 'flagrantly attempted to influence the outcome of the election' is a gross misrepresentation of the events. Again I would suggest that the imagined behaviour of Mr Stefani is a projection of the frustrations and anger of the group who wrote to you. The Vietnamese women were subjected to a constant barrage of election material from this group who signed the letter about Mr Stefani. It must be very annoying, to say the least, to have put out so many pamphlets, spoken so many words and been so bitterly disappointed with the election outcome.

I am advised that the association has received many telephone calls today expressing anger about the allegations made against Mr Stefani on the grounds that they were baseless. This was not the first AGM of the association that Mr Stefani has attended. He has attended many others since he became a member of the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission, as it was then in 1981.

The commitment of the Hon. Julian Stefani to the ethnic community is well known, and during his many years of involvement he has taken a particular interest in a number of organisations, including the Indochinese Australian Women's Association. This organisation has gone through a very unsettling period which has been reflected in some of the events at the annual general meeting. Of course, court actions are being taken as a result of some of the activities of those who lost at the election. The ultimate consideration for all in this matter is the Indochinese women who have made their home in South Australia. Their best interests will be served by ensuring that this association is very quickly allowed to proceed with its work on behalf of the women and their children for whom it was set up to serve originally.

GRAND PRIX

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I wish to make an important statement regarding the 1995 EDS Adelaide Australian Formula One Grand Prix.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. Baker: Get out of it. You lost it, you useless, good for nothing—

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

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Without doubt, the 1995 Grand Prix was the most successful staged in Adelaide, breaking all attendance records in the 45 year history of world Formula One racing. It has also gone down in the record books as one of the largest ever attendances at any sporting event of comparative size. The sell-out Sunday crowd reached 205 000, with attendances over the four days amounting to a record 511 000. We expect to make a record profit for this year's event, but this will not be quantified for several weeks.

There are other important statistics which I believe ought to be put on record. The after race concert, which featured the Australian band Yothu Yindi and the international rock band Bon Jovi, drew a record crowd of 100 000 people. The event was covered by 1 000 national and international media people.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Listen, Frank, I wouldn't say anything if I were you because you were part of the reason we lost the event. You could not even be bothered signing the agreement. I am fascinated that the former Treasurer—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House has been up for two weeks and members have obviously forgotten all about Standing Orders. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Premier that the Standing Orders will be applied. I suggest to members that they allow the Minister to make his ministerial statement without further interruption.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I am sorry that the member for Giles objected to my reference to the word 'frank' because—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Giles will not make further comment.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: If the member for Giles as the Treasurer had been frank with the public of South Australia, we would not have lost the event. There were 5 500 workers at the track, of which 1 000 were volunteers. The volunteers did an absolutely fantastic job and we need to support them very strongly. The 16 day extended program featured 71 non motor sport events including the Sensational Adelaide-Channel 9 Family Concert; the Sensational Adelaide East End Food and Wine Fair; the Canine Grand Prix; and the Pit Straight Family Open Day.

Some fascinating comments have been made about those two events, which attracted nearly 10 000 people to the track—South Australians wanting to be part of the exercise. It is important to note that the Grand Prix program comprised 71 events and that the Grand Prix race was only one of those 71 events. The Grand Prix race was the centrepiece of the program, and it was the biggest event that has ever been organised in the history of South Australia.

The Grand Prix Ball was attended by 1 450 people. The Australia Remembers fly-past was the largest ever gathering of war planes from both World Wars. This event was also significant for the enormous level of community pride it engendered amongst South Australians. As South Australians, we have shown that we have the expertise and the experience to put on the most successful sporting event in the world not only in terms of crowd numbers but also in terms of smooth and effective organisation, particularly when we think of the high pressure that often must have prevailed behind the scenes.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I am fascinated by the interjections coming across the House. Some of those comments need to be put into perspective. It is only over the past two years that this event has been properly commercialised. Prior to that, it was a fun event, run just as a bit of a go—and I will get to that point in a moment. I pay tribute to the commitment and dedication of the people who, in essence, ran this event: in particular, Ian Cocks, the Chairman, and Sam Ciccarello and his staff at the Grand Prix Office. We have been very fortunate to have such a motivated team putting together this event—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I will get to you in a minute. Only 25 people put this event together—and I think that is something that very few South Australians understand. Their efforts show that when given a challenge we can do a

job well in a way which makes all South Australians proud. I also take this opportunity to thank this year's sponsor, EDS.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Giles. I warn the member for Hart for the second time.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I also take this opportunity to congratulate the Tourism Commission for putting together the high profile Sensational Adelaide program. Unfortunately, it has been only over the past two years that the Government has been able to promote our city and get some value for tourism. The US Marine Air Corps must also be congratulated for putting on an exciting and impressive F-18 air show, which was a highlight for many.

I also put on record that the Federal Labor Government attempted to stop the US Marines from providing that fly-past. That is absolutely incredible! Everyone should know that the Federal Labor Minister wanted to stop the US Marine Air Corps from conducting that fly-past. It was only because of the intervention of the US Government that the marines were able to come here free of cost to us and be part of this program.

Also, we cannot forget the superb efforts of members of the on-track and Royal Adelaide Hospital medical teams who treated injured McLaren-Mercedes driver Mika Hakkinen, thus avoiding a potential tragedy. The teams were headed by FIA medical delegate, Professor Sid Watkins; CAAMS chief medical officer, Dr David Vissenga; and the CEO of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, Dr Brendon Kearney. Very special thanks ought to go to that medical team and to the emergency services team that was part of the Grand Prix.

Once again, this year, the strategically placed Sensational Adelaide signage ensured that South Australia and Adelaide retained a place in the international spotlight throughout the four days of on-track activity. We must ensure that we build on the momentum created by the overwhelming success of this event. It is because of this that the Australian Major Events group has been set up. We know that we have the necessary expertise to stage major events, and we will now turn all that talent to obtaining further events in the future.

AME, the South Australian group, recently announced a two-year program of national and international events, which is expected to attract a total international viewing audience of 500 million people and bring \$56 million worth of economic value to the State. There has been some comment about that. The Grand Prix itself brings in \$50 million, and this year it cost the Government in investment about \$11 million. So far, with \$6 million, the major events group will put together a program that will bring in \$56 million worth of economic activity. I think that is an important point that everyone should note. On top of that, we must not forget the Festival of Arts, WOMAD and the International Barossa Music Festival, which are of tremendous value to our State.

It would be impossible to replace the Grand Prix with any one event, but over the years we will develop a spread of events which will make South Australians very proud. During the past decade, the Grand Prix has been pivotal in taking Adelaide and South Australia to the rest of the world. All South Australians can be proud that we will be remembered for staging the most exciting and best organised Grand Prix on the Formula One circuit in Sensational Adelaide.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

QUESTION TIME

EDS CONTRACT

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Given the Premier's statement today about EDS, will he tell the House why he failed to contact the State of Florida in relation to its contract dispute with EDS until two days after he signed the EDS contract and eight weeks after he was made aware of the dispute while he was in the United States? The Premier has admitted that he did not consult the Florida Government before signing with EDS even though he was aware of the dispute when he was in the United States in August.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: However, the Opposition has a copy of the Premier's letter, which he mentioned today, to Florida's Attorney-General and dated 1 November. In his letter the Premier states:

... this is the first time in the world that data processing has been contracted out on a whole of government basis. You will therefore understand my Government's interest in any litigation which may involve EDS and another Government.

That was two days after the Premier signed the EDS contract and eight weeks after he was told about the litigation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections. I do not know whether members think it is their right to take exception to or licence with the Chair. I suggest that they do not.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It would appear that the Leader of the Opposition has not bothered to look at the hard facts. When I was in the United States of America, the judgment handed down by the former federal court judge was already there and clearly in favour of EDS.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. Baker: Well why should he, you great clown?

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Leader of the Opposition, who sits here today like a simpleton, asks why I did not bother to contact the Attorney-General of Florida when, in fact, the judgment had been brought down in favour of EDS—\$43 million in favour of EDS.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The only reason why this issue was raised again was that Florida's Attorney-General took action in a counterclaim about two days before we signed the contract. Having lost his shirt and pants, and perhaps having only his socks left on, the Attorney-General of Florida was out there trying to grab a bit of credibility for himself. So, he decided to breach the agreed procedure for settling the dispute and put in a new counterclaim. I find this incredible because, if the Leader of the Opposition were sincere—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—in his claim this afternoon, why was he wanting to sign a deal with EDS in November

1993 when the litigation had not even been settled at that stage? As I have already outlined to the House, the litigation had been settled before we signed.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is warned for the second time.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I find it interesting that the Labor Opposition in South Australia has not even bothered to go to each party. I took an even-handed approach. I wrote to the Attorney-General of Florida and asked him to send me all the relevant information and, in particular, information about his most recent action which had been taken just a few days before I wrote to him. I also wrote to EDS and asked for its assessment. EDS sent me a full copy of the judgment so that I could look at the entire document. The Attorney-General of Florida sent me 13 pages of a 62 page judgment—a judgment which was largely brought down against the Attorney-General of Florida.

I do not want to take sides on this except to say that I have found that the Attorney-General of Florida wants to run for Governor of Florida and is apparently trying to restore his credibility, having lost his shirt in terms of the judgment brought down. I suggest that members look at what the Special Master stated in his full judgment, because he brings down all the different areas—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that members allow the Premier to continue without further interruption, and that includes the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: As the member for Hart and the Leader of the Opposition apparently do not have access to the full judgment brought down by the former federal court judge, I would be only too happy to make a full copy available so that they can see all the facts which they have deliberately not availed themselves of until now.

GRAND PRIX

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): Will the Premier inform the House of the response of business leaders to the functions associated with the Grand Prix to promote investment in South Australia? Last Saturday, I was present, as were some members of the Opposition, at one function, namely, the breakfast. The function had an audio-visual computer simulation presenting South Australia's competitive advantage, quality of life and living advantages over those of other States and countries. To say the least, it was an exciting presentation.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Once again, the Grand Prix and the lead-up to the Grand Prix have been very successful for the promotion of South Australia for economic development and investment. A number of events took place. First, there was another trade mission to Hong Kong led by the Minister for Industry, which I understand was a very successful trade mission—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—and on which the Minister will enlighten the House shortly. I understand that some agreements were signed. I did an interview from Adelaide with Jeremy Cordeaux in Hong Kong and, certainly, the feedback he gave was that it had been a great success for the entire week. There was also a mission to Kuala Lumpur led by the Minister for Education, Mr Lucas, from another place:

750 people attended various functions put on in Kuala Lumpur. The 30 trade companies involved in Kuala Lumpur have reported a fantastic response. In fact, a number of those companies have stayed on to have detailed discussions about increased trade from South Australia to Kuala Lumpur.

Four hundred and seventy people attended the breakfast referred to by the member for Norwood. There is no doubt that it was an outstanding success in selling South Australia to the interstate and overseas business people who were present. In fact, I had a response from about 80 to 90 of those people, most of whom described it as the most outstanding presentation they had seen from any State Government or any organisation. In fact, the Managing Director and CEO of one of the largest companies in the whole of Australia told me, when he came up to me at the end of the breakfast, that it was the best presentation he had ever seen. The organisation of which he is CEO has a turnover in excess of \$10 billion a year. He said that he was taking it back to all his senior executives to put it on the CD-ROM disk that we had made available so that they could see how a presentation should be undertaken. We also had 640 business people at the dinner on the Saturday night and, again, that was a great success. Importantly, in the last two Grands Prix, we have been very effective in being able to use the Grand Prix to sell South Australia as a place for new industry development and economic investment.

I also want to endorse the remarks made by the Minister for Tourism concerning the medical team both on the track and at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. At 12 p.m. today I paid a visit to Mika Hakkinen, who was asleep when I went there. I had a chance to speak to Mr Ron Dennis, manager of the McLaren team. I also had a chance to meet most of the major doctors, other staff involved in the team and the people both on the track and at the Royal Adelaide Hospital who dealt with Mika as soon as the accident occurred.

A letter has been handed to the Chief Executive Officer of the Royal Adelaide Hospital today by Professor Watkins, who looks at all the medical standards and treatment for Formula 1 motor racing worldwide and who was at the site about one to one and a half minutes after the accident. He was amazed at the speed with which Mika was withdrawn from the car and immediately received medical treatment. He has said that this has established a new model to be followed by Formula 1 worldwide in terms of the standard, speed and quality of treatment on the track, on the way to the hospital and in the hospital itself. South Australians can be proud that their medical system has stood up to the most intense scrutiny under enormous pressure, as we can imagine would occur with an accident such as that. Frankly, people like Professor Watkins and Ron Dennis from the McLaren team are saying that, if it was not for the speed and quality of that treatment, Mika would not be alive today.

EDS CONTRACT

Mr FOLEY (Hart): What guarantees can the Premier give that South Australia will not end up in litigation with EDS over its contract, given the experience of the State of Florida? The Opposition has been provided with a copy of the response from the Attorney-General of Florida, dated 7 November, in which he says:

Perhaps our unsatisfactory experience with EDS might in some way help you to avoid some of the problems that we encountered—problems that remain unresolved to this day.

The Attorney-General goes on to allege that EDS 'has engaged in a pattern of deception and non-disclosure and fraudulently claims US\$20 million from the people of Florida' and that this information 'is not speculation, is not misinterpretation; it is plain fact.'

The Hon. D.S. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Mines and Energy.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I would now ask the member for Hart to bother to sit down and read the full judgment. If he read the full judgment, he would not be standing in this House making a fool of himself as he did a few moments ago. The member for Hart has apparently been willing to sit down and read 13 pages of a 62 page judgment and stand in this House and make a fool of himself. Frankly, that shows someone who is clearly prejudiced and biased.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is warned for the second time.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: All I am saying is that the member for Hart, the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition should have the decency to sit down and read the full judgment and be prepared to make statements based not on the 13 selected pages sent by the Attorney-General of Florida but on the full 62 pages of the judgment, which was critical of both sides in the litigation but which, very importantly, ultimately found overwhelmingly in favour of EDS.

SENSATIONAL ADELAIDE

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): My question is directed to the Minister for Tourism. Following the Minister's statement on the huge success of the EDS Australian Formula 1 Adelaide Grand Prix, will he inform the House about the future of the Sensational Adelaide promotion campaign?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I am very proud to stand in this Parliament and say that the Government intends to promote Sensational Adelaide as one of its major tourism concepts. One of the important issues that has come out of the Grand Prix in the past two years is that this is the first time we have put a branding name on the Grand Prix that told everybody they were in Adelaide. Two years ago, when we first did it, we got 15 to 16 minutes of coverage of Adelaide being promoted to more than 500 million people around the world.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: It is fascinating that the member for Giles should say that we could not get a sponsor. One of the reasons why it was done was that this Government decided it was in the best interests of South Australia to put Adelaide's branding name on the event so that we could sell it to the rest of the world.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: If the member for Giles agrees with it, why did his Government not do it for the previous nine years? It was because it did not understand how to do it; it had no comprehension at all. One of the important issues in this promotion of Sensational Adelaide is to promote our city. This morning I was able to go down Gouger Street and be part of the promotion of Gouger Street, along with the East End, Melbourne Street, and all the city streets, in promoting food and wine. That is what we need to do. Next weekend is the Sensational Adelaide Tattoo at Glenelg. It is the first time that we have had an Army Tattoo in this city.

I hope that everybody will come along and help us to promote Sensational Adelaide forever and a day.

EDS CONTRACT

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is again directed to the Premier.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder.

Mr FOLEY: You can bet your life it is, Johnny.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hart will ask his question.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir. When the Premier became aware in August of the dispute between the State Government of Florida and EDS—

Mr Ashenden: Didn't you listen?

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

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir. I will start my question again. When the Premier became aware in August of the dispute between the State Government of Florida and EDS, did he instruct the Office of Information Technology to investigate this matter and, if necessary, visit Florida for this purpose; and, if not, why not?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The answer is as I have already outlined. I became aware when I saw it publicly reported and the judgment had been handed down in favour of EDS. I brought that to the attention of the Office of Information Technology, but the judgment stood by itself. Why go off and ask the various parties when the judgment was there and in favour of EDS? I will tell you what I will do, Mr Speaker: I will offer the member for Hart the full judgment, because clearly he has not read it. Clearly he is embarrassed, because he has taken the 13 edited pages by the Attorney-General of Florida and based all his questions today on that case. I invite him to come across here and get all 62 pages of the judgment.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The honourable member might like to walk across the House for it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I should point out what the member for Hart has been up to in the past couple of weeks. He has been ringing the United States of America and speaking to various clients of EDS trying to obtain adverse comments on EDS.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In fact, two of those companies have sent back to the Government of South Australia their report and assessment of EDS, which was extremely favourable. I challenge the member for Hart to put on the table the list of telephone numbers that he has been ringing around the world trying to dig up something on EDS. He is not even prepared to walk across the House and get a full copy of the judgment which finds on this matter. How biased can any member be than not be prepared to read the full judgment but to look at just 13 pages sent by the losing party?

HONG KONG PROMOTION

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Will the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development inform the House of the response to the promotion of South

Australian goods and services held in Hong Kong during the week leading up to Sunday's Grand Prix and how he expects South Australian businesses to benefit from it?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am pleased to advise the House of the outcome of the promotion in Hong Kong. As the Premier indicated to the House, it was extremely successful. It was South Australia's largest ever promotion overseas with tourism, food and wine, advanced manufacturing, skilled migration, and education, just to mention a few.

Over 60 companies were assisted by the Government in travelling to Hong Kong to showcase South Australia and to reposition this State in the marketplace. Fewer than 40 companies attended last year but, based on that promotion's success and \$13 million worth of sales from it, it is clear that companies are looking for this sort of support to enter the marketplace. It also signalled an important fact to the Hong Kong market, namely, that South Australia is there for the long haul: that we are not merely getting involved for one year and then not repeating the exercise; that we are wanting to build on those relationships; and that we are building and establishing credibility in that marketplace.

It is interesting to note that in the past 12 months the number of tourists to South Australia from the Asia region has increased by 51 per cent. This is the roll-on effect of promoting South Australia in the marketplace. Over 200 tourism operators from Hong Kong participated in that exercise over the day and evening, during the course of which an arrangement was signed between the South Australian Tourism Commission and Jetset in Hong Kong to jointly market South Australian packages to that marketplace, with the objective of increasing out of Hong Kong by 25 per cent the number of tourists coming to South Australia.

Three chefs from the Regency institute attended the promotion with the cooperation of the Hyatt, which incidentally employs 180 chefs. Those three chefs catered for all the promotions using South Australian food and wine. It was a presentation of what South Australia has to offer in food and wine. The tourism day, the business opportunities night and the press conferences were all catered by South Australian chefs using South Australian food. The Hyatt's head chef had nothing but absolute praise for the three chefs from the Regency institute and for what they were able to present. A number of contracts have come out of the event, even though it occurred only a few days ago.

Terms and conditions are being negotiated for an order of 200 tonnes of frozen prawns, and several wineries are negotiating with distributors in the region. Some 60 of Hong Kong's influential business people attended the business opportunities dinner, their interests including agriculture, infrastructure and advance manufacturing opportunities. Approximately 20 people have committed to visit South Australia in the course of the next 12 months and four will be visiting within the next two months, with an anticipated investment of some \$5 million. In relation to migration, almost 60 people attended a seminar on employment opportunities for skills in information technology, telecommunications and computing, while 45 people attended a business migration seminar, with expected investments in pulp paper, corrugated cardboard and the petrochemical industry.

The ANZ Bank participated in the promotion in Hong Kong and secured from Taiwan nine new business migration cases, expected to generate \$12 million during the first 12 months, and from Hong Kong eight new cases are expected to generate a similar investment of \$12 million in the course

of the next year. In addition, an advanced technology expo was held and contracts in excess of \$1.5 million are currently being negotiated. One of the highlights was the education expo, which was attended by more than 320 visitors. Six students signed on the day, with course fees under contract totalling \$126 000.

Strong interest was displayed from journalists. Last year about 30 journalists attended the press conference and explanation of South Australia Week in Hong Kong. On this occasion 42 journalists attended the media event. The profile of South Australia in the Asian marketplace and what this State is doing in its outsourcing contracts with EDS and United Water are starting to establish the standing of this State. I refer, for example, to companies such as Motorola, the Australis Media Customer Service Centre and the Westpac National Loans and Mortgage Centre establishing in South Australia. When one travels overseas the question is asked: Why did Motorola go to Adelaide? Why did EDS go to Adelaide? Why did Westpac go to Adelaide?

That enables us to open the door to market the benefits of South Australia, which is something the former Government did not even contemplate doing during the 1980s. The suggestion by the Premier to use the first Grand Prix as a platform for economic development, to reposition and remarket South Australia, is starting to work. If we continue with that approach we will get the marketplace looking closely at this State as a sophisticated manufacturing society with a skills base to offer companies in Hong Kong. The Hong Kong Productivity Council, for example, wants to enlarge on the memorandum of understanding with the South Australian Centre for Manufacturing for skills base enterprise improvement for manufacturing industry in Hong Kong and, more particularly, in the growing markets of China.

As the Australian Government has clearly identified, marketing Australia in Asia is a key priority. The first State to join with the Australian Government to remarket Australia in the marketplace is South Australia, and the first State in Australia to locate an office in Sydney to capitalise on the Sydney Olympics is South Australia. This is another example of building on the strengths of this State and positioning it State in the marketplace. The bottom line is an investment in our future. The cost of \$400 000 to \$500 000 to enter this market will be repaid many times in this State, not only in investment but, more importantly, in years to come in jobs for South Australians.

EDS CONTRACT

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Is the Premier concerned by the findings of US Judge William Webster that EDS failed to disclose important information to its client, the State of Florida, and what guarantees did the Premier obtain to ensure full disclosure under the Government's contract? Judge William Webster, who was a Special Master presiding over the alternate dispute resolution process, said in his findings:

Perhaps most importantly—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: You should listen to this.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Too many comments are being made from the front bench.

Mr FOLEY: The findings state:

Perhaps most importantly EDS failed to disclose the principal reason why HRS, the Florida Department of Health, should have run a benchmark test. EDS knew that the Florida system generated two

internal transactions, not one, for every screen of information presented to the end user, but did not disclose this to the Florida Department of Health.

The judge's findings also stated:

Good faith and fair dealing required EDS to disclose the erroneous modelling assumptions to the Health Department before it purchased the upgraded computer. It failed to do so.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member was commenting.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It would appear from the way the question has been asked that the member for Hart does not quite understand that we have signed an outsourcing contract. The equipment must be purchased and operated by EDS, which must deliver the outcome. Therefore, the sorts of problems experienced in Florida are not applicable here. All we want is our information processed on time. The honourable member asked the question, 'What protection is there for South Australia in the contract in two important areas?' With respect to delivery of information on time, very substantial protection is provided.

First, if there is more than 1 per cent down time for the main frame, a huge penalty is imposed on EDS each month. I believe a 2 per cent down time applies to most of the other systems and 3 per cent or 4 per cent applies to local area networks. So, we have set a very high standard, indeed. Secondly, if there is continued breach of the contract, on one factor alone a penalty of up to \$10 million applies against EDS and up to \$50 million against EDS for multiple breaches of the contract. I would have thought that was a huge protection for the State of South Australia. I would suggest to the honourable member that, first, he read the full judgment because, if he had done so, he would have found that the State of Florida threatened one of the so-called independent consultants who was giving evidence and said, 'Unless you give evidence which is unfavourable to EDS, first, we will not pay your account; and, secondly, we will make sure you do not get any more work in the State of Florida.'

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: If the member for Hart was really serious about this, he would have been equally as concerned about the way the State of Florida was handed down some rather severe judgments: in fact, much more severe judgments, overall, than this judgment that was handed down. The important thing is that our contract is an outsourcing contract. Secondly, we have protection there and that protection is substantial indeed to look after the interests of the South Australian Government.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): My question is directed to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What is the South Australian Government doing to create jobs for young people, given the mess created by Keating's Federal Labor Government?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: It is important that we put this issue in its proper context. In talking about 15 to 19 year olds, we must bear in mind that 90 per cent of them are at school, TAFE, university or in employment. When people hear the figure of 40 per cent it gives a distortion of the reality of the situation. That is not to say that there is not a need for active programs to deal with the situation. The main focus—and we have just heard from the Minister for Infrastructure—is to attract industry and investment to South Australia, and this

will employ people, including young people. That has to be the main focus. That is why the Minister for Education and Children's Services was in Kuala Lumpur and why the Premier has been overseas attracting investment. The main focus must be private sector investment, to which this Government is committed, and that is why we are keeping costs and taxes down in order to make South Australia an attractive place in which to invest. Young people will benefit from the employment opportunities created by such investment.

In terms of education, South Australia has one of the highest retention rates in Australia: 81.7 per cent to year 12, which is 7.1 per cent above the national average. In other words, most of our young people stay on to year 12. I repeat: 90 per cent of that age group is in employment or studying, and so we must keep the situation in context. It is not a 40 per cent figure applied to the whole age group: in fact, it is less than 10 per cent. However, many of those young people do not have the necessary skills, because they have come from an education system administered by Labor and many of them have problems with basic skills. We are addressing that matter through programs such as Kickstart for Youth and other new innovative programs focused on the future.

I will not detail all our programs, because there are many of them, but they include the WorkCover levy exemption scheme, which encourages employers to take on young people and trainees; the payroll tax rebate scheme, which has been operating for two years; the group training employers' rebate scheme, under which we give a \$50 a week incentive to companies who take on trainees; the Employment Brokers Scheme, which has been very successful in turning part-time work into full-time work; Greening Urban SA, which has assisted 657 people in the short time it has been operating and which will lead to employment in local government; and the young farmers' incentive program, which is helping young people stay on farms. Kickstart for Youth is delivering successful employment, along with Kickstart, and the recent announcement about jobs at the shark processing factory involves Kickstart jobs, with 120 positions created there. There is also the State Government youth trainees' scheme.

I compare that with the previous Government's record. In June 1993 the Arnold Government had 126 trainees: in June this year our Government had 741 trainees, and by the middle of next year we will have 2 500 trainees in the Government trainee scheme. In addition, I have asked the Federal Government to assist and come to the party so that we can take on up to another 1 500 trainees in the State Government. There is a commitment there, and we are endeavouring to give our young people the skills they need to gain employment. I heard the member for Taylor, in her continual misrepresentation campaign, talking about cutbacks to TAFE. We have not cut training programs in TAFE: TAFE enrolments are up this year, and they will be up again next year.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The restructuring of TAFE has been in the non-teaching areas so that we get greater output in terms of training and so that the efficiencies are coming from the system and not at the expense of training. TAFE enrolments are up across the board and productivity is up. The previous Government got rid of the name and destroyed TAFE, but we have brought it back. We have many other innovative programs under way, and we are currently looking to institute in 1997 a vocational training scheme through a senior secondary technical college based at TAFE institutions so that young people over the age of 15 can enter the

vocational training area much more efficiently and effectively. I have had an assurance—

The SPEAKER: I suggest that the Minister draws his comments to a close.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I have had an assurance from Federal Minister Crean that he will contribute to that scheme, so that young people who want an alternative to the existing school system can come into a TAFE institution at senior secondary level to be trained in a vocation and spend part of the week in industry, thereby acquiring the necessary skills to obtain employment. That is a small part of what we are doing. Every member of the Government is committed to our young people and determined that they will have a future, which they did not have under the previous Government.

EDS CONTRACT

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir. How is the guarantee given to South Australia by EDS superior to the absolute and unconditional guarantee that EDS gave to the State of Florida? Will the Premier table the guarantee in this House?

Members interjecting:

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

Mr FOLEY: The Opposition has a copy of the Florida Government's guarantee which reveals—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: And the Minister for Tourism.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir. I will start my explanation again. The Opposition has a copy of the Florida Government's guarantee with EDS, which is something we do not have from this Government. The guarantee reveals that EDS guaranteed absolutely and unconditionally all performances, obligations and liabilities under the contract and declared it had no legal defence whatsoever against any claim made by the State Government of Florida. The contract guaranteed payment on demand of any claim made orally or in writing for all sums due from EDS. Speaking on Adelaide radio today the Attorney-General of Florida said that the guarantee had failed the State of Florida.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It would appear that the Attorney-General failed the State of Florida as well. He has lost his judgment and, therefore—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has had his third warning and he will be named the next time he interjects.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: There was a former Federal Court judge—

The SPEAKER: The member for Peake is warned for the second time.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —who handed down a judgment that went overwhelmingly in favour of EDS, even though some minor aspects were awarded to the State of Florida. The State of Florida got US\$4.7 million or US\$4.2 million and EDS got US\$48 million. Clearly, the Attorney-General of Florida is pretty sour because he has lost the independent judgment. However, I point out to the member for Hart that there is a fundamental difference: we hold a bank guarantee for \$10 million. I have given that information to the House and the media previously. We hold

a bank guarantee for \$10 million. Does the member for Hart understand what a bank guarantee is?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: He has probably never seen one. I can point out what a bank guarantee is. For the benefit of the member for Hart, it means that a bank has to guarantee to the State of South Australia \$10 million. It is not the company that pays: it is the bank, which has already deposited with the State Government this guarantee for \$10 million. Clearly, there is a big difference between what occurred in Florida and the guarantee given here in South Australia.

INSURANCE, THIRD PARTY

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): My question is directed to the Treasurer. What action is being taken by the Government to ensure that motorists are paying appropriate compulsory third party premiums? Under the current arrangements, motorists with vehicles registered outside a 40 kilometre radius of the GPO pay third party premiums that are substantially less than those in the metropolitan area, reflecting the lower accident rates outside the built up areas.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I will be very brief. The problem with the CTP system is that people do try to sort it. A number of people register their cars outside the 40 kilometre limit, which is the current prevailing limit, to get the cheaper registration that applies in country areas, irrespective of the fact that their usual place of residence is in the city. Our best calculation on motorbikes and cars is that we are losing about \$500 000 from the CTP fund. We cannot afford to lose that amount of money. We are giving people until 31 December this year to sort out their usual place of residence—where they actually live. However, if we find that people are transgressing, that they are giving a false address, we will prosecute them. Indeed, when we introduce the Bill in the House, I am sure the Opposition will support our capacity to obtain all the outstanding premiums owing to the CTP fund. We are taking action on this matter and, during this grace period that the Treasurer has given, we trust that people will sign up, be honest and make sure that they provide the appropriate address.

EDS CONTRACT

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Is the Premier still satisfied that the South Australian Government could claim up to \$10 million from the EDS bank guarantee without being challenged in court? On 31 October, the Premier said:

For a major breach of the contract we can be paid up to \$10 million, for a multiple breach we can be paid up to \$50 million. . . and on top of that we actually hold a bank guarantee of \$10 million. . . so that we aren't out there arguing for the money.

Court documents lodged in Florida show that the State Government of Florida has had to take EDS to court, even though Florida had a guarantee that was 'absolute and unconditional'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I invite the member for Hart to come over and read the full judgment. Instead of asking question after question today and making a fool of himself by acknowledging that he has read only 13 of the 62 pages of the judgment, why does he not come over and get the full facts? He has used taxpayers' money to ring Florida. He has made an overseas call, but he is not prepared—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Wright.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am drawing the contrast: he is prepared to use taxpayers' money to ring Florida but he is not prepared to make a local call to speak to EDS to get the other side of the picture, or to walk across this Chamber at no cost at all to get the full judgment. Why is it that the member for Hart and the Leader of the Opposition do not want to see the rest of the judgment? They are scared of the facts; that is what this is about. Of course, until they are prepared to look at the facts and the full judgment, they will be the subject of mockery.

LAND VALUATION

Mr KERIN (Frome): Will the Minister for Environment and Natural Resources inform the House of the steps being taken to ensure valuations for rating and taxing on rural property are not unfairly inflated as a result of large areas of formerly rural land being sold off for multiple housing allotments? Some land-holders believe they need protection against possible over valuation of their land. This is particularly the case where farm land is sold in multiple allotments at a much higher price than if the same land was sold for primary production. There is a concern that, if property is valued on potential use rather than existing use, some people will be forced off their properties.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: As the member for Frome would know, this matter is gaining considerable prominence, particularly with the urban sprawl since the 1980s, and the effect that the sprawl has had on the real estate market and on valuations for rating and taxing. As a result, it is timely that I should indicate to the House that I am establishing a working party to ensure the valuation methods of the 1980s are relevant to today's situation. That working party will look particularly at the concept of notional values—a concept passed by this Parliament in 1981 to provide rate relief to properties where the value of the land is enhanced by its potential to be sold in multiple allotments rather than on activities traditionally undertaken.

As members would realise, notional values represent the value of the property, assuming that potential does not exist. This is particularly relevant in the case of rural properties where land may be zoned for a higher potential than it is being used for currently. It applies to market gardens, where there is potential for subdivision, on heritage allotments and on areas set aside for native vegetation where zoning or potential use might not reflect the activities or returns on the land. These areas include the Mount Lofty Ranges, the Fleurieu Peninsula, the northern areas, and also popular country or holiday and retirement locations where former farms or large allotments are being subdivided.

In primary production it is important to ensure that producers are not unfairly rated or taxed, particularly if that means that they are forced off their land because land is valued on the basis of encroaching urban sprawl. Because of the diversity of land use today, it is important that the valuation system is both responsive and flexible, and the working party to review the notional values policy is an important step towards ensuring that that is the case.

HEALTH SERVICES

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister for Health advise the House of opportunities to capitalise on South

Australia's expertise and application of technology in the health area?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Newland for her question about a very important matter, and it is a matter which, quite frankly, will see the South Australian health sector leading the world. As the Premier indicated earlier in response to the trauma at the Grand Prix track, they now clearly will be used as a world model. I am pleased to report to the House on yet another such example. Very recently, whilst in the United States I had some positive discussions with key personnel at the University of Iowa. The University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics is an outstanding university hospital group. Indeed, it is rated in true American fashion as one of the top 10 hospitals in the United States. It is nationally recognised for its research and, for its advanced medical and surgical services, it is recognised internationally as well as nationally. Very importantly, it is recognised most specifically for its creative use of modern technology, especially in the area of distance education and in health related applications of computer technology.

There are very strong similarities geographically and demographically between the State of Iowa and the State of South Australia: we are both diversely spread populations, relatively small in terms of the national population, and typified by relatively long distances between small population centres. The health systems also have a lot of similarities. They service population centres which are stable and comprise a significant rural component. They have large geographically centralised institutions of comparable size and importance, and relatively similarly sized medical schools. They both serve a mix of racial and economic communities. The disease mix is very similar, and similar problems such as remote communication and patient retrieval, and so on, are also shared.

Given that the health sector in South Australia has made a push to be at the leading edge of development and application of technology for health purposes, it is particularly important to develop products in the international market and, as I have told the House on many occasions, there is obviously an intention to establish a base to expand into Asia; and the University of Iowa believes that a number of international collaborative alliances can help it achieve this with its product as well.

I am delighted to advise the House that on 3 November I signed an agreement with Dr Henri Manasse, the Vice President for Health Services at the University of Iowa. That is but phase one in a long-term agreement in the establishment of just such a transnational alliance. By February 1996 both parties will have business plans available, and the Transnational Alliance Coordination Group, which is chaired by Iowa with the deputy chair coming from South Australia, is being established to assist that process.

In March 1996 representatives of the University of Iowa intend to visit South Australia, and I would expect the finishing touches to be put onto the proposed transnational alliance at that time. It is another exciting opportunity for South Australia to be associated with a recognised world leader and to seek to expand into Asian markets to capitalise on our excellent reputation in health care which is demonstrated—as I indicated before—by the recognition from the International Formula One Constructors Association senior doctor, who said that the care given to Mika Hakkinen was absolutely world-class and will become a model. That is recognition of the health care that we provide. With the focus

on information technology there is a clear synergy which will be of benefit to everybody.

EDS CONTRACT

Mr FOLEY (Hart): When the Premier became aware in August of the dispute between the State of Florida and EDS, did he seek advice from the Government's American legal advisers Shaw Pitman and, if so, what advice was provided? On 23 March the Premier told the House:

Because of the importance of the contract we must ensure that we get it right and protect the long-term interests of South Australia.

The Premier went on to say:

We have brought in lawyers from Washington DC, Shaw Pitman, because they are the best in the world.

What was their advice?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The member for Hart is acting as no more than a one eyed lap-dog for the Attorney-General of Florida. He has yet to walk across to this side of the Chamber and obtain the full judgment. I ask him to come and read the full judgment. In August-September I found out not the argument of EDS or the argument of the State of Florida but the judgment of the former Federal judge. That is the important thing. You do not just look at the evidence of one side of the case or the other side—

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: There would be no defence case according to the member for Hart. The member for Hart would roll in his own prosecution, hear the case, execute the other side and then say, 'Well, it was not worth listening to his case.' The member for Hart has not been prepared to make a local telephone call to hear the other side of the case or walk across the Chamber and obtain the independent judgment. He is the one eyed lap-dog of the Attorney-General of Florida who has just missed out very substantially indeed in terms of the judgment that has been handed down and the damages awarded.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Ms WHITE (Taylor): My question is directed to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Given the appalling news of 40 per cent youth unemployment in South Australia compared with the national figure of 25 per cent, will the State Government now put its own money where its mouth is to address the problem? In his latest report the Commissioner for Public Employment expressed concern that the rate of youth employment in the South Australian public sector was less than half the rate of youth employment in the private sector. The State Government spent only \$2 million—or the equivalent of one week's pokie tax revenue—on programs for youth employment.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting. The chair has been most tolerant. I suggest she explain her question.

Ms WHITE: The Minister has now written to the Federal Government requesting further Commonwealth funding while, by his own admission, his own Government has cut more than \$10 million out of TAFE and \$40 million out of schools.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The member for Taylor is way off beam again. I explained earlier that the figure of 40 per cent is not an accurate representation of the situation. Ninety per

cent of 15 to 19 year olds are in employment, at school, at TAFE or at university. I will provide the official definition. The 40 per cent refers to those young people aged 15 to 19 in the full-time labour force who are unemployed and who were looking for full-time work in October. It is less than 10 per cent of that whole age group.

In terms of funding, we are putting in more money now for youth employment than was the case previously and certainly under the honourable member's Government. With respect to the request to the Federal Government to increase Public Service trainees, I point out that we have to put in money. We do not get it for free—we have to put in money. We are also spending more on facilities such as TAFE capital works. We are funding much of that out of our own pocket. The previous Government did not do that. There is a whole range of other programs. The honourable member mentioned a \$10 million cut. That is untrue.

Ms White: That is what you said in the paper.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: What the honourable member describes as a 'cut' is not anywhere of that order. TAFE has been allowed to keep the proceeds from property sales which will exceed \$4 million to off-set reductions in other aspects of the TAFE budget. Overall, the net impact is very small. Enrolments are up, productivity is up and the future looks good.

WATER FILTRATION

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): Will the Minister for Infrastructure provide details of the status of tenders and the program for regional water filtration plants? I point out that last week tenders closed for build, own and operate projects for up to 11 new water filtration plants for regional centres in South Australia.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The bids for the BOO projects worth up to \$100 million for the 11 water filtration plants to serve some 75 towns and communities in the Adelaide Hills, Murray River towns, Barossa Valley and Mid North areas were received last week. The bids are now being assessed. They are keen competitive bids which have come from Anglican Water, which includes its Australian subsidiary Purac Pacific, the designers Connell Wagner and Australian constructor John Holland undertaking civil works; North West Australia, which will involve Baulderstone Hornibrook as constructor, with design input from engineering design group CMPS&F; Pacific Water, which will involve Thiess Contractors & Tubemakers of Australia, which is largely owned by BHP, and it will also involve Yorkshire Water; SA Water Services, which is equally owned by Lend Lease Australia, P&O Australia and Lyonnaise des Eaux; and United Water, which includes in its bid the South Australian company Henry Walker, Australian company Concrete Constructions and AIDC, which is largely Australian owned.

Plants will extend filtered water to some 100 000 more people in South Australia where present supplies are dependent upon the Murray River as a source. April 1996 is expected to be the construction date following the tender, evaluation and contract negotiations. Communities in the Adelaide Hills, the Barossa Valley and Mid North towns can expect to receive filtered water from the last quarter of 1997.

SMITH, MR M.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): My question is directed to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Who is Michael Smith and what connection does he have with the Minister's office? Last week my office received a telephone call from Michael Smith who described himself as a TAFE student who was upset at the Government's cuts to TAFE. He said that he was ringing about an interview which I had done on radio that morning and he asked whether there had been a press statement and, if so, whether it could be sent to him. The fax number given by Michael Smith was 2265859. The Minister will recognise that number as his own ministerial number.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Without my approval or prior knowledge, a junior member of my staff, having heard some porky pies on radio, took the initiative to ring up and get a copy of the alleged—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: No. He rang up to get a copy of the press release issued by the member for Taylor. As I said, this was done without my approval or prior knowledge.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I do not condone that, neither do I condone the porky pies of the member for Taylor.

AUSTRALIAN BARLEY BOARD

Mr VENNING (Custance): Will the Treasurer explain why the Government will no longer provide a guarantee for the Australian Barley Board?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I am pleased to announce that, by mutual agreement, the South Australian Government will no longer act as guarantor for the Australian Barley Board. The key issue of whether the Barley Board should operate with a Government guarantee has been negotiated and discussed since we have been in government. Some restraints and constraints have been placed on the operations of the Barley Board. It has found an alternative avenue of finance, which is more than happy to provide the very large sums of money that are needed, particularly at the beginning of the season, to pay growers for their crops. So, from that point of view, it has achieved an economic result from the borrowing of its funds.

Of course, now that the Barley Board is no longer subject to the Treasurer's strictures on what businesses it can be involved in, it can act in a more unfettered way than it was able to under the arrangements that were previously in place. So, the deals it has done in Victoria and now in Egypt, which would have been frowned on by the Treasurer, can now operate to the benefit of farmers, but there will not be any Government fall back. I am delighted with that result, as I am sure are the farmers.

GARIBALDI SMALLGOODS

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Emergency Services. Has the Director of Public Prosecutions determined yet whether anyone may be prosecuted over the Garibaldi HUS epidemic? On 12 October, the Minister for Health made a ministerial

statement in which he stated that the South Australian Police Department had referred the Coroner's findings to the DPP seeking his views as to whether evidence is sufficient to prosecute under criminal law.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I have not received any information back on that matter, but I will take the honourable member's question on notice and bring back a considered report.

COASTAL EROSION

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources outline the progress of the current review into management of the metropolitan coast? There appears to be considerable community concern about the future direction of the maintenance of metropolitan beaches, particularly regarding the issue of coastal erosion.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: This is a very good question. I am always particularly pleased with the interest shown by the member for Lee in his electorate and the coast in general: he makes a considerable amount of representation to me and my office regarding this matter. I think we would all agree that coastal issues are extremely emotive, particularly in the light of the fact that much of the State's cultural base and lifestyle centres around the coastline of this State. I believe that recent issues at Semaphore have highlighted the need for a long-term approach and have certainly vindicated the decision that I made some months ago to call for a comprehensive independent review of the management of Adelaide metropolitan beaches.

This review has given the public an ideal opportunity, one which has been requested on numerous occasions, for input, to lodge submissions and to attend a series of workshops which will be held in the near future. This most important review will look at a number of issues that will be of interest to members of this House, including the protection of private and public property from erosion and storm surge flooding; planning implications of development approvals from an environmental, planning and engineering viewpoint; and also, of course, the cost and means of payment by the community for management of the coast.

I point out that the cost of storm damage along the metropolitan coast has reduced significantly since 1972 when the Coast Protection Act was adopted. Severe storms now cause much less damage than in the past when damage bills of between \$4 million and \$21 million after severe storms were not uncommon. It is important to understand that current beach replenishment programs are not unique. Recent figures show that 70 per cent of the world's sandy coastlines are eroding and that sand replenishment is used throughout the world as a solution to the problem. In fact, without sand replenishment a number of Adelaide's beaches would gradually disappear and tens of millions of dollars would be needed in addition.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I know that you want to disappear; there is no problem with that. Finally, I would like to say that the review will look at a range of options for sand replenishment. I expect the review to have prepared its findings by the end of the year with a Government response being formulated soon after.

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Constitution (Salary of the Governor and Electoral Redistribution) Amendment,
 Criminal Law (Sentencing) (Miscellaneous) Amendment,
 Land Tax (Home Unit Companies) Amendment,
 Pay-roll Tax (Exemption) Amendment,
 Stamp Duties (Miscellaneous) Amendment,
 Summary Offences (Indecent or Offensive Material) Amendment,
 War Terms Regulation Act Repeal,
 Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (Dispute Resolution) Amendment.

LAPTOP COMPUTERS

The SPEAKER: It is my intention to allow members the opportunity to bring laptop computers into the Chamber for use after 4 p.m. on each sitting day. Laptop computers should be used in such a manner that they do not interfere with other members or in no way disrupt the sittings of the House. I will be interested in members' comments, and I will review this ruling when the House meets in the new year. The New South Wales Speaker has allowed the use of laptops or notebooks in the Chamber, and the Queensland Speaker has also taken similar action.

The Hon. D.S. Baker: How do you use them?

The SPEAKER: It is beyond the ability of the Chair to assist the Minister.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): It is an appalling contempt of the Chair that over recent weeks, and particularly in the last session, members of the Premier's staff were running around telling journalists individually that various Labor members were to be thrown out on a particular day. I know that you, Sir, would not sanction such a role of the Premier's staff. It is an extraordinary contempt for the office of the Speaker. I understand that at least one media outlet was told today by a Premier's staffer that a senior member of the Opposition would be thrown out of Parliament before Parliament started.

The SPEAKER: Order! I did not quite hear what the Leader of the Opposition said. Let me assure the Leader of the Opposition and all other members that the Chair takes no direction whatsoever from any member. I regard any comments which infer any such course of action as a reflection on the Chair.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Exactly, Sir; that is my whole point: it is an extraordinary contempt of the Chair. Today, we had a situation where the Premier launched an extraordinary attack on Mr Tung Ngo. Mr Tung Ngo is a 23 year old Vietnamese-Australian, the first Vietnamese-Australian in South Australia's history to be elected as a local government councillor. It is very interesting that the Premier sought to politicise this matter by saying that I had given him a reference. The piece of information that the Premier selectively quoted from was a foreword of the inaugural publication of the *Adelaide Asian Business and Community Guide*,

a guide that will be distributed free of charge to Asian-Australian households and businesses.

I was asked to provide a foreword and to mention how delighted we should all be, including the Premier of this State, who happens to be the Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs, that a Vietnamese-Australian has been elected to local government. Let the Premier remember that Mr Tung Ngo ran his campaign against National Action. I would have thought that the Premier, in his role as Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs, would be prepared to come into this Chamber today and condemn National Action for what it did in its campaign against Tung Ngo. What an extraordinary attack on a Vietnamese-Australian by this Premier. Let us remember that it is this Premier who is currently trying to delay any vote on my racial vilification Bill, which includes criminal sanctions, because his own Party wants to water it down. When you scratch a red neck you know what you find.

I also refer to an important article that appeared in the *Australian* today. It relates to submarines 7 and 8 of the submarine project. Senator Robert Ray, as Minister for Defence, is quoted by the *Australian* as saying that two extra submarines could be afforded only by slashing other defence projects or by convincing Mr Keating to offer additional funding for the project perhaps as an election promise. Today, I have written to the Prime Minister. I hope that the Premier will do so, too. I also hope that he will write to Mr Howard. In a bipartisan way we should all be fighting to win a seventh and eighth submarine to be built in South Australia. The submarine project is vital to the achievement of greater defence self reliance and, of course, another critical Commonwealth policy objective, the promotion of regional industry development.

In a vulnerable economy such as ours, we must ensure that there is bipartisan support for this submarine project. I understand that work force reductions at the Australian Submarine Corporation, Adelaide site, will begin next year unless a commitment is given to construct the two extra submarines. Jobs that are vital to South Australia and world class expertise that is vital to the nation's defence and electronics industries would be at risk. So, we all need to work as a Parliament to ensure a commitment at the highest levels in Canberra for the construction of submarines seven and eight. Let us remember, too, that if that does not occur we will lose a huge reservoir of international world class expertise in systems, computer technology, and so on. That is expertise that we cannot afford to lose as our reputation is maturing internationally.

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): At about 10 p.m on Sunday I took the opportunity to draft a letter and send it to Bernie Ecclestone. I will read it out so that it is on the record. It states:

Dear Bernie

Having met each other on a few occasions, I think that it would be remiss of me as a former Lord Mayor of Adelaide for six years and now as a State politician representing the seat of Colton, if I did not write to tell you the way the final Grand Prix has affected the people of Adelaide.

We won the event more than 13 years ago not knowing very much about staging Formula 1 races but we were determined to show that Adelaide could do it better than anywhere else in the world. It did not take you long to realise that the people of Adelaide are really special, they are friendly and warm, and they have enormous pride in everything that they do. We were excited to see Adelaide win the trophy for the best run Formula 1 race in the entire world in its very first year and 11 years later our Grand Prix gave you the record of 205 500 for the greatest attendance at any sporting function

anywhere in the world. Everyone expected us to put on a mediocre final Grand Prix, but that is not our style, we were too proud not to end it with a 'BANG' and show the world our quality and commitment.

It was a bitter disappointment when you announced that Victoria would take our Grand Prix. You have attempted to justify your reasons many times, using many reasons but no matter how hard you try you will never convince Adelaide and South Australians that the reason was not dollars. I think you have learnt great lessons from the past 11 years. You have learnt that Adelaide may only have just over 1 million people but we excel in everything we do and we displayed that during the horrific injury to Mika Hakkinen when our medical team operated on him at the track moving in split seconds to display the brilliance of our doctors and neurosurgeons. I would say that on most Grand Prix tracks in other parts of the world he probably would have died. As a community we prayed for him because we considered him part of our community and in fact, your drivers and their teams became part of our family once a year.

You may have moved the event to Melbourne for financial reasons, but you will never have the same quality of event out of Melbourne as that out of Adelaide, the reason being, that big cities lose that personal touch. Melbourne will continue to have its protesters because it has cut down so many beautiful old trees at Albert Park which will cause embarrassment for international visitors who will see those protesters when they arrive for the event. Bernie, I have the support of the people because I negotiated to remove six large gum trees and to replace them with 6 000 new native gum trees and provide irrigation for 110 acres of the parklands surrounding the track.

Bernie, you have moved the Australian Formula 1 Grand Prix to Melbourne and in doing so broke our hearts, but you will never break our spirit. Out of this experience all South Australians will become stronger. We will develop major functions, we will turn our Three Day Equestrian Event into a spectacle that will rival even the Olympic Games. We will develop a food and wine festival that will attract tourists from around the world. We are not going to sit by and lament our loss, but we are going to prove that we became better because of it.

Bernie, you may not visit us often in the next five years, but you certainly will hear of Adelaide and the world class events it is hosting, but remember, we are big enough to say that the people of Adelaide will always welcome back you and the Australian Formula 1 Grand Prix . . .

My kindest regards and best wishes.
Steve.

The thing about this whole issue is that we have lost something that we did better than anyone else. We lost it for many reasons which I do not want to go into, but we had the opportunity to stitch it up. That is gone now. As a community we have to get together. We have a quality of life that is unsurpassed anywhere else in the world. We can put together world class events and allow people from all parts of the globe to come here and enjoy the life style which South Australians have the privilege to enjoy.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): I was very disappointed today not to have heard at least a ministerial statement from the Minister for Health or questions from the member for Gordon and the member for Flinders about the withdrawal of Red Cross blood bank facilities in Whyalla, Mount Gambier and Port Lincoln. The Federal Government has brought out new guidelines for blood banks and the taking of blood, and I do not disagree with those guidelines. I think we have learnt over the past few years that we cannot be too careful in these areas. The Red Cross has said that it will cost a fair bit of money to fix the Adelaide centre and that that money will be found at the expense of the three regional cities. Therefore, there will no longer be a facility for the taking of blood at Whyalla, Port Lincoln or Mount Gambier.

I understand the Red Cross having a shortage of funds, but I object in the strongest possible terms to its closing Whyalla and the other operations for the sake of fixing something in

Adelaide. Again, this demonstrates how country people get the rough end of any deal that is going. The problem can be fixed. The Red Cross needs \$250 000 to upgrade all its facilities to comply with the new Federal standards. My appeal is for this Government to supply that \$250 000 to the Red Cross to enable the rural blood banks to continue. In many respects, this Government has had windfall profits in a number of areas, so \$250 000 would not stretch its budget at all.

This Government is always saying how much it appreciates what volunteers do. There are about 40 volunteers in Whyalla who donate blood regularly to the Red Cross. In fact, they supply about 60 per cent of Whyalla's needs for blood during operations and other emergencies. Those volunteers have been told, 'If you want to continue to give blood, you must go to Adelaide to do so.' That is silly and impractical. All these volunteers—40 in Whyalla and similar numbers on Eyre Peninsula, in the South-East and around Port Lincoln—are being told, 'Go away. We don't want you. Adelaide comes first. Too bad.'

Another concern of mine relates to arrangements for autologous blood donations. In the 1970s Mr Richard Davies, a specialist who practised in Whyalla, pioneered autologous blood. I think that I was one of his first patients when I had an operation in Whyalla Hospital. I went for a couple of weeks beforehand, gave my own blood and received it back during the operation. As I said, that practice was pioneered in Whyalla by Richard Davies. I believe that will no longer be possible due to this practice. I hope I am wrong, because I understand that the best and safest blood that one can give these days is one's own, and that practice ought to be more widespread. If it means that those who live in Whyalla, Mount Gambier and Port Lincoln can no longer arrange autologous blood donation, it is very serious.

I think that all those volunteers who have given blood over the years have been doing something worth while, and the practice should be allowed to continue. I believe that the Red Cross ought to be given \$250 000 to bring its facilities up to standard. Nothing could be more important, so the Government ought to make funds available for it. I would very much like Liberal members to raise the matter in their Party room to ensure that rural South Australia gets the support that it needs. They have the power to do it, and I hope that they will exercise it.

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

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): I have always been a great supporter of basic skills testing, which has recently been completed by the majority of primary school students in South Australia. This outstanding initiative was implemented by the Minister for Education and Children's Services, and we should congratulate him for taking that stand. There is no doubt that this revolutionary practical concept has proven to be a great success, despite the negative propaganda by the South Australian Institute of Teachers and the Opposition, in particular the shadow Minister for Education and Children's Services, the Hon. Carolyn Pickles. The result of the literacy test component—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr LEGGETT: If the member for Spence will shut up for five minutes, he will perhaps learn something new. The literacy test component result shows that 66 per cent of all year 5 students and 61 per cent of all year 3 students achieved

results in the top two skill bands. While the results show that a majority of students have very good literacy skills, the fact that 17 per cent of year 3 students and 13 per cent of year 5 students recorded below average marks means that there is still a lot of work to be done in this area, and the Minister is very conscious of that. The numeracy tests show that 76 per cent of all year 3 students and 65 per cent of all year 5 students achieved results in the top two skill levels.

As this was the first ever basic skills testing, there is no benchmark with which to compare it, but that will change as we do the tests on a yearly basis. However, some of the major results of the tests are worth looking at. First, year 5 students did not do as well in spelling and grammar as they did in reading; secondly, year 5 students did not do as well in numeracy problems using shapes and graphs as they did in calculating areas, volumes and identifying the correct time; and, thirdly, girls did much better than boys in the literacy test, although the results were almost comparable in the numeracy test. For example, 73 per cent of year 5 girls were in the top two skill bands for spelling and grammar while only 56 per cent of the boys performed at that level. Similarly, in year 3, 68 per cent of girls and 54 per cent of boys were in the top two skill bands. Sadly, Aboriginal students recorded results well below the other groups, with only 27 per cent in literacy and 30 per cent in numeracy in the top two skill bands.

Final figures show that 14.5 per cent of students did not do the test; 7.5 per cent were automatically exempt because of significant disabilities; and 8 per cent were absent for reasons such as sickness or other appointments. In fact, 21 000 students (70 per cent) actually took the test.

It is significant that, after examining these results, the Minister has now given \$2 million in grants to 83 per cent of all schools to provide extra assistance to children with learning difficulties in their early years of schooling. These grants range from \$1 020 to \$11 020, quite substantial, with an average grant of \$4 000. While the grants must be used to support the early assistance action plan, the final decision on how the money is used is up to the principal and the school management. One option is to purchase SSO hours on condition that they support students with learning difficulties in the early years. The basic skills test highlights the many challenges that lie ahead, and the \$2 million grant to provide extra resources to assist students with learning difficulties is merely a starting point. The Minister has pledged to announce further grants over the next few years, and I commend him for that.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I refer to the issue that dominated Question Time, that is, the contract EDS has with the State of Florida and its potential impact on the EDS contract in South Australia. The Opposition has embarked on a course of investigation that any Opposition should because, on the day following the announcement by the Premier of a \$565 million contract over nine years, it came to light that the State of Florida had entered into a major legal dispute with EDS and, in fact, had lodged a claim against the EDS company for US\$60 million.

The Premier had to admit immediately that he was made aware of that claim in August this year when he was in the State of Texas, not that far from the State of Florida. The Premier spoke to EDS about the dispute—he admitted that—and accepted the EDS position, not even bothering either to go to Florida himself or to send one of his officers travelling with him to ask the Government of Florida, ‘What is the

major issue in dispute?’ The Premier failed the very first step in accountable Government and about getting contracts right—he ignored it. Funny about that! I obtained the claim made by the State Government of Florida and tabled it before the Economic and Finance Committee of this Parliament, because I wanted it checked out by the Auditor-General. A reaction then came from the Premier. On that day, 1 November, the Premier thought, ‘I had better ask the Government of Florida what is going on.’ So, the Premier of this State wrote to the Government of Florida and, in part, the letter states:

As Premier of this State of South Australia, I seek your assistance in obtaining information about litigation between the State of Florida and Electronic Data Systems Corporation (EDS).

The Premier goes on to say:

I understand this is the first time in the world that data processing has been contracted out on a whole of Government basis. You will, therefore, understand my Government’s interest in any litigation that may involve EDS and another Government.

If the Premier was so concerned about litigation—

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Sir.

Mr FOLEY: You disgraceful—

An honourable member interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Becker): Order!

Mr BRINDAL: I ask for an apology and a withdrawal of that remark.

Mr FOLEY: I apologise and withdraw.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you. The member for Unley has a point of order.

Mr BRINDAL: I seek clarification on the fact that the member for Hart says he tabled a document before the Economic and Finance Committee. I ask you, Mr Acting Speaker, whether the Economic and Finance Committee has authorised that that document or those proceedings be published and, if the Economic and Finance Committee has not authorised their publication, whether in fact the member for Hart is in breach of the Parliamentary Committees Act in disclosing matters that have been discussed confidentially within the Economic and Finance Committee.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The matter should be dealt with appropriately by the Economic and Finance Committee. I warn members to be very careful of the time taken up by points of order.

Mr FOLEY: That is a delaying tactic by this Government, which will not stand up to proper scrutiny. The point is that the Premier of this State had an obligation to at least ask the State of Florida, ‘What is the issue in dispute?’ Quite frankly, whether EDS is right or wrong, or whether the State Government of Florida is right or wrong, is not my concern. What is my concern is that the Premier of this State failed to investigate, failed to ask the question, and failed to follow proper due diligence to ascertain the nature of that dispute. It will affect this State because the State Government of Florida had a contract.

If the Premier of this State wants to get up in this House and slander the Government and the Attorney-General of Florida, if he wants to get up in this House and accuse me of being the lap dog of the Government of Florida, if he wants to accuse me of being dumb and small minded—and all those other abuses for which this Premier is so renowned—I will accept that, because if I have to go through this process to make sure that our State is protected I will do so. I will not allow to go unchallenged these multimillion dollar contracts that exist over the lives of many Governments.

If the Premier wants to make petty abuse his defence, let him do that. I am not the lap dog for the Government of Florida, nor should he be the lap dog for EDS. I will not be intimidated by tactics such as that from the Premier and I will not be intimidated by EDS. I will do what is right for this State to ensure that we have a proper contract, one that safeguards South Australian interests, even if the Premier will not.

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

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): I wish to commend the City of Tea Tree Gully. Members in this place know full well that I have been very critical of that council in the past, but I wish to give credit where credit is due. Some years back, when I was a City of Tea Tree Gully councillor, the then council made a decision to make some major changes in the senior management structure of that council. One of the best things that council has ever done is to appoint Mr Brian Carr as its Chief Executive Officer. I wish to commend Mr Carr and his senior officers at the council for initiatives they have undertaken since the changes were made.

If the member for Elizabeth were here I am sure she would remember Mr Carr as the Chief Executive Officer of the Elizabeth council, where I understand he also was very innovative in the programs and initiatives he undertook. Similarly, since his appointment at Tea Tree Gully, I have never ceased to be amazed at the drive that man exhibits and the way in which he has turned the Tea Tree Gully council around from a council which was very reactive, given the difficulties management sometimes has with some of its elected members, to a council that has introduced a number of initiatives.

I do not know whether members of the House have read the article, but a recent edition of the *Business Review Weekly* indicates that the City of Tea Tree Gully is now not only the hottest spot for business in South Australia but one of the hottest spots for business in Australia. This has not just happened. One initiative introduced by Mr Carr was the Tea Tree Gully Project Management Board, which consists of a number of community and business leaders Mr Carr gathered together from within the City of Tea Tree Gully. That group has set up a number of initiatives which are now bearing fruit.

The *Business Review Weekly* conducted a survey which 'shot Tea Tree Gully to the top of the list'—that is, in South Australia—referring to rapid population growth, and my electorate is reflecting that because most of the growth in the City of Tea Tree Gully is occurring in the Golden Grove development. Secondly, the survey indicated high levels of commercial and retail development. Again, it is not unfair to single out Mr Carr and his senior executives for their years of work in attracting a major retail development on the site of the previous council chambers and the employment and money that is now bringing to Tea Tree Gully. The survey indicates, thirdly, the growth in labour force numbers; fourthly, the growth in retail sales; fifthly, the growth in housing starts; and, sixthly, the growth in commercial development approvals.

In other words, it can be seen clearly that the executive of the City of Tea Tree Gully has been instrumental in attracting housing, retail activity and commercial development to the City of Tea Tree Gully, and tremendous growth is occurring. So, to Mr Carr, as Chief Executive Officer, to his senior management team, and to the Tea Tree Gully Project

Management Board I offer my absolute commendation for the work which has been undertaken to make Tea Tree Gully one of the premier business hot spots in Australia, and certainly the premier business hot spot in South Australia.

I would also like to pay tribute to one of Tea Tree Gully's councillors, Colin Douglas. Last week I attended the opening of the new Avago facilities in Tea Tree Gully. This project has provided employment, training and opportunities to many young people. The project has gone through a pretty rocky period over the past 12 months and there is no doubt that Councillor Douglas, because of his astute leadership, his very balanced political outlook, the way in which—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: I will tell the honourable member something later. I would not laugh if I were the honourable member. Councillor Douglas is certainly not a supporter of the Liberal Party but a very fair person who has worked on both sides of the fence to bring together two very diverse groups—almost warring groups—to ensure that this facility has been able to progress and proceed. I want to say how much I admire what Councillor Douglas has done. I have worked with him and we have often disagreed, but I commend him for this work.

MOTOR VEHICLES (HEAVY VEHICLES REGISTRATION CHARGES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

HOUSING COOPERATIVES (HOUSING ASSOCIATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 October. Page 295.)

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Support from Labor Governments in setting up community cooperatives and housing associations was the main impetus in getting this sector of the housing community going in this State, and it has proved to be very successful. Despite an extensive network of public housing in this State that has been developed over the years, niches have developed in the housing sector which have been filled by cooperative and community housing groups in this State—and filled very well. This results from the commitment and expertise of a range of dedicated community members who have and who are overcoming a range of problems in the sector, including the difficulty of working in that area. They have been working hard to make their sector of the housing market responsible, accountable and, above all, responsive to their tenants.

I understand that the previous Government undertook consultation about community housing in 1991, and so it has been an exhaustively extensive process. The goal in this consultation process was to develop a legal and financial framework which would underpin the community housing association sector and enable community housing to continue and extend its work. It is important that there be security for people involved in community housing programs. Community housing is at a fairly critical stage and in need of increased support and funding to meet the demand.

Certainly, the Opposition is pleased to support this Bill. It is pleased that the Government is taking it forward and reaching a stage whereby the Bill fulfils all the consultation that has gone on. We have spoken to housing interest groups, including those heavily involved in this area, and we have reached a position where we support the Bill in its entirety. We hope it goes through and is implemented quickly. Community housing associations have been waiting for the Bill to go through for most of the year, and we are pleased to assist in that process.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD (Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations): I thank the Opposition for its support of the legislation this afternoon. It is well known by the cooperative housing sector and associations that I am a keen enthusiast and supporter of the sector. There is no question that the Bill has received good support. This is sound legislation, and this is a step that had to be taken. We have taken this step in consultation with the sector. There has been an enormous amount of community debate leading up to today, and this is certainly a step in the right direction.

In winding up the debate it is advantageous to put on the public record the results of qualitative and quantitative surveys into the cooperative housing sector because that will indicate the direction in which it is going. It records the very positive responses out in the sector, particularly as people do not see this as just a welfare option but are indeed supporting it. Certainly, as long as I am Minister responsible for housing I will endeavour to support the sector and see that it continues to grow.

Surveys were done in both qualitative and quantitative areas, and I would like to run through some of the findings. As to the qualitative research findings, the primary objectives of the initial research phase were, first, to ascertain the key product attributes of cooperative housing and, secondly, to examine potential expansion avenues for the cooperative housing sector. The methodology used 30 indepth interviews with SACHA clients. Sector intermediaries and potential cooperative members representing youth, the aged and the environmentally conscious were also interviewed.

As to the key findings, cooperative housing was seen by current SACHA clients as the next best alternative to home ownership. In particular, cooperative housing felt more like a home than rental accommodation. Unlike tenants in the private rental sector, cooperative members felt that they had security of tenure. Cooperative tenants highly valued the fact that they could choose or even design their own housing and build their own home. Tenants also expressed a strong feeling that cooperatives offered them a chance to live in better neighbourhoods and view their homes as being theirs for as long as they liked. Significant potential existed amongst groups to develop a community with members supporting each other in other areas beside the day-to-day operational matters of the cooperative.

As to the qualitative research findings, the key attributes highlighted were security of tenure, affordable housing, potential to develop a community, flexibility of tenure and a feeling of having a home. The research objectives in the quantitative research findings were, first, to determine the level of satisfaction with existing housing; secondly, to identify the potential for cooperative housing in specific housing segments of the community and speed the probability of specific groups committing to cooperative housing; and, thirdly, to ascertain current awareness of cooperative housing.

Again, the methodology used was a quantitative questionnaire administered to respondents in the private rental market, Housing Trust residents and amongst Housing Trust owners and occupiers. The sample was representative of most demographic segments in the community, and 308 telephone interviews were conducted by the IQCA qualified field staff. The research involved probabilistic segmentation, a technique providing accurate indications of consumers' propensity to buy a given product. The research found that positive support existed for the cooperative housing options in South Australia. Some 28 per cent of respondents had heard of cooperatives, 65 per cent of whom had a correct understanding of what cooperative housing involved; 10 to 15 per cent of respondents believed that they were highly likely to adopt a cooperative housing option within the next two years; and 10 per cent of the total sample were practically certain to adopt cooperative housing.

The highest demand for cooperative housing options came from respondents in the private rental sector, and 39 per cent of private rental tenants in the sample surveyed, as compared to 18 per cent of Housing Trust tenants, suggested that it was highly probable that they would consider living in a cooperative. Also, 5 per cent of owner occupiers expressed an interest in the cooperative housing product. The potential demand for cooperative housing is equally spread across all demographic segments in the market.

As to the potential market for cooperative housing, the research indicates that a significant percentage of the population is ready to adopt the cooperative housing option. About 10 to 15 per cent of the community represented by this sample would be highly likely to adopt the cooperative housing option. This represents a potential market of between 51 570 and 77 355 households. The demand for the cooperative housing option would be significantly increased if the housing product was promoted more widely.

In conclusion, the research indicates that there is significant support for cooperative housing in South Australia. The larger than expected demand for this form of housing is all the more surprising given that there has been no organised publicity campaign seeking to promote the benefits of this option to date. The research also indicates that significant commercial opportunities exist for the establishment of cooperative housing in the future. It is in that latter area that governments of the day and should look at the economics of the cooperative housing movement, examine the cost benefits and see whether there are cost benefits in proceeding further into the area of cooperative housing in the long term.

Members might also be interested to learn that SACHA has just agreed to fund business plans to develop large associations sponsored by the Salvation Army, the Port Mission and Housing Spectrum, which is a disability service provider. In this case, the Government's entering into partnership with the not-for-profit housing sector is something that should be observed by all members, particularly as it will provide housing for people with special needs. That is what the housing cooperative is all about. I am pleased with the support of the Opposition and the general bipartisan attitude to public housing in this State. South Australia can be very proud of its public housing record. I am pleased with the operations of both the Housing Trust and SACHA, certainly since I have been Minister. Some dedicated people are involved whose prime interest is the welfare of the recipients of public housing, and I hope that continues for many years to come. I thank the member for Napier for her

support of the Bill, and I hope that it receives speedy passage elsewhere.

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

**TELECOMMUNICATIONS (INTERCEPTION)
(MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 19 October. Page 338.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): The Bill makes changes which are consequential on changes to the Commonwealth Act such that the States must improve their reporting procedures so that the Commissioner of Police is able to tell the Attorney-General how many times telephone communications have been intercepted and how much money was spent annually, including capital expenditure, on telephone intercepts. The definition of 'prescribed substance' in the Bill is expanded from 'narcotic drug' to 'psychotropic substance'. The Commissioner of Police must now retain a copy of all approvals for intercepts. The Police Complaints Authority must give any information it receives about intercepts to the Commonwealth Ombudsman if it thinks the information is relevant to the Commonwealth Ombudsman's duty, which I presume is in connection with the Federal police. The Opposition has scrutinised the Bill carefully, finds its provisions sensible and will support it.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I must express my appreciation for the clarity and delivery of the member for Spence in his support for the proposition.

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

**STAMP DUTIES (VALUATIONS—OBJECTIONS
AND APPEALS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 25 October. Page 391.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): The Opposition supports the Bill. It seems eminently sensible. From what we understand of the legislation, it will give a far greater right of appeal to the taxpayer who wishes to query, if not directly challenge, a valuation upon which stamp duty is based. As a consequence of that, there is no sense in unduly delaying the House. The Opposition supports the legislation and is happy for it to go through to the third reading.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): It is a straight forward Bill. I appreciate the support of the member for Playford. I must admit that I did take some time to reconcile myself with the fact that we now have in place an appeal process. The appeal process—at least to the outer world—shows a degree of fairness. However, from some of the letters I have received, I know the extent to which people will contest down to the last dollar the valuation of a property. When the power was supreme and no objection was available to any person, that was a simple solution but not a fair solution. We have now come up with a fair solution, and we trust that it will be used accordingly.

The last thing we want to see is courts or tribunals tied up with complaints where the difference in dollar value is very small. It is a step forward. It gives people more rights than they had previously. We will be watching it with great

interest. I am sure that it will work better than the existing system—at least for taxpayers. As the matter evolves, I will keep a close watch on the extent to which it leads to new levels of litigation, and I trust that it will provide a deal of remedy that is not in the system today. I thank the honourable member for his support.

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

**SUPERANNUATION (CONTRACTING OUT)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 26 October. Page 446.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): The Opposition wants to address a few matters, so I intend to speak only briefly in the second reading. I want the Bill to go into Committee so that I can obtain answers to four or five questions before the Bill goes to the other place. In essence, even though the Bill does have a curious title, which is there to frighten certain people in the community more than anything else, we wondered what was being contracted out. Of course, it involves Government employees who have been offered employment in the private sector and who had Government superannuation obligations that terminate at the point at which they take up employment offered by a new employer in the private sector.

It appears that this Bill seeks to ensure that, for as long as that person is contracted to work for the new employer—and this is where it gets complicated in reading the whole thing—that superannuation will be preserved. So it is not paid out on the day that all wages and all other obligations are paid out—for example, holidays, holiday leave loading, and so on—but it is preserved until such time as the person's contracted employment with the next employer ceases. There seems to be a lot of emphasis on the age of 55 years and this will be the subject of some questions that will be asked in Committee. I anticipate that we will not be proposing any amendments but under clause 4 we will be seeking to put down four or five matters to seek a response.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I do appreciate the comments of support. It is relatively straightforward. In the sale of assets that has taken place, the honourable member would recognise that there has been a negotiated position in terms of what happens after the sale. That has been negotiated with the State Bank and the Pipelines Authority and, indeed, there has been enterprise agreement reached with SGIC employees.

We have had legal opinion on one area which does disturb us: as soon as an employee who transfers into new employment reaches the age of 55, he or she is legally entitled to receive a pension while receiving wages and salary from their employed position at the same time. We have considered this carefully and we believe this amendment is necessary.

This might save one or two questions: the amendment provides that, if a person is in a contracted out situation with the same employer with whom he was contracted when that outsourcing arrangement was agreed to, provided that person is still with that employer, there is no right or entitlement for that person to collect the pension as well as the pay cheque. The situation becomes interesting for those people who have taken separation packages or have gone elsewhere: they have the right to collect a pension and earn another salary, and some people are actually doing that. These circumstances are

quite clear. We are providing a level of Government employment through a contracting out arrangement. We do not believe that a person in that situation should be able to draw a pension cheque at the same time as he or she is being employed. Until we had legal advice on this particular issue, most people were not aware that was the situation that prevailed. It is the interpretation of 'when a person leaves the Public Service' that the 55 years age entitlement can be canvassed. It is a technicality which should be remedied immediately to prevent that situation.

When a person who has a superannuation entitlement preserves the benefit—and most of these employees obviously will do that—there is an improvement in benefit the longer the entitlement is preserved. There is a lack of knowledge about the fact that at age 55 the pension can be accessed at the same time as they are employed. That technicality has not seeped through to the general work force and it has been assumed that it was not available until they left the employ of that particular contractor. There are only a few people in that group but we have a number of other contracts coming on board now. The matter has been canvassed with the Public Service Association and I understand that there is no difficulty because everyone assumed that that was the situation that would prevail.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Retirement.'

Mr QUIRKE: I thank the Deputy Premier for answering some of the questions. Certainly, the explanation for this Bill was unduly complicated and that has caused some problems. My understanding is that a person who currently has superannuation entitlements and works in the public sector—whether it be under the SSS scheme which has just commenced operation, the closed lump sum scheme, or even the closed defined benefit scheme—will be caught by this legislation, because it covers all three superannuation areas.

The second question I pose is that, if a person is employed by a contractor who has directly contracted to the Government and has taken over that person's employment, when that person leaves the employ of that contractor to work for another Government contractor, or whatever, provided age 55 has been reached, will those obligations then be paid out?

I would like to know the status of a person who is employed beyond the age of 55 and who is no longer employed by a particular contractor. Even though that person is receiving a weekly or monthly salary, will that person still get the superannuation benefits? The Deputy Premier has told us that there has been widespread consultation on this point and that to this stage no-one was aware of the loophole in the Act in respect of contracting out.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I should clarify a couple of issues. Because the SSS scheme has virtually now started, the issues are a little bit different, but I can probably segment them. I will not talk about taxation or Commonwealth pensions but, as the honourable member would appreciate, the pension scheme actually carries the highest level of subsidy. Under the current arrangements in the Act, a person can retire at the age of 55 and receive a reduced pension, which has a higher level of subsidy than does the pension if the person had retired at the age of 60, for example.

The pension itself will be preserved until such time as that person leaves the employ of the principal contractor. If that person, for example, is employed by EDS for five years and goes past the age of 55, upon leaving that employment he or

she is entitled to collect the pension that has been preserved and all the benefits that have accumulated. That person can—and possibly will—seek alternative forms of employment of a part-time or full-time nature—a few hours a week—or they might have a long holiday, but that person is entitled to draw on that pension, or to draw on that lump sum, if he or she retires at the age of 56 or the age of 57, for example.

These provisions ensure that the drawing down of the pension and the lump sum takes place at the time of retirement from the contractor: that is the point at which the benefit becomes available. That was by way of clarification. For those people who do something else, that is their entitlement: that is the way in which the Act is structured and we are not, in any shape or form, reducing their capacity to collect those benefits. They may wish to leave them preserved or to take them up at that time, but we do not want them to receive the 55-year pension at the same time as they receive a remuneration for what is, in effect, Government service.

Mr QUIRKE: I want to be absolutely clear. I am not being obtuse about this, but I have just been given a document which tells me that there has been absolutely no contact with the Public Service Association by the State Treasurer or his office or, presumably, any of his officers. I think we ought to clarify now whether there has been any consultation.

The other issue that needs to be raised is the point which the PSA seems to be making about what it says is the inequity between the pension scheme and the lump sum scheme in terms of what would be available as benefits to, presumably, its former members if this amendment were carried. That seems to me to be the nub of the issue with the PSA.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I apologise: I did say that there had been consultation with the PSA. That consultation was supposed to have taken place. I understand that the office was contacted today, so I offer my apology to the House. That consultation was supposed to take place and any concerns raised. I will make sure that my superannuation officer goes back to the PSA now that it has had another chance to look at this measure and, if there are any concerns, we can straighten them out in the other place. Again, I offer my apology: an instruction was issued to make sure that everyone knew what was going on.

Regarding inequity in the process, whether you are in or out of Government is a matter of interpretation. A person who reaches 55 years of age, who has preserved their pension and taken it at 55, who is working outside Government but not for a contractor is eligible, whereas a person who is working outside Government for a contractor related to Government or in a contracting out situation is ineligible. I do not necessarily see that as an inequity, but the member for Playford may wish to raise other issues in that regard, and I am willing to have those examined.

In this contracting out situation, the issue is that we are dealing with Government work. The employment is being provided by Government but in a contracted out situation. So, Government is committed to provide that service, Government pays the bills for that service at a price, and therefore Government provides the employment. Under those circumstances, we believe that the responsibilities of Government are a little different from a taxpayer's point of view than if a person is working outside Government and not involved in any contracting situation for which the taxpayer actually pays directly.

Some other issues might have arisen as a result of the PSA's not being contacted earlier and not being able to run through the Bill and check on various points. If there are any

further problems or any points of clarification, I apologise to the honourable member, and I will make sure that we liaise closely with the PSA. The PSA may wish to put up amendments that might be unacceptable, but obviously at this stage it has not had an opportunity to look fully at the Bill and its ramifications. Those issues can be debated, and I undertake to have any discussions that are needed post this debate in relation to any matters that arise as a result of the PSA's being concerned about particular issues. We feel confident that this Bill is acceptable not only for the employees, who all assumed that that was the case and that it would prevail, but also for the taxpayers.

Mr QUIRKE: The document that has been given to me elaborates the PSA's position *vis a vis* the questions that I asked in the first bracket. So, I will be interested to look at *Hansard* tomorrow to see what has occurred. The PSA raises a question that I posed a moment ago: if a person leaves the public sector and takes on employment with the principal contractor under an agreement in whatever terms, the success of this amendment through the parliamentary process would see that person then having their superannuation obligations by Government preserved until such time as their employment with that contractor ceased. What the Government is saying in this document is that the union's position is that they should be preserved until there is genuine retirement. That is the word that is used in this document.

I posed a question earlier. If another employment takes place once the person has decided to move from the principal contractor either to another Government contractor or, for instance, to own a newsagency, or any one of a million things, according to this document the union's position is that they should not be in receipt of superannuation payments at that point. That is what this document says. That is not my position, and I do not know whether it will be the position of the Opposition—it will depend on who has the numbers—but I suggest that, if a person goes on to the next level of employment, the superannuation obligations at that point should be met. If a person is receiving a larger wage packet, that is a matter for the Federal Tax Office which, in my experience, is very good at levelling the playing field. That appears to be the process with superannuation payments, because they will be taxed at the full marginal rate.

So, again, I emphasise to the Government that I do not expect a response tonight. I think we should have ongoing discussions about this matter, and the Opposition wishes to be involved. No doubt, we will deal with this matter in the other place. I do not think there are any further outstanding issues other than the matters that I have raised here in Committee. Clearly, the documents that I have received I will want to study a bit further, and it may be that we will have further discussions later, but at this stage I think all the principal issues are on the table.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Again, I thank the honourable member for his assistance in this matter. There is debate at Commonwealth level about when people should become eligible for a retirement benefit. It involves the issue of when a person actually retires and when the benefit actually becomes available. There is a prevailing view, which may be shared by more than one person, that any superannuation entitlement, if it were deemed for retirement, should become available only at the point of retirement. There are some interesting developments within the union movement on that issue. The extent to which they will affect this Bill are, I believe, somewhat limited, and I am not sure how we would manage that position.

For example, in South Australia we have a rule that people cannot cash out their superannuation benefits, whereas in other schemes they can transfer that money out of the State scheme into a conforming scheme provided the trustees or the board are satisfied that it is a matter of hardship. For some people it can effectively provide a cash return and, again, not a retirement benefit. So, a number of matters and issues are being discussed at the moment as to when in fact people should call upon what they would class as their savings and what the Federal Government would class as a retirement benefit. From a nation's point of view, one could suggest that the fewer calls on social security systems and the later in life those calls are made the better off the nation will be as a whole. However, there are matters being discussed at the moment. We have seen some movement on some of those issues, but whether they will translate into anything substantial before the next election is somewhat doubtful. As a Government, we will continue with some dialogue on those issues. I will be pleased to consider the material the honourable member has, and we will provide a considered response on any other issues which may be there.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 9) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 October. Page 394.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I note that the Government will be moving some amendments, although the Opposition will not be doing so: we support the legislation as such. In essence, the legislation, which we support and which the friendly societies have assured me they support, seeks to clearly map out in the 1990s the role of Government intervention and reserve powers. I am assured that it will be a matter of reserve powers. This week marks a rather famous occasion in terms of talking about reserve powers of Ministers and such like. A very sizable amount of funds (about \$800 million) is controlled by the friendly societies in South Australia. This legislation seeks to amend the 1919 Act to provide a proper, modern legislative framework to deal with the problem and to create a level playing field with other friendly societies which have come across the State border over the years and which, because they are registered in another State, come under the Act of their home State. This legislation seeks to mirror the legislation operating at least in Victoria and I understand in one or two other States, and to ensure that all friendly societies work on a level legislative playing field.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): Again, I thank the member for Playford for his contribution. Obviously, he understands that South Australia is committed to this process of at least attempting to ensure that there is integrity in the system and in the scrutiny of the various financial institutions. The AFIC legislation was meant to encompass friendly societies as originally designed. There were building societies and credit unions, but friendly societies were left out of that general legislation because there were some degrees of difficulty which were recognised at the time. There was also a clear understanding that the systems under which some of these friendly societies operated were clearly not capable

of meeting the requirements under the general legislation covering these other financial institutions. The standard legislation to be agreed by all States was supposed to have been in place by 1 July this year. There is some doubt as to whether it will be in place by 1 July next year.

We have an understanding that these provisions are acceptable to the Commonwealth and to the States but that there seems to be some reluctance to proceed along these lines. There are complications with friendly societies quite different from the other institutions, including certain of their investments and involvement in service delivery which is inconsistent, for example, with the role of credit unions and building societies, which are basically just credit providers that redistribute money. Friendly societies play a much wider role in a number of areas. It is for that reason that there were complications and the suggestion that it was not possible to enact this legislation across Australia in the time frame that was originally agreed.

In South Australia we have seven friendly societies registered managing sums in excess of \$800 million. They are a very important repository of money as well as being an important provider of credit. They are a very significant force in the non-bank financial institutions sector. They have faced increasing competition, and it is important that they are as good as their counterparts, namely, the credit unions and building societies.

We should not be less diligent in our scrutiny of friendly societies simply because it is a little more difficult or because the quantum of money are not as high as they are in these other two sectors. The AFIC scrutiny and the supervisory scheme have a lot of merit, in that if there are difficulties they can be detected a lot earlier. We believe that the Bill has the support of the friendly societies and, therefore, from a South Australian point of view, we are pleased to be the first State enacting this legislation in order to provide rules that I believe are overdue in this area. We have seen a lack of diligence in other institutions. We are aware of the building societies, particularly in Victoria, which have fallen over. We want to make sure that these institutions conform to a given set of rules, provide returns to Government and have a sensible way of operation to the satisfaction of the Government. We will move some amendments to this Bill as a result of further representations to us.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Objects for which funds may be maintained.'

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

Page 1, after line 25—Insert:

- (aa) by inserting after subparagraph (f) of subsection (1)V the following subparagraphs:
 - (g) chiropractic treatment;
 - (h) if members or their relatives are unable to attend an educational facility due to sickness, injury or some other medical condition—tutoring;

The provisions that were in place did not allow for some of the benefits provided by friendly societies today, so we have to insert new definitions. Paragraph (aa)(g) allows for chiropractic treatment and I believe that subparagraph (h) relates to some of the benefits provided. We then go to some of the other issues where there is direct involvement by friendly societies in areas other than providing credit to the broader community. As we know, friendly societies are involved in nursing homes, pharmacies and a range of other areas. These matters were brought to our attention at the time.

It was said that the Bill is deficient to the extent that these are allowable processes and they needed to be more explicitly catered for in the Bill.

Amendment carried.

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

Page 2, after line 7—Insert:

- (da) by inserting after subparagraph (f) of subsection (1)VI the following subparagraphs:
 - (g) chiropractors registered under the Chiropractors Act 1991 towards the cost of treatment by them of members or their relatives;
 - (h) persons licensed under the Ambulance Services Act 1992 to provide ambulance services towards the cost of providing such services to members or their relatives;
 - (i) tutors towards the cost of tutoring of them by members or their relatives who are unable to attend an educational facility due to sickness, injury or some other medical condition;

Again, this extends the areas of involvement of friendly societies beyond what was contained in the Bill.

Amendment carried.

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

Page 2, after line 12—Insert:

- (fa) by inserting after paragraph VIIIA the following paragraph:
 - VIIIB for providing persons with recreational or leisure facilities or services;

This is another area of involvement in recreational facilities which caters for modern day practice within friendly societies.

Amendment carried.

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

Page 2, after line 19—Insert:

(j) by striking out subsections (7) and (8) and substituting the following subsections:

- (7) A society or branch must maintain separate funds in relation to the objects set out in subsection (1) so that each fund relates only to the object, or one or more of the objects, referred to in any one of paragraphs I to XIII of that subsection.
- (8) However, the Minister may, on application by a society or branch, authorise the maintenance by the society or branch of one fund for the purposes of more than one of those objects with effect from a specified date (which may be a date prior to the date of the authorisation).

The original requirement was somewhat difficult in that it could be conceived that for every fund in which a friendly society was involved it would have to keep separate accounts. That may have been useful, but I understand it was impractical. We are now allowing the societies to be more flexible in those arrangements. The keeping of those accounts in the way specified in the Bill was not essential for the financial accountability of the organisation. We will find accounts which have more than one function, so we have put in new subsections (7) and (8). In effect, the amendment provides that the keeping of accounts can be in a much broader sense than was allowable under the legislation. We believe that it will not reduce the accountability of friendly societies but will assist their operations. Otherwise, we would have had to set up all these different funds and the costs associated with them for a result which would not assist either the friendly societies or the Government in its monitoring of their progress.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 5 to 14 passed.

Clause 15—'Annual returns.'

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

Page 6, after line 6—Insert:

- (c) by inserting in subsection (1)(e) 'by notice in the *Gazette*' after 'prescribes';
- (d) by inserting after subsection (2) the following subsection:
 (3) A society must, if so required by the Minister by notice in writing, forward to the Minister within specified periods further returns (whether periodic or not) containing the information specified by the Minister.

This is self-explanatory. This mechanism provides that when matters are prescribed they have to be published in the *Gazette*. The formality is laid down in that change. Subparagraph (d) provides:

A society must, if so required by the Minister by notice in writing, forward to the Minister within specified periods further returns (whether periodic or not) containing the information specified by the Minister.

If a requirement is placed on the industry, a notice must be placed in the *Gazette* and the friendly societies must comply, according to this amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 16 to 39 passed.

New clause 40—'Validation of funds of societies.'

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

Page 18, after clause 39—Insert new clause as follows:

40. Funds raised and maintained by a society or branch before the commencement of this Act are to be regarded as having been lawfully raised and maintained if raised and maintained for an object of a kind referred to in section 7 of the Friendly Societies Act 1919 as amended by section 4 of this Act.

This new clause validates the funding at the time that this legislation comes into operation. As members would understand, how accounts are kept, how they will be required to be kept and at what stage those accounts are reconciled has been a matter of some discussion. This merely validates the funds as complying funds at the time that the Act comes into operation.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I wish to spend 10 minutes talking about a program that was to have made a lot of difference in the Elizabeth area in relation to the care of families and young children. The home visiting program was announced with great fanfare by the Minister for Health in the budget this year. I will quote from the Minister's press release and then from a reply he made during the Estimates Committee in relation to this program. The Minister's press release states:

The Government has allocated \$1.2 million over two years to improve the health of families by establishing a world's best practice pilot home visiting health care program for new parents in the Munno Para and Elizabeth areas. If successful the project will be expanded to cover the families of all new babies by the year 2 000.

Following this announcement, we received the benefit of further information about this program from the Health Commission during the Estimates Committee. I will quote some sections of the Minister's reply and also comments made by his officer, Ms Gaston. The Minister, in reply to a question from the member for Reynell in relation to this program, said:

It is an exciting program.

The Minister then asked Ms Gaston to provide details. In part, Ms Gaston said:

We have been looking at a program called family home support, which was piloted in Hawaii. It was an extraordinarily successful program, and to such an extent that it is a permanent program in Hawaii. It has now been introduced in nearly 30 States in the United States. It entails the assignment of a home visitor to a family when they are aware that they are having a new child. There is, therefore, contact with the family prior to birth and during the occasion of delivery and then follow-up in the home. That home visiting can occur for up to 12 months.

Ms Gaston further states:

We have chosen to pilot that program in the northern suburbs because of the particular needs of families there and also because of the existing network of services.

Further, Ms Gaston states:

We have no reason to believe that the pilot will not be successful. However, by evaluating it, we will ensure that, if or when the program is extended across South Australia, it actually meets the needs of families in South Australia.

Ms Gaston concludes:

We all, including the Minister, are looking with interest at the project. We firmly believe that it has the potential to change the face of family health in South Australia.

All this was said in June this year. The program began in Elizabeth. A coordinator and a small staff began work on the project. The Northern Suburbs Home Visiting Program consulted with the community and planned and set in place all necessary requirements to commence the program. I refer to the coordinator's outline of the program model, as follows:

Let me tell you a little about the model. The home visiting program believes that:

- every child is a community asset to be treasured;
- parenting is a mark of status; and
- the work of parenting is a valuable contribution to society.

The goals of the program are to:

- assist parents to encourage the new baby's development;
- help parents enjoy the new baby;
- support parents in having effective interactions with their children; and
- put families in touch with good medical care and other useful services.

The pilot program outlined positive outcomes for children, mothers, parents and families. Those positive outcomes were extensive. The program was underway, even to the extent of advertising, appointing home visitors and establishing an accredited training course for home visitors it would use when the program commenced. A couple of months down the track things started to change. The Minister started to go cold on this program that he had touted as world's best practice and such a great milestone for South Australia. The Minister started to go cold. He started to search for excuses he could use to cut this program.

That must have been quite difficult for the Minister, bearing in mind how successful this program had been elsewhere in the world. These vibes were picked up in the community and Professor Freda Briggs, from the University of South Australia, Magill, wrote to the *Advertiser* expressing her concern about the fact that this program, which is world renowned, was about to be cut. Things drifted and no firm answer was given by the Minister for Health, except that everything had to stop while he considered what he would do about the program. Finally, on 16 October—4½ months on from the great announcement in June—the people of Elizabeth who were involved in this program were informed that the Minister had had a change of heart and that he was cancelling the program in favour of setting up programs in other parts of the metropolitan area.

What a cynical move this has proved to be. The Minister announced the establishment of three programs: one program in the south, which is Commonwealth funded; one program in the west, at a cost of \$500 000, bearing in mind that the cost of the Elizabeth/Munno Para program was \$1.2 million; and one program in Elizabeth (a different program), costing \$60 000 of which \$50 000 had to come from efficiency dividends gained from community health programs in Elizabeth. The fact is that this wonderful, internationally recognised program is now over. This has had a considerable effect in Elizabeth, Munno Para and other areas of the north, which have already suffered from the demise and cancellation of at least five important family programs. I briefly quote from the minutes of a meeting of the Elizabeth council, as follows:

The immediate implication for the Northern Suburbs Home Visiting Program is that the home visiting program will now be replaced with a peer support program for new mothers. . . . Whilst peer support is, in itself, a valuable tool for dealing with some of the issues of new parents, it is a poor relation in terms of the practical support that a home visiting program could have provided. We have also been advised that an articulate program of antenatal and postnatal services will be established in both the central and southern areas of Adelaide. These, presumably, will be funded by the money previously allocated for northern suburbs.

It seems that once again the north has to bear the brunt of being the guinea pig study area so that the rest of Adelaide can benefit. In his letter, the Chief Executive Officer of the Health Commission added the consolation that, 'the process and community development methodology lessons learned in the last six months in the north will be an asset to all of the proposed projects and to the future program planning of the South Australian Health Commission'. It should be suggested that this should be of little comfort to the local community who yet again have been let down by a Government that has failed to come to grips with the grass roots issues of community need in this area.

That is the case not only in Elizabeth but in areas right across our State. For this Government to pass up the opportunity to do something of real long-term benefit for families in this State, to throw it away and save itself \$1.2 million is a disgrace.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Waste management strategies are being developed by the Office of the Environment Protection Authority looking to integrate waste management across the Adelaide metropolitan area. The development of an integrated waste management strategy for metropolitan Adelaide is certainly timely. Indeed, community and Government concerns have been expressed for a considerable time and existing landfills are reaching the end of their life. Current waste practices cannot be classed as state of the art operations. Best practice waste management is imperative. It is also no longer necessary to accept less than best practice. With the introduction of new technologies, current recycling programs and the development of new markets through recycling, South Australia's aim must be to achieve best practice waste management.

The Government's recently released public discussion paper from the Office of the EPA on waste management refers to several internationally agreed principles as espoused in the Rio declaration (agenda 21) and underpins the Government's approach to best practice waste management. These are: waste minimisation, environmentally sound waste reuse and recycling and environmentally sound waste treatment and disposal. It is also accepted that waste management is a shared responsibility, and the community as a whole needs to be aware of our role in waste minimisation, such as reuse, recycling, treatment or disposal.

The community also has a responsibility to speak out against what people believe to be any proposals that do not promote best practice landfills, that do not minimise the impact of waste operations on public and environmental health and safety, that do not ensure the protection of the community from liabilities arising from poor waste management practices and unforeseen events, that do not minimise the contribution of food waste to the solid waste stream and that do not encourage and promote commercial scale composting as a means of reducing waste disposal to landfill.

There are many more 'do not's' that must be taken into consideration before best practice waste management in this State becomes a reality. Over the next 20 years the majority of solid waste landfills now operating will close as they reach their capacity, or because of their inability to comply with appropriate environmental standards or through the expiry of temporal constraints in land use contracts. The focus will then relate to the need to rehabilitate closed sites and to provide alternative disposal options for most of the metropolitan solid waste stream. It is also imperative that planning and development strategies seek to improve the principles of land use factors where residential and industry landowners will be placed in conflict with one another purely arising from planning approvals which have enabled encroachment on previously distinct and separate land use zones to occur.

Therefore, any future strategies for waste management, including development and planning principles, should take into account a greater systematic and coordinated development of extractive and waste disposal industries which should determine to avoid future land use conflict. I place this matter on the record as the people of Highbury now face such a conflict. Extractive industry and proposed landfill are in conflict with families, family lifestyles, family environment and indeed the protection of the environment itself. Past procedures have seen residential development increasing in close proximity to potential landfill sites when quarrying has come to an end. The proposed landfill at Highbury follows those past procedures where residential homes have been allowed through planning approvals to encroach upon extractive industry zones, and a major conflict has now erupted.

An EIS process has been under way for the past 12 months and is now almost completely through the legislative process. It is expected that an answer from the Minister as to whether the proposal for a landfill will be accepted or not should be given by December 1995 or early January 1996. I advise the House again that I am totally in support of the opposition by Highbury residents to the proposed putrescible rubbish dump at Highbury. This is no longer just a question of environmental concerns which in themselves are serious enough but it is a question of families and residential landowners having the right to live freely, cleanly, quietly and without the threat of pestilence, which rubbish dumps bring to an area (and I do not say that lightly). The people of Highbury have had 25 years experience of living closer and closer to a rubbish dump and rightly believe that, when planning approvals were given to build closer and closer to these areas, they would not have to continue to live with the degrading circumstances that debilitate their health, their families and reduce their families' peace of mind.

It is time the dumps were closed; it is time the area was rehabilitated; and it is time that available alternative dumping sites—and there are many throughout the metropolitan area—were used. Certainly, it is time to say 'No' to any more dumps in the now heavily developed residential area of

Highbury. On Sunday 10 December the Highbury community has been invited by me in conjunction with the Highbury Environs Against Refuse Tips' (HEART) hardworking committee spokesman to attend when we call the community together for a 'Rally for the Valley/Family Day', which will celebrate the beautiful local environment that we now have and to publicly affirm our total opposition to any development which does not enhance our local environment and highlight, in particular, our opposition to a putrescible rubbish dump in Halls Road, Highbury.

Members of Parliament are also invited to join us on that day, and any member who wishes to be better informed need only contact me and I shall be happy to oblige with information. A site visit can also be organised through my office should anyone care to inform themselves on this matter. We are holding the rally on 10 December, but right through to January, until an answer is given, any member interested can contact my office and we will be happy to provide them with that important information. I also men-

tioned earlier in my discourse that people in Highbury have had to live next to rubbish dumps for over 25 years. In that instance, I am referring to the dump that is run by East Waste, which is a conglomerate of councils that use the Highbury area to dump their collective rubbish. I would like to put on the record the human face of what happens to people who live next to rubbish dumps. I cite a letter from a constituent who lives approximately on the boundary, within 15 metres, of the dump. It states:

We have lived at the end of Paradise Grove for 17 years and have been very happy for most of that time. But in the last five years, it has been increasingly apparent that our immediate next door neighbour is not just a disused quarry but a very much alive rubbish dump. The quarry edge is 15 metres from our fence.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.46 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 15 November at 2 p.m.