

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 28 November 1995

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

- Gas (Miscellaneous) Amendment,
- Motor Vehicles (Heavy Vehicles Registration Charges) Amendment,
- South Australian Country Arts Trust (Review) Amendment,
- Telecommunications (Interception) (Miscellaneous) Amendment,
- Tobacco Products (Licensing)(Miscellaneous) Amendment.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

A petition signed by 22 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to privatise the management of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was presented by the Hon. M.D. Rann.

Petition received.

WATER, OUTSOURCING

A petition signed by 979 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to maintain control of our water resources was presented by the Hon. M.D. Rann.

Petition received.

SCHOOL SERVICES OFFICERS

A petition signed by 744 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to restore School Services Officers' hours to the level that existed when the Government assumed office was presented by Mr Ashenden.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 17, 22 and 27.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs (Hon. Dean Brown)—

South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission and the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs—Report 1994-95.

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

Regulations under the following Acts—
Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing)—
Environment Protection Forms—Variation.

Liquor Licensing—Dry Areas—Murray Bridge.
Residential Tenancies—Forms.

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Collections for Charitable Purposes Act—Regulations—
Marking of Commercial Recycling Bins.

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

Motor Vehicles Act—Regulations—Registrations Without Fee.

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

Chiropractors Board of South Australia—Report, 1994-95.
Foundation SA Report—Report, 1994-95.

Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science—Report, 1994-95.

Medical Board of South Australia—Report, 1994-95.

Occupational Therapists Registration Board of South Australia—1994-95.

Pharmacy Board of South Australia—Report, 1994-95.

South Australian Health Commission—Report on the Administration of the Radiation Protection and Control Act 1982, 1994-95.

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

Administration of the Development Act, The—Report, 1994-95.

Development Act—Regulations—Infrastructure on Crown Land.

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

Animal and Plant Control (Agricultural Protection and Other Purposes) Act—Regulations—Soil Conservation Boards.

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

Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act—Regulations—
Layer Hen Housing.

WATER, OUTSOURCING

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. DEAN BROWN**: Last week the member for Hart asked me a question about whether the exports to be achieved under United Water, under the contract being negotiated with the South Australian Water Corporation, would have to be sourced outside of Australia in their entirety. My response was based on advice given to a meeting of the Cabinet outsourcing subcommittee on 11 October 1995. That advice was that the exports as defined in the contract would have to accord with the ABS definition. The Deputy Premier, the Minister for Industrial Affairs and the Minister for Infrastructure, who were also members of the Cabinet subcommittee and who were also present, confirmed that the advice—

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

The **Hon. DEAN BROWN**: —given at the meeting was that the \$628 million value of exports under the contract related to exports outside Australia. I have now been advised that the United Water proposal allows for a small component of exports to other parts of Australia. After seeking clarification of this matter from United Water—

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The member for Hart has started off the day very badly.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: After seeking clarification of this matter from United Water I have been advised today that United Water estimates that exports out of Australia will be approximately 91 per cent of the total commitment. Of course, that makes no difference to the net benefit to South Australia. That benefit to South Australia, in dollar terms, remains at \$628 million. Nor does it make any difference in the key objective of the Government to use this contract to create a new water industry for South Australia through access to Asia. Whether a Holden or a Mitsubishi vehicle manufactured in South Australia is sold in Sydney or Singapore makes no difference to the benefits in terms of jobs and income to our State economy, and the same applies in this case.

INDUSTRY, MANUFACTURING AND EXPORTS

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: As Deputy Premier, I would ask that questions to the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development and the Minister for Infrastructure (Hon. John Olsen) be directed to me in his absence. The Minister is absent today on a number of important matters affecting the State. First, the Minister attended a meeting yesterday in Brisbane—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Just listen!

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want any further disruptions from the Deputy Leader.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: There is a message here for Opposition members, and I hope they listen. First, the Minister attended a meeting yesterday in Brisbane of electricity Ministers, including Federal Energy Minister (Senator Bob Collins) dealing with the national electricity market. This is a complex area, and one which will have a considerable impact on the structure of the ETSA Corporation. For some time the Government has been exploring a structure for the ETSA Corporation which will achieve the objectives of ensuring that South Australia can compete in a national electricity market and at the same time preserve the interests of the Government in a valuable asset.

Minister Olsen has advised that New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland have indicated that South Australia would be locked out of the national market unless the structure of its electricity industry conformed to that of other States. It has become clear from this meeting of Ministers that South Australia could be isolated from the national electricity market unless the State Opposition supports legislation to separate ETSA's generation arm from the electricity distribution business.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: If the Leader of the Opposition has spoken with his colleagues, I hope we will actually get some support.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Today, the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development is holding talks in Sydney with Pay TV company Foxtel, and tonight he will represent the Premier at the annual export awards dinner, where South Australian companies are expected to be honoured for their export efforts. A number

of local businesses are vying for the 1995 Australian Export Awards, including the Ashford Community Hospital, in the New Export Award category; Radio Frequency Systems Pty Ltd, in the Small to Medium Manufacturers Award category; Codan Pty Ltd, in the Large Manufacturers Award category, and Jumbana Pty Ltd, (Balarinji Design) in the Services Award Category, and we wish them all the very best.

QUESTION TIME

WATER, OUTSOURCING

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Given United Water's announcement today that it is ready to appear before the Upper House select committee on the water contract at any time, will the Premier give an undertaking that the Government will not sign the contract with United Water until both United Water executives and the Minister for Infrastructure have completed giving evidence to that committee?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: How can I possibly give such an undertaking when a select committee of another House could go on for year after year and South Australia would miss out on the very important benefits that this contract will bring to this State? What the Leader of the Opposition seems to fail to comprehend is that we will save about 20 per cent of our operating and maintenance costs for the Water Corporation in South Australia and that we are building a totally new water industry in South Australia to create over a thousand jobs. They are huge benefits to South Australia and we do not want to delay it, even though the Labor Party in the other place might want to do so.

RACIAL VILIFICATION

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Will the Premier, as Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs, advise the House what action the Government intends to take to outlaw racial vilification in South Australia?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I indicate to the House that the Government intends to introduce racial vilification legislation. It will be a specialised piece of legislation and it will deal with two specific areas: criminal sanctions and civil redress. In many ways it will be landmark legislation because it will be the first legislation in Australia that deals with civil redress where vilification on racial grounds has been carried out. I will introduce the legislation tomorrow. South Australia has a truly multicultural community, and it is very important that we protect that community from racial vilification.

I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition will be interested in this legislation when it comes into Parliament tomorrow because it goes significantly further than his legislation does in that it gives civil redress for the first time here in South Australia. That is very important, and it certainly has the wholehearted support of the Liberal Party in this State. The criminal sanctions clearly make it a criminal offence for anyone to threaten an individual or to threaten damage to property based on racial hatred or vilification. Therefore, I look forward to the support of all members of the House for this landmark legislation for South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I think that the commentary of the member for Giles has gone far enough. The member for Hart.

WATER, OUTSOURCING

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Given the Premier's statement that Cabinet was not informed of United Water's two company structure, has the Minister for Infrastructure misinformed the Premier and the public on when he became aware of the two company structure? On Friday 24 November the Minister said that he had only just become aware of the two company proposal. However, on 22 November the Minister explained to the House the two company structure that was part of the bid lodged on 7 August by United Water. The Minister said that United Water Services was the operating company of the consortium that lodged the bid and that United Water International was the company to be formed when the contract was signed to establish 60 per cent Australian equity. This was the two company structure.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I would suggest that the member for Hart simply go back and listen to what the Minister for Infrastructure said last Friday on this issue. The other point that is highly relevant here is that, as the Minister and I both said to the House last week, the final details of the structure are still being negotiated under the contract.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to members that when they ask a question they should allow the person the opportunity to answer it. The member for Elder.

INTELLECTUAL DISABILITY

Mr WADE (Elder): Can the Minister for Health report on actions taken and progress towards meeting the significant need amongst those in the community with an intellectual disability and their carers? Today there was a rally on the steps of Parliament House convened by Project 141, a national campaign to highlight the needs of, and lobby for further funding for, people with an intellectual disability.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Elder very much for his question and acknowledge his interest in this area. As the House would know only too well, when the Government came to power we were confronted with a large debt, left by a previous Government which had been bereft of ideas and with ways of dealing with what were major problems. In 1988, approximately 10 to 15 people with an intellectual disability were identified as being in crisis. The previous Government's commitment to managing the problems of those people can be seen in a major IDSC report which I initiated as part of the Liberal Party policy for the election. It found that, whereas 10 to 15 people had been in crisis in 1988, by 1994, 141 people with an intellectual disability were being labelled as being in crisis, and hence the name 'Project 141'. So, in the last seven years of Labor rule, the number of people in crisis rose tenfold. Recognising the rally outside, I was going to speak with those people in my office, but they chose not to do that.

As of today, after two years of Liberal Government, the number has fallen from 141 to 111, so that is a fall of 30 people. I remind the House that in the previous seven years the number had increased tenfold. The main factors in the decrease have been quarantining the budget for disability services, the redeployment of funds from administrative and infrastructure efficiencies into services, good case management by IDSC and very effective utilisation of the money under the Commonwealth State Disability Agreement. Later this week I will be announcing another round of Commonwealth State Disability Agreement funding, which will

involve \$1.6 million in additional recurrent funds. On advice from the Disability Advisory Council, the top priorities for expenditure of that money will be accommodation, day activities and in-home support. I repeat: we have quarantined the disability budget over the past two years. Of course, addressing the unmet need is not just a matter of pouring in money: it is a matter of making sure that the money that is used is utilised efficiently and allocated effectively.

In terms of using the resources effectively, we have embarked upon a program of disability reform, about which I have informed the House previously and which involves benchmarking so that we can be absolutely sure that we are buying the most appropriate service. In terms of efficiency, we have insisted on the disability sector providing a 3.8 per cent efficiency dividend, which is equal to more than \$5 million, all of which will be quarantined specifically for services. The sorts of reforms that are then able to be achieved with those moneys that are put back into services are those which I informed the House about last week, such as the introduction of a single statewide equipment arrangement, which will allow another 130 to 150 disabled people each year to receive appropriate equipment.

In relation to the efficiency dividend program, the Intellectually Disabilities Services Council (IDSC) already under this process has freed up \$916 000 which will be available this financial year to fund new services. That is a great plus. Through those initiatives, and recognising that the numbers under the previous Administration increased tenfold in seven years and that they have come down from 141 to 111 as of today, we believe that by the end of this financial year we will have met the needs of another 40 to 50 of these clients. We inherited a list of 141, it is now down to 111, and we will further reduce it by 40 or 50 clients this year. So, the fact that the organisers of the Project 141 rally were unwilling to meet me in my office was disappointing, but I assure them and everyone involved in this crisis, which is a direct result of the previous Administration's not taking some difficult decisions, that the Government is doing and will continue to do what it can to address what is clearly an area of great emotion and great need. The figures indicate that what we are doing is successful and we shall continue to push those goals so that more of these people can be accommodated.

WATER, OUTSOURCING

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Premier now seek the immediate dismissal of the Government's high-powered water contract negotiating team, including Washington based law firm Shaw Pittman, and reprimand senior SA Water executives over their failure to advise the Premier and the Cabinet subcommittee of at least two known critical issues of United Water's bid? On Friday the Premier said, when referring to a lack of advice on the two company structure, '[That] is a very significant and material issue that should have been revealed to Ministers.' The Premier has again revealed today that the same team failed to reveal the true nature of the exports in United Water's bid.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, on the point of the exports, as I said to the House earlier this afternoon, in fact there will be exports out of South Australia of \$628 million. In fact, 91 per cent of those will be overseas and 9 per cent apparently will be within Australia, but all that benefit will come back to South Australia. On the other matter, I think the first thing the honourable member and the House need to appreciate is that the Government has not yet accepted any

structure for the carrying out of this contract. That is still subject to negotiation. The way the member for Hart has posed this question, one would assume that in fact the Government has signed and sealed off on some particular structure. That is not the case at all. Those issues in terms of the structure are still being negotiated and, when they are finalised, they will come to Cabinet in full detail. But no structure has yet been accepted or put to Cabinet for acceptance.

UNION CAMPAIGN

Mr BASS (Floreys): Is the Minister for Industrial Affairs aware of the document prepared by the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia entitled 'Strategic Planning for the Federal Election' which discloses union plans for a fear and loathing campaign, and can he say whether this document—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have to rule the question out of order, because the Minister is not responsible for the actions of either the South Australian Trades and Labor Council or the Federal Government. I would suggest to the member for Florey that he needs to have the question redrafted in an acceptable form.

WATER, OUTSOURCING

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Did the Government commission market research on community attitudes to the outsourcing of Adelaide's water system, and what did that polling reveal?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: As I understand it, the Government did not commission any market research on the water contract. I understand that the company that undertook some of the promotional work did so of its own volition but not at the instigation of the Government. That company provided some information, which was tabled before the Cabinet outsourcing subcommittee. I indicate to the House that the Government did not commission that work: it was apparently undertaken, of its own volition, by the promotional publicity company that worked closely with SA Water.

ENFIELD AND PORT ADELAIDE COUNCILS

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Will the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations provide further information on the amalgamation of the Port Adelaide and Enfield councils? It has been reported this morning that the two councils have agreed unanimously to merge next March with significant rate savings.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: At 12.30 this afternoon I received the documentation from the Mayors and Chief Executive Officers of both the Enfield and Port Adelaide councils. That documentation will be held—and a considerable amount of documentation is involved—and passed onto the Local Government Board when it is established after legislation is passed in another place.

Some significant information was passed onto me this morning, which I know will be of interest to the House. The proposal will bring about a rate saving in the first year to the residents of the new city of some \$2.3 million. In percentage terms, if that saving is broken down, in the first year (1996-97) the residents of Port Adelaide will have a rate reduction of some 10 per cent, and in the second year another rate

reduction of some 8 per cent. This means that, over a two year period, residents living in the Port Adelaide area will enjoy a rate reduction of some 18 per cent. In the first year (1996-97), residents living in the Enfield area will experience a rate reduction of 4 per cent. Over a period of five to seven years there will be a rate reduction on commercial properties—largely in Port Adelaide because of the emphasis on commercial properties in that area—of between 30 and 40 per cent.

This is a very significant figure because one can relate the percentage figure to commercial properties elsewhere around metropolitan Adelaide. When that sort of figure is passed onto other commercial properties, one can see the significant savings to be made by business. The submission took some six months to put together. I was very pleased to receive it because it vindicates the stance of the Government on this issue over this past year. It also impresses upon the local government community that significant savings are to be made. Reform is urgent. As a result of a purely voluntary amalgamation proposal, these councils have demonstrated that, by sitting down with their consultants and working through the issues, savings are to be made.

There was speculation in the media over the weekend that another voluntary amalgamation would bring about an increase of 10.4 per cent in rates for residents living in the City of Hindmarsh and Woodville. I have received a communication from the Director of Corporate Services, which has been confirmed by the City Manager of the City of Hindmarsh and Woodville. I will put that communication on the public record for the sake of debate because, over this next week, claims and counterclaims will be made about possible savings and others will say that savings cannot be achieved. In the 1994-95 budget of the City of Hindmarsh and Woodville the average rate decreased by .84 per cent in real terms, and in the following year (1995-96) the budget decreased by .67 per cent, with a cumulative reduction over the two years of 1.51 per cent.

During this time, the numbers and levels of services have been either maintained or increased, and I quote as an example the introduction of a comprehensive kerbside collection for recyclables. Hindmarsh and Woodville councils have amalgamated and achieved rate reductions, as have Port Adelaide and Enfield councils also. I commend those figures to the Parliament, and I am sure members will keep them in mind when we debate the Local Government (Boundary Reform) Amendment Bill this evening.

WATER, OUTSOURCING

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. What did the polling on South Australian community attitudes to the water outsourcing contract reveal, and why has the Premier told the House that the Government did not commission market research on the water deal when a letter from the Chief Executive Officer of the Minister for Infrastructure's own department reveals otherwise?

On 11 October, the Opposition lodged a freedom of information request for all documentation relating to market research conducted by and for the Government on the water outsourcing proposal. This followed an absolute denial in October by the Minister for Infrastructure that any polling had been undertaken whatsoever. The Chief Executive of SA Water, Mr Ted Phipps, has now advised the Opposition:

I refer to your request of 12 October last for documentation relating to market research conducted by, or arranged by, the Government or other agencies in respect of the proposal to outsource water resource and sewerage management in South Australia. I am unable to satisfy your request on the basis that the documents are 'exempt documents'—

they obviously exist—

As Chief Executive, I have determined the documents to be exempt for the reason that they were submitted to Cabinet for the purposes of its deliberations on the proposed outsourcing contract.

Freedom of information requests relate only to Government polling. Have we been misled by your Minister again?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Leader of the Opposition has asked the question, 'What did the polling show?': he has been a Minister and has sworn the same oath that I have sworn, and he knows that I am prohibited from revealing the information in any document laid before Cabinet. That is a fundamental principle of Government and, as a Minister who has taken an oath, I will not breach that undertaking.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has had a fair go.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Minister has indicated to this House that no polling was commissioned by the Water Corporation, and I have repeated that today based on the information the Minister has given.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I understand that the research was commissioned by the publicity company of their own volition without a specific request from the Water Corporation.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Clarke: You expect us to believe that?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair expects the Deputy Leader to conform to Standing Orders.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes; I understand that is exactly the basis on which the research became available, and that is what I and the Minister have been told.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Ted Phipps is saying the opposite.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader will not indicate to the gallery or anyone else by pointing.

Mr Clarke: It was to the member for Colton.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Premier to order. The honourable member for Ridley.

CANE TOADS

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): Can the Minister for Primary Industries provide any further information to the House about the threatened release of Queensland cane toads in parts of my electorate by that foolish, paranoid, anonymous telephone caller to the Department for Primary Industries, to the Australian Conservation Foundation's Adelaide office and to me last week which prompted my question to him then?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I thank the honourable member for his question and interest in this matter. First, I congratulate the people in the Department of Primary Industries on the way they have handled this issue.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: They are still trying. I thank the Animal and Plant Control Commission staff who have acted vigilantly and professionally in this matter. I also thank the

Emergency Services Minister for his quick reaction to the whole matter. The police have advised us to treat the matter seriously and not at this stage declare it a hoax call. There has been surveillance up and down the designated area, but it may be that a lesser number than the 627 suggested by the caller were released. All surveillance is still in place and will stay in place for a while yet, the period to be determined on information from the police back through the police Minister to me.

The CIB has been following up several leads as to time, place and the caller, but it cannot elaborate any more at this stage. It also states that a number of weekend reports of cane toads have so far all been negative, but it urges the public to remain vigilant. That does not mean, whatever happens out of this issue, that it has not been a good exercise because, as I stated to the House the other day, the cane toads from Queensland are spreading south and north and, as one expert stated in the *Advertiser*, it is expected that within the next 10 to 12 years they will get to the South Australian border if proper surveillance and patrol measures are not in place. The Animal and Plant Control Commission has a detailed course of action set in place if there is, at some stage in future, an infiltration into South Australia. I will keep the House informed this week as to where the matter is, but I am advised by the police to continue to treat the matter seriously.

WATER, OUTSOURCING

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Why did the Premier fail to correct his misleading statement to the House last Wednesday concerning exports under the United Water bid before today's statement? Last Wednesday the Premier advised the House that all exports under this proposal were out of Australia. However, the Minister for Infrastructure and senior SA Water executives were aware that this was not the case. The Opposition has obtained a copy of the request for proposals document, which states quite clearly that exports can be interstate as well as overseas.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I became aware of it last night when we had a Cabinet subcommittee meeting with the people from the Water Corporation and I asked a series of questions on this matter. As a result of that we asked for the specific percentages; that is, when United Water came back and said that 91 per cent of the exports were going overseas, and the SA Water people wanted to clarify that point.

Mr Foley: They already knew.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! One question at a time.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: They had indicated to the Cabinet subcommittee that all the exports were going overseas; in fact, 91 per cent were going overseas and the other 9 per cent going interstate. I was informed of that last night and I made the ministerial statement to the House today.

UNION CAMPAIGN

Mr BASS (Florey): Is the Minister for Industrial Affairs concerned about the role of unions in South Australia and the implication of the political axle in the industrial arena of South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: That is a very penetrating question.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Deputy Leader should laugh: he happens to be on the executive and he is right in the middle of writing the document that happened to be leaked last week.

Mr Clarke: I didn't write it.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I know you did not write it, but you agreed with it and probably helped put the whole thing together. It concerns me—and it should concern the South Australian public—that the unions are collecting money from their membership and then spending \$60 000 on an election campaign geared up purely and simply to get stuck into the Federal Liberal industrial relations policy.

The shame of the whole thing is that only last week the UTLC came to me and said that it wanted a \$70 000 grant to keep open the Migrant Workers Centre. Last week it came to me and said that it wanted \$70 000, yet within two days of that this document was leaked to the media stating that it would spend \$60 000 on campaigning against the Federal Liberal Party's industrial relations policy. Guess who was on the executive! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was standing out there saying that \$60 000 should be spent on campaigning against the Liberal Party, yet it wants \$70 000 for the Migrant Workers Centre. That is absolute hypocrisy.

We can go one step further. In the last Federal and State elections at least \$100 000 was spent by SAIT on trying again to discredit the industrial relations system. The tragedy of all of this is that, with dwindling membership in the union movement, the unions are not, in essence, spending the money to try to improve industrial relations issues for their employees. That is what they all ought to be about instead of getting together and putting out this document.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: It is a disgrace, and there is a good reason—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition will come to order.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:—why we should seriously be considering putting into legislation the provision for individuals to decide where their money goes when donations are made to political Parties. There is a good reason why this document shows clearly that the unions do not care at all about their membership.

Last week in the Federal industrial relations area we had the example of Bob and Blanche making a revisit. We had a perfect example of the individual not being at all concerned about the union movement or the ALP, where they went out and deliberately promoted the collective bargaining argument. Here we have the same argument, with the unions collecting everybody's money and putting it in an area where it is to their advantage but of no advantage to the individual, who has no choice whatsoever.

With 300 000 people obviously voting for the Liberal Party at the last election, at least half of the union movement—30 000 people—must have voted Liberal. All their money was to be thrown into a Labor campaign. It is a disgrace. It is a bigger disgrace that the Deputy Leader should be sitting on that executive campaign and allowing this nonsense to occur.

WATER, OUTSOURCING

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Premier say whether the Government's request for tender proposal documents required companies bidding for the water outsourcing contract to be 60 per cent Australian owned within 12 months of winning the contract?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I think that the answer to that is 'No'. A more general provision asked them to maximise the Australian content and stated that the level of Australian content would be taken into consideration. It was not a specific requirement that there be 60 per cent Australian equity and, as the honourable member knows, as I understand from public statements that have been made from these companies (because the specific response of the companies did not go to the Cabinet subcommittee, as I explained to the House last week), clearly one company was going for 51 per cent Australian equity and United Water, through its international company, was going for 60 per cent Australian equity. So it did vary, but there was a requirement that, in general terms, they had to achieve Australian equity as high as possible and that that would be taken into consideration when assessing the bids.

RABBITS

Mr KERIN (Frome): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources say what steps have been taken by State Environment Ministers to minimise environmental damage potentially caused by the rabbit calicivirus? Some groups have claimed that populations of native flora and fauna are at risk because of a drop in rabbit numbers, but I understand that action is already being taken on a nationally coordinated basis to deal with the potential for environmental damage.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I thank the member for Frome for his important question. Can I say, at the outset—and I am sure that all members of the House would realise this—that rabbits are one of Australia's biggest environmental vandals, causing something like \$1 billion damage nationwide each year. The controlling of rabbits has been something of a nightmare for Ministers around the country, taking significant resources and, of course, we realise the devastation that they cause in our parks and our pastoral areas, and certainly Environment Ministers around Australia welcome the decline of the rabbit population.

At a meeting of Environment Ministers in Perth last Friday, we formally recognised this fact and welcomed the enormous benefits that could flow to the Australian environment from RCV. In some areas of the Flinders Ranges National Park in this State, where up to 95 per cent of the rabbit population has been wiped out, vegetation is already showing signs of recovery, and there is hope that the country in this area will return to the way it should be. I am pleased to say that South Australia will play a pivotal role in Australia's environmental response to RCV. A task force set up by Environment Ministers and to be chaired by a representative from South Australia will target issues and coordinate a national management approach. The task force will build on work already undertaken in South Australia to monitor any environmental impact. It will also develop baiting, shooting and pest management programs to protect vulnerable species from foxes and feral cats as a result of the diminishing rabbit population. The effect on vegetation is also being monitored.

I am also very pleased that all the States have adopted a united approach to the issue by being prepared to put the environment before parochial State attitudes in sharing expertise, technology and information, and ensuring that there is no unnecessary duplication in efforts and expense in dealing with the issue. I only wish the same could be said for the Federal Government. In fact, while all State Environment Ministers were thrashing out this issue, the Federal Minister, once again, could not be seen—the second Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council meeting that the Federal Minister has missed in the same number of years. It is a disgrace that the Federal Government, and this Federal Minister in particular, is treating with contempt the national opportunity to meet at this council with other Environment Ministers. However, I am pleased that all the States have taken this action, and I am particularly pleased that South Australia is in the forefront with the action that it is taking.

WATER, OUTSOURCING

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Given the Premier's answer to my previous question, will the Premier say how the Government will now legally force United Water to be 60 per cent Australian owned, and will the State be exposed to legal compensation to United Water if the Government continues with its non-negotiable position on Australian ownership?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The member for Hart obviously fails to understand the basis on which contract negotiations are proceeding. He is suggesting that the RFP is the contract. That is not the case at all. They respond to an RFP, and the honourable member needs to appreciate that United Water put in a proposal to establish United Water International, which would have 60 per cent Australian equity. That is dealt with as part of the negotiations. I suggest that the honourable member sit back and wait until the negotiations are finished, because it could well be that a very satisfactory outcome is reached, whereby there is significant involvement by an Australian company in the operation and maintenance of our sewerage and water in South Australia.

CONSUMER PRICE INDEX

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): Will the Treasurer provide details of how South Australia compares with other capital cities in respect of the cost of selected consumer items? I understand that the Australian Bureau of Statistics surveys the price of items on a typical household list in each capital city on a regular basis.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: It confirms the news that most people suspected: South Australia's food prices are the cheapest in Australia overall. The basket of goods used by the ABS contains 54 general shopping items, and we were the cheapest of all the capital cities on 17 of the items. It is cheaper to buy a leg of lamb, a loaf of bread, flour, laundry detergent, baked beans, tomato sauce, chocolate, soap, baby food, peas, rice, margarine, pink salmon, tea, sugar, pet food and corned beef in Adelaide than it is in the other capital cities. The two items where we are a bit more expensive are tomatoes and chuck steak.

If you look at the total assessment of the weighted food basket—the number of shopping items, including clothing—you see that Adelaide is the cheapest, with the average total cost of the weighted food basket being \$42.50. There is a 6.7 per cent difference in respect of Sydney, for example, which

came in at \$45.35. At least in the food area and a number of other areas—including housing—South Australia is cheaper. In fact, Adelaide is a better place to live because it does offer advantages, and I am sure that that will be a major element in the attraction of new business to this State.

WATER, OUTSOURCING

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Why is the 60 per cent Australian ownership now non-negotiable, given that it was not a specific condition of the request for proposal documents originally released by the Government?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: As the Minister indicated to the House last week, the Government perceives this as an important issue now that the company has made a commitment—and that is the case through United Water—and, quite rightly, the Government wants to put that in the contract. The honourable member needs to appreciate that the RFPs put out general conditions; the companies then respond with specific conditions; and then you pick up those specific conditions and negotiate them into the contract. That is what the whole process is about.

The Hon. D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, it is a very interesting point. Is the honourable member now complaining about the fact that the State Government has asked for 60 per cent Australian equity, and asked for that to be a condition of the contract? I would have thought it was a pretty good provision, and that we should make sure that it is in the contract. In fact, that is exactly what the Government is now doing—making sure that it is in the contract.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education highlight how the South Australian private sector is taking up the challenge of providing valuable and rewarding jobs for our young South Australians?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I am pleased to advise the House that Adelaide Bank today announced that it will be taking on 200 young South Australians into its organisation as part of its commitment to young South Australians, as part of a total employment package of 400 over the next four years. The bank is to be commended for its initiative, and not only is it taking on young people but it has also indicated that it wants to work closely with firms that seek to expand in South Australia and create more employment. It will be particularly targeting companies who wish to create more job opportunities, and I commend it for that. The bank, in its own statement, has issued a challenge to other private employers to take on young South Australians, and I hope that other employers will do exactly that.

The future for our young people in South Australia is very bright and, as I have indicated on previous occasions, there are plenty of job opportunities, particularly for young people who have the skills. The announcement today by the Adelaide Bank is a vote of confidence in South Australia, and all South Australians should get behind this State, particularly the private sector, and create job opportunities for our young people as we advance this State even further.

WATER, OUTSOURCING

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Premier. What legal advice has the Government received over its exposure to legal action by the unsuccessful tenderers for the water outsourcing contract, given that they were not advised that their bids required 60 per cent Australian ownership?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will have to look at what legal information is available because it is unusual for us to reveal to the House the contents of any legal advice given. That is one reason why, under freedom of information, legal advice is specifically excluded, because the Government wants to protect its own position. I will be in touch with the Government's legal advisers, particularly the Crown Solicitor, to see whether we can give at least a general answer to the honourable member.

ST BARBARA'S DAY

Mrs HALL (Coles): Will the Minister for Mines and Energy advise the House what arrangements are being made for the mining and resource processing industry to celebrate St Barbara's Day in Adelaide on Friday? As the patron saint of mining, St Barbara is obviously an important lady for this State and its economy, and I therefore ask the Minister for details of this important celebration.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I thank the honourable member for her question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: The honourable member said that we are celebrating St Barbara's Day on Friday, and I advise the House that St Barbara is the patron saint of miners and those who work with explosives. You could quite easily call it Opposition Day, because members opposite are about to blow up. These are the people—including the Leader of the Opposition—who said Marcus Clark, who cost this State \$3 billion, was a good guy. He was the one—

Mr CLARKE: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I appreciate your ruling, Sir, with respect to the latitude of Ministers' answers, but—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections. The Chair has no hope of hearing the honourable member.

Mr CLARKE: My point of order is that the Minister's answer in some way usually has to have some connection with the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is correct. The Minister should not divert from the question and, therefore, I ask him to confine his remarks to the general area of the question.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: Mr Speaker, I was talking about explosives. Not only that but then this Leader of the Opposition—the same Leader of the Opposition—lost the Grand Prix, so this is what we have had to put up with. Now—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If members want Question Time to continue, I suggest to them—

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

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

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart has been spoken to firmly.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is warned for the second time. I suggest to the Minister that he look at his Standing Orders, where he will see the general guidance for answering questions. The Chair is particularly interested in the answer because it is not familiar with the topic, so I ask the Minister to complete his answer or leave will be withdrawn.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, and I thank you for your help in this matter. St Barbara's Day is all about this Government doing good things for South Australia, such as trying to get 60 per cent of our water contract South Australian owned. We are trying to help South Australians. On St Barbara's Day, 1 000 people will be present—it would be 1 011 if all Opposition members turned up. This day is for the mining industry of South Australia to show the people of South Australia what a good job it is doing for South Australians. The Premier will be there, and Sir Arvi Parbo will give the opening address. There will be various awards during the day that recognise the contribution that the mining industry makes to South Australia through not only mining but the environment. Once again, this Government is getting behind the mining industry—

Mr Foley: Going all the way!

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I will have to read the yellow stickers to see whether or not that is so. We are right behind St Barbara's Day. The Premier is attending, and Sir Arvi Parbo will be there. It is the biggest day in mining in this State, and I urge all South Australians to turn up and make it.

WATER, OUTSOURCING

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Was the Premier made aware of any other issues concerning United Water's bid following the Cabinet subcommittee meeting last night that revealed further information concerning the bid that he was unaware of and, if so, will the Premier please reveal that to the House?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Cabinet subcommittee last night sat down with the negotiating team from SA Water. We went through the structure as the negotiations are proceeding. That is to the benefit of South Australia because we want to make sure that out of this we get a corporate structure in the final contract that is the best possible deal for South Australia.

Mr Foley: Why didn't you do that five months ago?

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I advise the member for Hart that at that stage we were not negotiating this part of the contract. What I indicated was that, when the contract was announced, as the Minister clearly indicated, they put out the broad parameters. The Government is now going through the detail of that and negotiating the corporate structure that will apply. As I said to the House earlier this afternoon, the indications are that it will be a very good corporate structure for South Australia. So I ask the honourable member to wait and be patient until the contract is finalised, and then we will reveal the exact, final corporate structure that will apply and the benefit of that to South Australia.

FARM DEBT MEDIATOR

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Primary Industries please tell the House how the decision by a national bank to appoint a debt mediator for farm debt will impact on South Australian farmers?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I thank the honourable member for her question and interest in this matter. Members may know, and I reported it to the House earlier this year, that the New South Wales Government introduced a debt mediation scheme as part of its farm policy when it took office earlier this year. The Act compels financiers to speak to farmers before they commence action in relation to debt management and farm sales. It has recently been announced that that experience has been quite beneficial in New South Wales, and in South Australia we are prepared to look at what benefit that can be to this State.

Members will note that one of the major banks has announced a debt mediation service as part of its service to clients. That may help other banks realise that these services are required by people, and this Government would much sooner do it by education, not legislation. However, we will look at what has happened in New South Wales and we will urge all people to look closely at their financial arrangements with their banks because, in this State, as all members know, farmers have the ability to refinance their farm debts without paying stamp duty. Now that one bank has provided this service, that allows farmers to look at the deal they are getting from their own bank and, if they do not think they are getting a good deal, they can negotiate a better deal and transfer their debt without paying stamp duty. I urge all farmers to look at that. I congratulate the bank that has introduced a mediator and I urge other banks to have a close look at the service that is being provided to consumers in South Australia.

WORKCOVER

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Industrial Affairs now rule out any increase in payments by WorkCover to its private claims managers for managing its claims portfolio beyond the formula which was detailed to the Economic and Finance Committee of the Parliament on Friday 24 November? The Opposition has been informed that the private claims management agencies are preparing a claim for an increase in payments to be made to them for managing WorkCover's claims management portfolio in excess of that originally agreed to. The Opposition understands that the increases sought will make the cost of claims management more expensive to employers than if the claims management had remained with WorkCover.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I thank the Deputy Leader for his very interesting question: I understand that it has only recently been discussed by the board and, as the Deputy Leader would know if he had read the Act, no member of the board is entitled or expected to leak any information. So, it is a very interesting question. I am very happy to give the answer, but I think the Deputy Leader had better be very careful about making any comment about this outside this House. The situation is that the WorkCover board made two decisions in relation to payments to private sector agents. The first was that a base sum would be paid to all agents, and that sum was discussed with the Economic and Finance Committee last Wednesday week, which hearing I attended with Mr Lew Owens. The base position is the cost reflected by WorkCover in putting out those claims over the previous

year, and that is the base amount that would be paid for any of the claims.

The second part of the payment to any of the claims agents is based on performance. As the Deputy Leader would know, Mr Owens made an explanation to the Economic and Finance Committee—of which, I point out, he is not a member. I might also point out that that committee has not reported to this Parliament and that, whilst it was a public hearing, no members of the public were there, so I can only suspect that it must have come from one of the members of that committee. I will go on and explain further—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: This is the sort of nonsense that the Deputy Leader always goes on with. If he will just be patient, I will explain the final part to him.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the Deputy Leader that he is on a very short straw.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: If he is able to get the transcript from that committee—which I again point out has not reported to this House—he will clearly understand from that transcript that a bonus is paid to any of the agents who improve the return to work situation, the management of claims and generally the whole way these claims are managed by a recognised formula. That formula—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Just be patient. I know it is \$2 million; if you are patient, I will tell you. The reality is that the second part of the payment is performance driven. The WorkCover board has said that it is prepared to pay an extra \$2 million into a pool from which all the agents will be able to draw out money. What the Deputy Leader has not said, however, is that the WorkCover board has calculated that within three years all the outsourcing costs will be recouped because of better management by the private sector.

As the Deputy Leader would know, given that it will be at least three years before we can measure that—the contract with the agents is for at least three years—his question is absolutely irrelevant until we get to that time. As for the issue of whether more money will be paid, the Deputy Leader would know (and I will explain the Act to him again) that the Government and the Minister have no influence whatsoever on the direction that the board might take. I would suggest that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: —if the Deputy Leader wants to know any further information he ought to write formally to the Chairman of the board and ask him that question himself.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! And I am asking the Deputy Leader—

Mr Lewis: Shut up!

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Ridley regarding his comments. The member for Newland.

ADOPTION

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister for Family and Community Services provide information on the level of consultation associated with the review of the South Australian Adoption Act? Many members might have had representations over issues relating to adoption, and I seek

information on whether further community input to the review recommendations is being encouraged.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I thank the member for Newland for her question and for the strong interest that she continues to have in areas relating to family and community services. The honourable member and the House will recall that in March last year I appointed a review committee to look at the Adoption Act, which I think was last amended back in 1988, so it is very much in need of review. The review committee circulated an issues paper in May last year and more than 800 copies were distributed. Public consultation was then undertaken and people were given the opportunity to write to or appear before that review committee. The consultations were conducted in both city and country areas to ensure that all people had an opportunity to express their views in what is a very sensitive area. The adoption review report was released in September for further public comment and a deadline of 30 November was set. However—

The SPEAKER: Order! When the member for Giles and the Minister finish their conversation, the Minister who is on his feet will continue to answer the question.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I was saying, a deadline of 30 November was set to ensure that adequate consultation was undertaken. I have decided to extend the deadline to 31 December this year. Additionally, the review report has been sent to groups with an interest in adoption and to all members of Parliament.

The Government supports in principle the broad recommendations set out in the report. Adoption has affected the lives of many South Australians and their families. In fact, about 27 000 people have been adopted in this State since legislation was first introduced in this area. The House might also be interested to know that about 200 people and interest groups made submissions to the review, and it appears that the majority of people in the community are sufficiently satisfied with the current arrangements that they did not comment as part of the review. Because of the interest in this subject, it has been necessary to extend the period to provide an even greater opportunity for people to have their say in what is a very important area.

WOMEN'S INFORMATION SERVICE

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I lay on the table the ministerial statement by the Hon. Diana Laidlaw on Women's Information Services Towards 2000.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Today we finally found out that this—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: They want to shout—

The SPEAKER: Order! There will be no shouting.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I would much prefer them to keep ringing me at home. Let me tell members one thing: it was not the member for Coles. I know that she was involved in the plots of last Wednesday night; I know that she put the

member for Hartley up to asking a dorothy dixer of the Premier so that he could give the Minister for Infrastructure a spray to his colleagues which set off a series of events, including a series of meetings in different rooms, and including—

Mr SCALZI: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition is reflecting on me.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the honourable member that—

Mr SCALZI: I ask him to withdraw the comment.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are two things. If the honourable member believes that the comments are unparliamentary, he can ask to have them withdrawn, if he tells the Chair what they are. If the honourable member believes that other comments reflect on him, he has an opportunity to make a personal explanation.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I understand that the member for Hartley was saying the Leader of the Opposition had reflected on him.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask all members to conduct themselves in a rational manner. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, Sir. This always happens when they are nervous, when they are jumpy, when there has been a fight.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Let us look at this Government. It was wrong about the two company structure. The Premier was wrong about it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Norwood and the member for Mawson.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —and the Minister for Infrastructure also was wrong about the two company structure. They were wrong about subcontracting it to Australian water services. They were wrong about French and British 100 per cent ownership. They were wrong about Australian equity. They were wrong about exports—that was revealed today. They were wrong about the polling. They were wrong on the jobs figures. This is a Government that chooses to announce first—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —and negotiate later, which puts it into an incredibly bad negotiating position—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —in terms of the water contract—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —and in terms of the EDS deal.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We have a Premier who is so in love with his own name and the sound of his own voice that he prefers to make the announcements now, do the negotiations—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —and the details later. On all the key factors, the Premier has got it wrong. When he saw that

he got it wrong, he tried to blame the Minister for Infrastructure. The events of the other night were, quite simply, extraordinary. Let us have a bit of an outing here. We got information from Olsen supporters and Brown supporters seeking—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —to do damage to each other and, in the same process, put their factional and individual concerns ahead of that of the Government of this State. And that is the problem. We have the two primary economic development Ministers in this State, whom the business community knows, constantly white-anting each other.

Mr Cummins interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The real test of the Premier's leadership will come up in this current reshuffle. He wants to dump the Minister for Infrastructure and remove that portfolio.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: He wants to take the EDA—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —under his own control. I do not think he will have the courage to do so, because in the Festival Lodge Motel, the motel owned by the husband of the member for Newland, the other night we heard the truth.

Mrs KOTZ: On a point of order—

The SPEAKER: A point of order—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: John Olsen will resign—

Mrs KOTZ: A point of order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —if he is dumped from those portfolios.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Newland.

Mrs KOTZ: Thank you, Mr Speaker. My point of order relates to Standing Order 127, which refers to personal reflections on members. It is bad enough that the honourable member reflects upon another member in this House, which he did, but to reflect—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs KOTZ: —on a member of my family is disgraceful.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs KOTZ: I ask him to withdraw.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member please indicate the actual words which were offensive.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the member for Newland indicate the words that were offensive.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Newland has the call.

Mrs KOTZ: Sir, I refuse to repeat what everyone heard—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Mrs KOTZ: —because a reflection should not be repeated once it has been said. I am asking for a withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order and will resume her seat. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This is a deliberate attempt by a frightened rabble of a Government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —a Government that does not know whether it supports either John Olsen or Dean Brown.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley, aided and abetted earlier by the member for Norwood, acted in a manner which is not particularly dignified. It would be the view of the Chair that some of the tactics employed by a reasonable person would suggest an attempt was made to prevent the Leader of the Opposition from making his comments. The Chair at this stage is not sure whether I have the authority to give extra time, but I intend to investigate that matter. If there is a repetition of this, and if it is possible, in the future the Chair will give extra time.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: On a point of order, Sir, I think this is a deliberate tactic. All I want to do is clear the name of the member for Coles—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —because she did not ring me. She is a friend but she did not ring me.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members should read, in relation to the grievance debate, 'The Speaker may, if the Speaker is of the view. . .' The Speaker is of the view that, if this continues, members do not want to proceed with the grievance debate, and I will call on the next item of business. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): Today we saw the real character of the Leader of the Opposition—the sheer nastiness—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: —the sheer grubbiness with which he operates. I know he wants to walk out—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CLARKE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I ask the Deputy Premier to withdraw his reference to 'grubbiness'. If I am thrown out for the word 'mongrel'—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CLARKE: —then the Deputy Premier can withdraw the word 'grub'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair understands that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has taken offence at the comments made by the Deputy Premier. Therefore, I ask the Deputy Premier whether he will withdraw those comments.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: No, Sir, I will not withdraw those comments.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Sir, the remarks were made of the Leader of the Opposition who heard them and walked out.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Your previous rulings have related to the person affected taking the point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is not going to have its authority called into question. I have asked the Deputy Premier to withdraw the comments because the Leader was not actually here at the time. He was on his way out, I understand. I ask the Deputy Premier to withdraw the comments.

Mr MEIER: On a point of order, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! No, there is no point of order. I suggest to the Deputy Premier, as his time is ticking away, that the proper process is that he rephrase the comments. He knows how to do that.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Obviously, if the Leader of the Opposition is offended by being called 'grubby', that is a matter he should have taken up but, in his absence and with the help of the Deputy, I am happy to withdraw to allow the debate to proceed. When Opposition members are in desperate strife, they get straight down into the gutter. Who remembers what we have had to put up with from Opposition members and what they perpetrated on the people of South Australia in terms of the contracts they wrote. I do not have to talk about the Myer-Remm Centre; I do not have to talk about the grubby little ASER deal in which the former Treasurer was involved and which exploded to the extent of 60 per cent over the recognised costs.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! I take it that the member for Giles is taking a point of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: You are quite correct, Sir. The Deputy Premier has accused me of a grubby deal. You just ruled out 'grubby' and insisted on a withdrawal. I would expect, for the sake of consistency as well as justice, to have the Deputy Premier withdraw and apologise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would suggest to the Deputy Premier that he withdraw the comments and rephrase them.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I will withdraw. I will have to think about—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER:—how indeed we address the statements.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart knows the rules.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: What I want to take up more than anything is the extent and length to which the Leader of the Opposition tries to smear and besmirch everyone in this House, including those on his own side. Let us deal with the issue about who called whom. I have heard statements that the Premier's office had briefed the Leader of the Opposition. That is totally untrue—absolutely untrue. He says he has had phone calls from members. That is absolutely untrue. If he can stand up and actually name them in this House, that is the time he has credibility, but what he does the whole time is to take this Parliament down into the pits, and then he walks away. It is not good enough for this Parliament to have innuendo and lies told by particular people, including the Leader of the Opposition—

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The Deputy Premier said that the Leader of the Opposition told lies in this place. Had he said 'deliberate untruths', then—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is; 'lie' is unparliamentary, 'deliberate untruth' and 'two-faced hypocrite' are not.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will not debate the matter. Unfortunately, the Chair's attention was diverted at the time. If the Deputy Premier made those comments, he knows the course of action to take.

Mr ASHENDEN: I rise on a point of order. With respect, Mr Speaker, I ask you to clarify a ruling given previously, so that the rules of the House will be clearly understood by me in future debate. In the past, I have always understood that the only person who could take a point of order and ask for a withdrawal was the person to whom the comment directly referred. In the recent instance you, Sir, required an honourable member to withdraw a remark when a point of order was called not by the person to whom the remark was directed but by another member. It is my understanding that in the past it has been ruled that there is no point of order. I want to be quite clear on the ruling so that members can abide by it in future.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member is in his or her seat, it is the responsibility of the honourable member. In relation to the point of order concerned, the comments referred to the Leader of the Opposition; the Deputy Leader of the Opposition then took the point of order, and that is, as I have been advised, the appropriate course of action. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I rise today to talk about this morning's rally that was held by many hundreds of people supporting the cause of Project 141. I was interested to hear the Minister, in answer to a question during Question Time, explain that he did not talk to those people this morning because they failed to come to his office to see him. I was outside with those people this morning and I heard them say that they had invited the Minister to speak with them but that he had declined. The fact is that they waited until 12.10 p.m. and, of course, the Minister did not attend. That is very interesting, because this Minister for Health is prepared to meet and speak with people from the community only on his own terms—'In my office, surrounded by my advisers, one, two or three of you can come and talk with me for five minutes.'

This is not what it is about. The Minister needs to go out and listen to people wherever they may be and not expect them to come to his office where he is closeted with his advisers. In this way the Minister quarantines himself from hearing the stories of many people who spoke at that rally and understanding their situation. Instead, the Minister quarantines himself in his office; he slinks and hides behind facts, figures and percentages and pretends he is doing a great job.

In his answer to the question asked today, the Minister said he was doing a great job and that, in fact, it was not his fault. We have heard this many times before. The Minister said that in a few weeks another \$1.6 million will be available and that, out of the 114 people who he says remain in severe difficulty in this area, this \$1.6 million will be able to assist another 40 to 50 people. I ask the Minister: what about the rest of the people? What about the fact that this figure of 141 or 140 is only the tip of the iceberg—the most serious cases? Many other people in our State are in severe difficulties in this regard. I quote briefly from the speech of Joanne den Otter, at a Project 141 meeting at Gepps Cross on 29 October this year, and I hope the Minister takes note:

In South Australia 2 500 intellectually disabled adults have no known day option. 400 are leaving schools, 1500 will come out of workshops in South Australia in 1995. There are many elderly

intellectually disabled not registered with IDSC [the Minister quoted only IDSC figures] or any other service who are at home with their frail elderly parents.

When I was outside with these people at the rally today, they told me that 250 people aged over 50 in our community are being cared for by their frail elderly parents. This is a disgrace. This Minister is the person in charge, and it is his responsibility to address this issue and to do something about it. There is money available but the fact is that there is not the will to make these people a priority for this funding. Let us be quite clear about where this Government is coming from. This group of people are not a priority. We can spend \$2 million on royal commissions; we can spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on a State slogan that has made us a laughing stock, but we cannot provide funds for these people.

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

Mr KERIN (Frome): I too have much sympathy for that group of people. Those problems have not come about overnight. I myself have been involved in talks with the Minister, and I know that it is an area of great priority to him. We ought to remember that if we had not had such economic vandalism of this State we would have more money for this group of people.

At the risk of lifting the level of debate, I would like to talk about something in my electorate. Last Wednesday, the Port Pirie and Regional Chamber of Commerce and Industry held its fiftieth anniversary celebrations and presented the Outstanding Business Awards for the Port Pirie region. The celebrations were attended by 170 people at the Northern Festival Centre at Port Pirie, and a terrific night was had by all. The guest speaker was Jean Kitson, of ABC fame, who made an extremely entertaining and humorous speech on team work and other aspects of running a business.

The Port Pirie Chamber of Commerce is going through one of its most active phases in its 50-year history, under the excellent leadership of Gavin Mannix. The Secretary, Dianne Patterson, is an excellent organiser and keeps the executive motivated. Not only does the chamber act as a voice for the business community but it also has representation on many committees within Port Pirie and the region involved in tourism and other undertakings.

The Outstanding Business Awards drew dozens of customer nominations and emphasised the high regard in which many local businesses in Port Pirie and the surrounding towns are held by the general community. Nine awards were presented. The winner of the Large Retail Award for over 10 staff was the Australian Central Credit Union, which is a neighbour of mine. The credit union has a very enthusiastic staff who provide a very high level of service to customers. The Small Retail Award was presented to Meg's Bookshop, which is an excellent little shop owned by Margie and Mark Arnold.

The Port Pirie Regional Development Award went to Bentley's Signs. Hayden Bentley sends signs all over the State, and is also involved in bringing the Australian Off-road Championships to Port Pirie next year. The Judges' Award went to Electrical Discounters, which has expanded to Port Pirie and other Spencer Gulf cities after initially making its name in Whyalla. The Services Community Award went to San Remo Studios, where Bev Argent has spent decades giving excellent service to Port Pirie and its residents.

The Regional Award went to the Gladstone Post Office. Sam Smith, the former Postmaster, and his wife run an

excellent post office agency and, of their own choice, also offer an excellent service to visitors to the town, providing information on tourism, etc., for the Gladstone area. The Hospitality Award went to the Risdon Hotel. It is only just over 12 months since the hotel was in receivership and under the management of Mark Venables \$1 million has been spent on the hotel to provide an excellent entertainment venue for Port Pirie. The first Chamber of Commerce and Industry Special Award went to Sago Bush, which is a very well presented business in the Solomontown area, an important business area of Port Pirie in itself. The second Chamber of Commerce and Industry Special Award went to Mr Music at Port Pirie Plaza, which is an excellent small business very involved in the community.

I add my congratulations to those received by the winners on the evening. It was terrific to see such a dedicated group of people receive some due recognition for the services they provide to their customers and the communities of Port Pirie and surrounding areas. The celebrations were attended by a very good crowd of people, including many business people from Port Pirie and nearby towns, as well as representatives from Whyalla and Port Augusta, and several former Port Pirie residents travelled from Adelaide for the night. Among those attending were previous Chamber Presidents, including Brian Richards, Mick Prest and Ken Madigan, who is the current Mayor of Port Pirie.

The Port Pirie Chamber of Commerce and Industry should be congratulated on its fiftieth anniversary, and I also congratulate all those responsible for the splendid organisation of what was a most successful and enjoyable evening.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): I wish to address the problems the Whyalla Hospital is having with the Government's concept of regionalisation. Whether regionalisation is a good thing or a bad thing is, I think, a separate issue: the difficulty I have with the Government is the way it has put the Whyalla Hospital into a huge region covering most of the north and the west of the State. That would not be so bad if it had not put another major hospital in the region. Having two major hospitals in the one region is bound to cause conflict, and it is unfortunate that the Minister has chosen to do that. It has the possibility to cause a great deal of dissent within the west of the State, particularly within the Iron Triangle. The board will have to allocate totally inadequate resources among all the health units and hospitals involved. It will pit hospital against hospital, health service against health service. Some will feel that they have lost because of the influence of others.

The Whyalla Hospital serves about 50 per cent of the population of the entire region—by far large enough to be a stand alone health unit without going cap in hand to a regional organisation that includes many smaller health units and hospitals which have the capacity to outvote the Whyalla representatives on the regional board. The Minister clearly is trying to wash his hands of funding decisions by saying to the region, 'That is now your responsibility: it has nothing to do with the Government'. I can advise the Minister that that just does not work, and the 20 year history of the Health Commission has demonstrated that it does not work. Ministers cannot wash their hands of the responsibility for their portfolios, irrespective of what structure they establish.

I urge the Minister to put Whyalla into a region of its own. It will in the long run save very many headaches for the Minister and very many headaches for the Whyalla Hospital. I believe that eventually it will have to be done because I

cannot see a hospital, as well as a community as large as Whyalla, allowing itself to be pushed around by a group of very small hospitals and health services within the region. I am not suggesting that those hospitals and health services ought not to continue: I believe it is proper that they be in a region with Port Augusta. I do not believe it is appropriate that Whyalla be included with them.

The problem that will arise is when one dollar is diverted from Whyalla Hospital to one of the other health services. I can assure the Minister that he will hear the voice of the Whyalla community—not just the medical and hospital community but all the Whyalla community—loud and clear. The Minister will be in absolutely no doubt as to the views of the community when money is moved from Whyalla to some of these other hospitals.

As soon as money moves out of the hospital, fewer procedures will take place, and the fewer the procedures that take place, the fewer specialists there will be in the city, and the whole region is disadvantaged. We are trying very hard to keep specialists—in fact, all medical practitioners—outside the metropolitan area. It is not realistic to move funds out of Whyalla to areas where they do not have specialists and expect the specialists in Whyalla to continue with reduced incomes. That will not happen—they will leave—and it will place an additional burden on Adelaide metropolitan hospitals, particularly the teaching hospitals, because people requiring an operation will have to travel to Adelaide. That is something that all Governments have been trying to avoid over the past 20 years.

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

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Again, we have seen in the Chamber this afternoon the Leader of the Opposition being not grubby but I would say his typical grotty self. It is interesting that the television people are prepared to hang around and run night after night the absolute garbage that he trashes out through the South Australian media. It is a pity that the media cannot be more responsible in this regard and that it has to record the grotty performances we see day in and day out from the so-called Leader of the Opposition—who will not be Leader of the Opposition by the next election. It would be so much better if the media could cover some of the great economic developments and events occurring in this State today. We all know in South Australia that Mike Rann is not interested in economic development opportunities. We all know that Mike Rann, as a member of the former Labor Government, was one of those who helped destroy this State.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is transgressing in that he is being unnecessarily antagonistic. His choice of words is not really desirable, but he is certainly transgressing in naming a member rather than referring to the member as 'the member for' or, in this case, 'the Leader of the Opposition'.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Sorry, Sir. We all know that the Leader of the Opposition is not interested in taking advantage of any of the opportunities now prevailing in South Australia to help clean up this mess. But this Government will keep peddling out the facts and people in the South Australian community—who are intelligent—will see what the real facts are. This Government comprises a strong team of people who, on a daily basis, are prepared to do those things needed to get the State back in order.

Talking about getting the State back in order, I was absolutely delighted yesterday to be invited to the Winestate

Publications launch at McLaren Vale, in my electorate of Mawson, of *Australian Wine—a Pictorial Guide*. This book, which I recommend to every South Australian, has been magnificently produced by Thomas K. Hardy, the great grandson of the Thomas Hardy of whom we all know and who back in the early 1800s led the way at Reynella in viticultural development for South Australia. The photography, by Milan Roden, is absolutely superb. I was proud as the local member yesterday to be present at this launch in McLaren Vale, and I commend the book to everybody. The book has been endorsed by people such as Sir James Hardy; Robert Mondavi, who is a leader in the Napa Valley in California; and Kodak, which also did a great job with the publication. It is interesting to note that the book was published and printed in South Australia.

Once again, McLaren Vale was chosen for the launch because of the great history and quality of the premium wines produced in the McLaren Vale region. The 52 wineries there are growing daily not only in the national arena but also the international arena. I highlight to my colleagues in the Parliament today the greatest achievement so far in McLaren Vale's recent fortunes in blitzing the Australian show arena. The Qantas Great Australian Shiraz Challenge was held recently. It is the first time that a challenge has been held throughout Australia for shiraz. McLaren Vale, as I have been espousing for years, is the shiraz capital of not only Australia but arguably the world. The document indicates that the gold medal winner was in the McLaren Vale-Kuitpo region. Those involved are still working out whether that becomes part of the Adelaide Hills, the McLaren Vale or the Fleurieu region. However, it is in the general McLaren Vale region.

The Kuitpo area, east of the McLaren Vale district, Pertaringa and Geoff Hardy, who we all know is one of the great viticulturists, were the gold winners of the Qantas Great Australian Shiraz Challenge. I spoke in this place recently about the magnificent efforts by the Maglieri family. They came in with 17.7 points and tied with Grant Burge for second place with a silver medal. What a fantastic effort that is: the top two places were taken by three wineries, and two out of those three wineries are in my general district. That augurs well for McLaren Vale and the southern region. It supports the reason why our Government is absolutely committed to wine in South Australia in the McLaren Vale region.

RACING (AMALGAMATION OF POOLS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 November. Page 508.)

Mr FOLEY (Hart): The Opposition supports the Bill. My colleague the member for Taylor, an avid racing fan and someone who is a big supporter of the punter out in the electorate, has a question or two to put to the Minister in Committee. The issue is one of achieving better profitability for the TAB, which the Opposition has supported. We firmly believe that a more profitable TAB in turn allows for increased dividends to go to the racing codes, something again which we support. It is good to see the Government and the Opposition agreeing on the profitability of the TAB for

a change. The whole future of the TAB is something that all members of this House—Government and Opposition—will have to face in the years ahead with the pressure being applied from TABCORP in Victoria.

Issues such as Pay TV, which we have spoken about in this place before, are putting unprecedented challenges on the TAB, quite apart from the obvious challenge from poker machines and other factors causing the downturn in TAB turnover. Clearly the racing industry and how it is serviced by organisations such as the TAB in each State will mean that this or future Governments will have to address the issue of how we participate in betting within Australia in the context of the massive changes brought upon us by the Victorian TAB, Pay TV and the like. We can leave that for another day.

I foreshadow to the Minister that the Opposition, as usual, stands ready, willing and able to participate in any discussions the Minister would wish to have that would see the TAB reformed to continue to provide a profitable return. The downturn in turnover is of concern to the Opposition. The factors that are contributing to that equally are of concern to the Opposition, and I do not wish to see the TAB's lack of profitability and downturn in turnover continue. We will monitor that situation closely and be prepared to participate in constructive discussions that the Government may see fit to initiate in terms of dealing with that issue.

I flag that the Government needs to look at the issue of how the TAB is constructed. Not wanting to revisit discussions of earlier times about the present Chairman of the TAB, I hold a general view that the make-up of the TAB is less than satisfactory when one looks at the needs of a modern board. In the context of other discussions we have had in this place about other boards, I flag that when time permits I am open to discussions about how we structure the TAB Board to ensure that we have the right skills on it to ensure a dynamic and progressive TAB. With those few words, the Opposition supports the TAB.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I reiterate the comments of the member for Hart as shadow Minister. The Bill is about redressing the TAB's downturn in turnover by looking at amalgamation with pools interstate, which we certainly support because there is a need to do something about the defection of South Australian gambling investments over the borders to TABs in the Eastern States, particularly New South Wales which has a lower percentage commission on its TAB takings. I refer to the competitive advantages of differential commissions between States. I seek an assurance from the Minister that he will not use this measure to provide a *de facto* tax increase. The Opposition supports the Bill.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): I thank honourable members who have contributed to the debate and thank the Opposition for its support of the Bill. This Bill is about improving the profitability of the South Australian TAB in an atmosphere of a highly competitive market across Australia between the various TABs. The introduction of the privatisation of the Victorian TAB and the sequence of events that has taken place since then have set a new direction for TABs. Small States such as ours, with a turnover potentially of \$505 million plus, have to be forever vigilant in looking at our turnover and in being supportive of the TAB at any time it wants to bring in a new scheme whereby it can increase its profitability.

The proposal in the Bill, as set out in my second reading explanation, is to amalgamate with Western Australia. The TAB has advised us that it would expect to benefit over a full year to the tune of \$836 900, and that is not an insignificant amount. Compared with the turnover of some of our interstate counterparts, that may not be considered huge but, for every \$800 000 of profit that can be generated for benefit to us, a small percentage of that will go back to the racing clubs and into prize money. I am happy to address in Committee the issues raised by the member for Taylor. I thank members for their support and commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed

Clause 4—'Deduction of percentage from totalizator money.'

Ms WHITE: I understand that the South Australian take on the quinella pool is 14.5 per cent and that in Western Australia the take is 20 per cent. I am not sure of the Victorian pool take. What will happen to the Government take? Will there be a change to that percentage? How will it be regulated?

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: The quinella will not change. The quinella is not picked up in this legislation. It really concentrates entirely on the trifecta and Pick Four. We have selected Western Australia, because Western Australia, like South Australia, has a common 20 per cent. Also, there is some security in linking with another State, developing a rapport with that State and getting into a business arrangement on our TAB. The arrangement we have with the Victorian TAB is such that South Australia is an agent and we pay .33 per cent of turnover as a charge. If ever Victoria decides to increase that charge and it becomes excessive on our TAB, we need the flexibility to be able to swing across and join another pool. Having established a relationship with Western Australia, I believe that, if ever the relationship with Victoria became untenable for South Australia—and I am not saying that it will happen—we would be in a position to switch, and we would be able to switch very quickly if we adopt the clauses of this Bill.

Ms WHITE: Am I correct in interpreting that the percentage take will be set down in the regulations?

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: That is correct.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 10) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FISHERIES (GULF ST VINCENT PRAWN FISHERY RATIONALIZATION) (LICENCE TRANSFER) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 November. Page 509.)

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I rise to represent the Opposition in this place on the Bill. Once again, I am pleased to be confronted with the Minister for Primary Industries on this matter.

Mr Venning: The Dog Fence Act!

Mr CLARKE: No, the dog fence legislation comes next. No doubt the honourable member will be able to speak at length and very knowledgably on that subject. The Opposition supports the Bill in this place. However, we express our concerns in a number of areas, which I would ask the Minister take on board. He may wish to answer these

questions in his second reading reply, rather than perhaps going into Committee. No doubt our shadow spokesperson, the Hon. Ron Roberts, in another place, will further elaborate on the Bill. If there is a need to amend the legislation, that will occur in another place. Unlike the Minister, the Hon. Ron Roberts has undertaken a very broad range of consultations throughout the industry in South Australia. Of course, this has been the hallmark of the Minister—his absolute lack of consultation with key stakeholders. I do not know what the Minister has against prawn fishermen—or ‘fisherpersons’; I suppose that is the correct terminology these days—but he has an absolute inability to discuss in a rational manner matters of some import to them.

Mr Foley: Can you blame him?

Mr CLARKE: The member for Hart is interjecting, and I seek your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker, from the member for Hart with respect to this matter because he, like the Minister, seemingly has some bias against certain fisherpersons. First, this Bill seeks to amalgamate licences in Gulf St Vincent and, at first blush, appears to pick up the recommendations of the select committee of this House. However, it needs to be said that, in the view of the Opposition, it should be done in the total context of all the recommendations of the select committee. Secondly, the Bill will not reduce the fishing effort on stocks in Gulf St Vincent. In fact, I am advised that it is envisaged that greater headline lengths (and I am sure that the Minister will be able to advise me on that), which were not endorsed by Garry Morgan in his recent study of the fishery, and more powerful boats will be encouraged into the fishery.

Thirdly, we are concerned that there has been no consultation with the South Australian Fishing Industry Council, the Gulf St Vincent Advisory Committee or the fishermen themselves. That is a very important point, and the Minister should very carefully explain to the House why he is frightened of consulting or finds it anathema to consult with those leading bodies. Fourthly, when Garry Morgan was commissioned to undertake a biological study of the fishery, an economic study by Julian Morrison of the fishery was also commissioned by the Minister. However, this latter report has not been made publicly available. As well, some questions of detail need to be addressed; for example, when an amalgamation takes place, does the owner pay two licence fees or just one? Will he have the right to take twice as many prawns, and how can he do this when there are no quotas?

Clearly, many questions are still to be answered. The concept of the debt or surcharge applicable to a licence being sold, being passed to the purchaser, is something we can support. The important thing here is that the Government still has the right to collect the debt, but it may facilitate some amalgamations of licences. However, we put on record our concern for the amount of pressure being applied to this still fragile fishery, which these amendments, of themselves, do not address. With those concluding remarks, and with those reservations, the Opposition supports the Bill. We ask the Minister to address his mind to those questions that I have framed to him, and we will see where it goes from there in another place.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER (Minister for Primary Industries): I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for his comments, but I do not know who wrote the stuff for him because, quite obviously, he has not been in this place for very long and he does not understand the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery.

Mr Clarke: Don't come the raw prawn with me.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: There will not be many of them if you are running it. No-one has crawled over Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery more than this Parliament. It has been the subject of a number of inquiries. Professor Copes came in 1986 when the fishery was having some problems and he conducted a very lengthy survey and inquiry into the industry. He followed it up the next year when he came out again, and there were 16 fishermen in that fishery then and there were 16 points of view as to how that fishery should be managed and run.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I will come to that in a minute. Then we had a buy back scheme, of which the previous Administration was in charge and which was an absolute disaster. This Government will never get involved in any scheme where taxpayers' funds or SAFA funds are used for a buy back. If any fishery wants to rationalise, it will get its own commercial finance from any source it wants and finance it itself, because once we—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: That is absolutely immaterial. Do not get into economic issues, because you are out of your depth. The interest rate is absolutely immaterial. The Government lent money to this fishery, and the member for Hart, who was an adviser to a previous Fisheries Minister, knows full well as I know full well, through the yellow stickers that he had on the dockets, what was really going on.

Mr Foley: They were good yellow stickers, too.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: They were very informative ones. Then the fishery got into trouble. It was closed for some two years, and I, in Opposition as shadow Minister, supported that. Prior to the closure, it was the subject of a select committee, and it was rationalised back to 10 licences, so after that select committee there were only 10 views on how the fishery should be managed.

Mr Foley: We had to have the Electoral Commission conduct a ballot.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: That is right. When those 10 fishermen had to elect a chairman, they had to have the Electoral Commission work out how they could elect one person. The Deputy Leader does not understand the amount of consultation that has taken place with the fishermen, the Opposition and every member of this Parliament.

Mr Clarke: Don't they all vote for you?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: To be quite frank, until a by-election, each one of them could have voted for one of you, because that is all there were on that side of the House—10. The Opposition could have had one on one consultation with the fishermen in the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: The member for Hart would not have wanted to be in it. I compliment the Opposition, when it was in Government, on getting the integrated management committee system in place. We have put up Ken Smith as Chairman of that committee and he is accepted by the fishermen and, for a change, I think that we are starting to get somewhere. We did get Gary Morgan—

Mr Foley: What happened to Ted?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: The Hon. Ted Chapman was appointed by the previous Administration, and he did an extremely good job, but he has taken on the chairmanship of the marine scale fishery, which is a very big job. He is still serving the State of South Australia as well as he did when he worked on the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery. This year,

when we opened the fishery, which is a fragile fishery, Gary Morgan came. Once again, there has been consultation with the industry and the IMC has been consulting with the industry, and the Morgan report says that we have got—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: No, I do not think that the Deputy Leader understands that the Minister is the final point. That is why we have integrated management committees and independent chairmen. They are the ones who work out what the fishermen want to do in the industry, they are the ones who conduct all the consultation and, finally, when they have decided on a course of action, that decision comes up to the Minister. That is how it should work. That means that the fishermen are responsible for their own destiny. The Deputy Leader was not here, of course, but the previous Administration put that in place, and I support it, and we are continuing that program with the overwhelming support of the Opposition, and I think that the fishery is getting somewhere.

What we have to ensure is that, if further rationalisation is to take place, it takes place without the interference of Government. All this Bill does is allow for an amalgamation of licences and an amalgamation of the debt so that that industry can, in itself, not only pay back the money it owes to SAFA or the Government but also through its integrated management committee rationally manage its own fishery. In his report, Morgan said that the fishery has a future. It is a fragile fishery but, properly managed, it will be a good income contributor, not only to fishermen but to South Australia. That is our aim and all but the Deputy Leader in this House support what we are trying to do, and concur that this is the best method—

Mr Clarke: I said that we support you.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: Funny sort of support: I would hate to see you in opposition. It is a sensible way of helping that rationalisation process go ahead. I have to say that, for the first time since I have been involved in this fishery, both in Opposition and in Government, more than two people agree on what is happening in the fishery, and that is a breakthrough in itself. I commend the Bill to the House. I assure the honourable member that it is in the best interests of the fishery to allow flexibility, and I thank him for his somewhat guarded support.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Money expended for purposes of Act to be recouped from remaining licensees.'

Mr FOLEY: As someone who was an adviser to a former Minister for Fisheries and as a person who has had some involvement with the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery issue, I should like to ask one or two questions.

The Hon. D.S. Baker: They speak highly of you, too.

Mr FOLEY: I do not believe that, but I will take the Minister's word on it. If anyone has been involved with this issue, I believe that I rank near the top. My colleague the member for Playford chaired a very important committee of the Parliament—

The Hon. D.S. Baker: And did a very good job, too.

Mr FOLEY: Exactly. It was a tough job. When the former Minister for Fisheries and I needed someone to undertake a very difficult task, one which required a member of the House who had the ability to manage such a complex issue, and one which needed a Chair that could withstand pressure—and anyone who has been involved with this

fishery knows that pressure has been applied—we scratched our heads and the member for Playford readily came to mind as someone who would be very good at that task.

The Hon. D.S. Baker: Does this lead up to anything?

Mr FOLEY: Trust me, it does. Of course, through that process I had the privilege of hearing all sides of the prawn issue in Gulf St Vincent, and that amounted to about 10 different views. And, as the Minister said earlier, even when it came to electing a Chair of the Gulf St Vincent Management Committee, they had to bring in the Electoral Commission, because they could not manage such an issue. The preamble is important to put on the record, because it is a very difficult problem. How much of the surcharge has been repaid to Government? Have the prawn fishers made any repayments to the Government of their outstanding levies?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: Yes. In the first year when we came into government there had to be a voluntary scheme, because the previous Minister had not quite put in place some provisions that would have allowed us to collect that surcharge. Some paid the voluntary surcharge and some did not. Before they went fishing this year, I insisted that all fees were paid up to date. All fees are paid up that are due to the Government, and that was all signed off before anyone went fishing. The next instalment is due in January and that will be the same thing: no-one will go fishing until the instalments are paid.

Mr QUIRKE: I thank the Minister for that answer. In fact, that was one of the key elements in the inquiry that I conducted on behalf of the House in 1991 when we finished with it. I noted that the Deputy Leader was trying to interject and I point out that I got the job of chairing that inquiry because I have a gun licence. In fact, on that occasion, the now member for Hart, who was then a senior adviser, came to me and explained that there were a number of problems in this fishery. This Minister is absolutely correct when he talks about some of the problems that were associated with it. In fact, this legislation before us and these clauses (and I want this on the public record) were the progeny of that report.

The Government has not done a few things yet, and I will take this opportunity to put a few matters on notice which the Government really needs to do to get people out of this fishery, which was the exercise. The inquiry into that issue which I chaired came to the conclusion that three boats could have taken the entire catch. I suppose you can have 10 boats with only one rig hanging off each boat or three boats with three rigs. At the end of the day, the problem is that there are far too many people chasing too few fish. That is the nub of the whole problem.

This legislation is eminently worth supporting. I told the Minister that. It would be very difficult for me not to support it, given that most of the ideas came out of the select committee of 1991. I do think that the Minister will have to look at the total available catch and the quota system. We must give these people a reason as to why they would amalgamate their two licences, and the only reason I can think of is that they will have twice as many fish. We can tell them that they can hang twice as many nets off the boat if they want to, but what we need to do is determine what the catch will be for the season and then proceed to allocate that on the basis of the licences. The sooner we can get it down to—dare I say—five licences, the more I believe this fishery will have a future.

One of the problems is that another recommendation of the select committee was to close the gulf for two years, which we did, but it still has not returned to the sorts of levels

of 10 or 12 years ago. No-one knows the reasons. The Minister in his speech mentioned Parzival Copes. We have had a whole string of people come in. I think mine was the ninth inquiry and I do not think it will be the last—I understand from the shadow Minister that there has been another one since—but substantially we sought to restructure and get some of the fishers out this fishery.

I welcome this legislation and take this opportunity, with your acquiescence, Mr Chairman, to put these remarks on the record. These are some of the building blocks which were necessary and which were envisaged four years ago for fixing some of the problems. I hope that in the future we will be dealing with the quota system too, so that we can amalgamate licences and get some of these people out of the gulf.

The conclusion I came to in 1991 was that this fishery would never return more than about 200 tonnes, at best. I have absolutely no biological evidence for making any suggestion about what the size should be. Much smarter people than I gave all sorts of other figures. The reality is that none of those figures came up to par. The buy-out was based on 400 tonnes a year. We have never gone anywhere near that. No matter what the payments were for 1987, no-one has gone anywhere near that figure. In fact, if you trend it on a graph since the early 1980s, you find that the average is about 200 tonnes.

That leads to another matter which I will take the opportunity to raise in this House: I commend the Minister for making these people pay before they go fishing, because that was another key element of the select committee inquiry. The other conclusion I came to was that we will never get our money unless they pay before they go fishing. The Minister put his finger on one of the problems, which is that, particularly given that there were too many boats involved—16 at the time—when we buy out six of those boats on very favourable terms to the persons being bought out, then transfer the whole debt onto the rest of them when the fishery is in decline, we have all sorts of problems. We look forward to seeing the rest of the issues come before Parliament in the not too distant future.

Mr CLARKE: My question to the Minister relates to what I said in my second reading contribution. When an amalgamation takes place, does the owner pay two licence fees or just one? Will he have the right to take twice as many prawns; and how can he do this when there are no quotas?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: The Deputy Leader is correct in suggesting that, if you amalgamate a licence, you will pay two licence fees, and that will be picked up under regulations. His other question was whether you will get double the quota, and the answer is that there are no quotas in the fishery as yet. The member for Playford enunciated quite clearly where he thinks it should go, and I compliment him on his work on the select committee. I will put all that back to the integrated management committees now to thrash out. We are now starting to get somewhere with this legislation if it gets the support of the Upper House, and I hope that more legislation will come back here to finish tidying up the fishery. Because there are no quotas, you will not get double the quota but, in consultation and through the IMC structure, you will be allowed to use different gear. I see all that as an interim measure as we work towards getting this thing fixed. With the concurrence of the Opposition and with a little goodwill on all sides, I hope that after this season we will have something in place which will allow this fishery to be sustainable and, more importantly, for the people in it to be profitable—and that is the ultimate aim.

In case members jump up and ask another question on how there is any benefit if people pay double the licence fees and they are not getting double the quota, I point out that it is a rationalisation: they are using only one boat, one deck hand and some bigger gear. It is a unit cost of production case, which is quite favourable to the fishermen if they amalgamate licences, but within six months we will have something through the IMC system which is very sensible and which I am sure will be applauded by both sides of the House.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

DOG FENCE (SPECIAL RATE, ETC) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 November. Page 585.)

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I rise to indicate the Opposition's support for this amendment to the dog fence legislation. The Opposition has consulted widely with respect to this issue. We have even done a quick survey of the dogs that may be affected! Unlike the Minister, we are truly consultative in our outlook when it comes to—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: I am afraid that the member for Ridley provokes me. He is obviously baying at the moon himself. I will deal strictly with the amendment before us.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sure it will be a howling success!

Mr CLARKE: Very true, Sir. As the Minister said in his second reading explanation, the amendment basically provides greater autonomy for the local dog fence boards in determining ways in which they are to be rated for the purposes of the repair work and the like that needs to be done on the dog proof fence. We hope it is a dog proof fence. Without any further ado, we totally support the Bill and commend it to the House in the hope that it receives a speedy passage to another place.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): As I understand this legislation, it makes possible a fairer arrangement than is presently possible within the framework of an unfair system. Let me illustrate that point by simply stating that the people I represent are not necessarily the beneficiaries which the current formula would, by implication, have us all believe they are. The fact is that the carrying capacity in the Mallee is very much lower in terms of dry sheep equivalents per unit area than it is in the South-East or other higher rainfall districts of the State, such as the Mid North, the Lower North or the Fleurieu Peninsula. So, you need a larger area of land from which to derive your living.

Up until now, the levy has been collected from those people who own a square kilometre or more of land. That discriminates against the people I represent in Ridley, the Mallee farmers. They are a long way from the dogs, which would have to run the gauntlet across the Blanchetown bridge (and we know that is a risky structure, anyway), hitch a ride on a ferry, perhaps chance their arm on one of the bridges in Murray Bridge (soon they will have one in Berri) or swim the river.

People in the Mallee also have their own dog problem, and that arises from the National Parks and Wildlife's population

of dogs in the Ngarkat National Park, to which I have referred many times since I first arrived here in 1979. My point about that is that, notwithstanding the belief occasionally held here by some members, including the Minister, that they were not having to pay double, they indeed are paying double under the system as the Act stands at present and even as we amend it. They pay a separate and distinct levy to the maintenance of the Box Flat dingo control committee, or the operations of the pest control officers now in any of the pest control boards which have taken over in that part of the world.

As I have said, they have to own more land to make a living, because it does not have the same productive output per unit area as the South-East has. So, you can run 14 or 15 sheep per acre in a place like Furner, to take an area off the map anywhere in the lower South-East, yet you are lucky if you can run one sheep to the acre in the Mallee. I am therefore pointing out that you would run about the equivalent of 37 or 38 sheep per hectare in the South-East for every 2.5 sheep you would run in the Mallee. In less than a square kilometre of land, if you grazed only sheep on it, you would have more sheep than any Mallee farmer on a farm of average area. Yet a Mallee farmer with 2 500 acres or a thousand hectares or a square kilometre of land will not survive in perpetuity: that is not sufficient area. So, what we are really doing is taxing dirt, or at least the people who own more of it, regardless of its capacity to produce.

Mr Clarke: Is it an increase in tax?

Mr LEWIS: Dingoes do not eat dirt, for the benefit of the member for Ross Smith. They eat sheep, lambs and maybe the odd calf. They certainly eat young native animals and ground dwelling birds, if they can catch them.

Mr Clarke: Is it an increase in tax?

Mr LEWIS: This is not an increase in tax. That is not my point. My point is, quite simply, that we do not tax householders on the area of their backyard when we determine how much they will pay for the dog or cat they keep. That registration fee is related to 'per animal', and it ought to be the same for the dog fence levy, per animal protected, because there are plenty of farmers in the Mallee who do not run any sheep; they have well over 10 000 hectares, and they are liable to pay an enormous amount, yet they receive no protection whatever because they are not involved in animal production of a kind which requires a dog fence to protect them.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Crops—that is exactly what they are on about—crops and cattle.

Mr Clarke: Couldn't they change from crops one year to sheep?

Mr LEWIS: They could but they do not.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: The member for Ross Smith would know that pastoralists outside the counties do not switch from sheep to chooks: they simply grow sheep.

Mr Clarke: But they could.

Mr LEWIS: If they did, they would find they would have to spend more money on providing appropriate water and protection from other predators, including the friends of the member for Ross Smith. My point is quite simply that the levy should not be collected on the basis of the area of land; it should be collected on the basis of benefit of the type of production undertaken. That is constantly brought home to me by the people I represent. I do not care what the South Australian Farmers Federation annual general meeting thinks about this issue. I do not represent that group of people here:

I represent the people living in the electorate of Ridley who have an interest in this matter, and they are the people who own the land that is subject to this levy.

The Minister has come some distance to making the system fairer by enabling, through this legislation, the people concerned to rearrange the way in which they rate themselves to pay the levy and put forward a proposal for such change and, with his consent, introduce it. But it must be with unanimous agreement that an alternative rating method is appropriate for that area. I am sure that my constituents in the Mallee will take up this alternative, which they see as a compromise position but still unjust. Let me illustrate that in yet another way by saying that sheep lice represent a far greater risk and cost to the sheep producers in my electorate than dogs.

The dogs that represent the greatest risk are those which come from the Ngarkat and the Big Desert and Little Desert National Parks either side of the State border, for which an independent and individual contribution is already made different and separate from the fund established by the collection of this levy as it presently exists and as it will continue to exist even following these amendments. Bearing all that in mind, I hope that ultimately the industry comes up with a fairer system because, clearly, as we shift away from wheat and sheep—as it were, stock in trade for mixed farming—towards greater diversity to ensure that there is less risk of our being exposed to the cyclical fluctuations of wool prices and sheep meat in the world marketplace—as we shift away from our dependence and emphasis on that—then the risk and benefit derived from having a dog fence will vary according to the type of production undertaken.

So that emu farmers, for instance, will not receive the same degree of benefit as sheep farmers receive and should not therefore have to pay as much. More particularly, wheat farmers do not get any benefit at all, yet they must pay, whether or not they like it, under the legislation as it exists and under this amendment. Bearing that in mind, and having helped the member for Ross Smith and anyone else who cares to either listen to or read these remarks, I rest my case, because this Bill is a means of making the whole thing fairer—that is, the means by which the rates are collected and the criteria by which they can be determined—and I wish the measure swift passage.

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

SOUTH EASTERN WATER CONSERVATION AND DRAINAGE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 November. Page 586.)

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): When I first saw the title of this Bill I thought it would come under a portfolio different from that of the Minister for Primary Industries, but I understand it is—

The Hon. D.S. Baker interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: I had difficulty mixing the word 'conservation' with that well-known conservationist at heart, the Minister, otherwise affectionately known in the industry as 'Chainsaw Baker'—

The Hon. D.S. Baker: I accept that amendment.

Mr CLARKE:—and far better than being known as the 'Butcher of the Bunnies'. This Bill, as I understand, is the

result of enormous consultation. The person who prepared my notes obviously does not know the Minister as well as I do, because the notes contradict what I have just said about the Minister's inability to—

The Hon. D.S. Baker interjecting:

Mr CLARKE:—consult, as I pointed out in the previous two Bills. However, obviously the Minister had nothing to do with this Bill, because I understand that enormous consultation was involved. It was something that was able to be kept out of the Minister's hands. This Bill identifies areas and degrees of responsibility between the department, local government and farmers' representatives. It identifies that a four-level levy on a per hectare basis is an appropriate way to collect the 25 per cent community cost of the program. This Bill also talks about the structure of the management board, providing for who may be represented and for staggered appointments to allow continuity of experience and expertise in the committee's deliberations. The Bill also identifies who may vote; for example, who may vote on behalf of a partnership.

For those reasons—again, following our own extensive consultation with all those affected parties—and on behalf of our shadow spokesperson in another place, the Opposition supports the Bill and will ensure its swift passage into law when it reaches another place.

Mr BUCKBY (Light): I support this Bill. Of course, we now all know the history of the South-East and the problem of salinisation of that area due to the clearance—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BUCKBY: No. If the member for Ross Smith just waits he will understand my connection with this particular Bill. The clearance of land in the South-East has resulted in the watertable rising and causing severe problems for farmers in the region. When I was employed by the Centre for SA Economic Studies, farmers from the South-East came to us and I was part of a team which undertook an economic impact study of salinity in the upper South-East.

That study identified 8 per cent of land as being suspect or under-marginal and prone to the effect of salinity each year. So that, if nothing were done to drain the water from the upper South-East, we would continue to lose about 8 per cent per year of prime agricultural land in that area. This drain will lower that watertable. The farmers have been very supportive of a drain. When we were undertaking the impact study over a period of about eight or nine months, we consulted with the then EWS Department, the farmers and also the Department of Primary Industries. The subsequent division of funding for this drain—25 per cent by the land-holders, 25 per cent by the State Government; and 50 per cent by the Federal Government—was seen by all to be fair and equitable. As a result, this Bill now comes before Parliament allowing a levy to be placed on those farmers affected by the drain and to cover that 25 per cent funding. I fully support the proposition, as it will improve the land; indeed, if nothing is done at this time, I believe that about \$32 million per year will be lost in agricultural income to that region and to South Australia.

I also note, as has the member for Ross Smith, that there will be appointments to the board. The Bill provides that people may be appointed to the board for any term of office, providing that it does not exceed four years. That will allow expertise to be brought on to the board as and when needed. As a result of that, it has the flexibility required. This drain will be of benefit to all the South-East. When the drain is brought to fruition, I will be interested to see where the outlet

will be sited. At the time the submission was made, there were two suggestions—either into the Coorong or through the sandhills and out into the sea. It will be interesting to note the result of subsequent discussions. I support this Bill, which will have a beneficial effect on farmers in the South-East.

Mr KERIN (Frome): I support the Bill and commend the Minister and the Government for their commitment to the Upper South-East Dry Land Salinity and Flood Management Program. This program is important to the sustainability of land use in the area and vital to the future productivity of primary production in the Upper South-East. It will allow land-holders to share in the prosperity that will be enjoyed by primary industries in future years. The problem with this program, as with many others, is that someone had to make the hard decisions as to who pays for the program. I congratulate the Minister for progressing the program with the payment plan as proposed, which is a mixture of State, Federal, local government and land-holder funding.

The amendments provide for the collection of a levy from land-holders by the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board; the levy will be collected from properties in excess of 10 hectares, the rate being set by the Minister on advice from the board and guided by public consultation. I congratulate the Minister on his initiative. This program is vital to the future viability of the region and, no doubt, land-holders in future years will reflect on the Minister as a man of vision, which indeed he is. I congratulate him and commend the Bill to the House.

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

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. D.S. BAKER (Minister for Primary Industries): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):

The purpose of my rising to my feet today is very simple. I will speak about the events of the weekend and late last week because I know that members want to hear it again. I refer to the interjections that occurred during the Leader of the Opposition's contribution earlier today. There were all sorts of interjections and frivolous points of order simply because members opposite wanted to stifle the Leader of the Opposition's remarks about the splits that are starting to appear in this Government.

Those splits are huge; in fact, they are wider than the divide between our two front benches. It is most appropriate that on the floor of this House we see the red blood line between the two opposing camps. Ordinarily, the two opposing camps would be the Government and the Opposition. But, in this instance, it is just as well that there are two sword lengths between certain members of the Government sitting on this side of the House and members of the Government sitting on the other side. In particular, I refer to the Minister for Infrastructure—otherwise known as Banquo the ghost—and the member for Coles—otherwise known as Lady MacBeth—who did a superb job on the Minister for Infrastructure over the weekend.

It is the first time that I read the *Sunday Mail* with glee. Usually, when I pick up the *Sunday Mail*, my hand trembles. When I picked up the *Sunday Mail* on the weekend, I saw 'Backstabber' as the headline, and I thought, 'Which one on

our side is to blame for something or other? It must be another investigation into one of our internal factional discussions.' Lo and behold, on this occasion I found that the political reporter for the *Sunday Mail* was very astute—I suppose you cannot be wrong the whole of your life—because he did an outstanding job of analysis. I thought, 'There is not much that could top a *Sunday Mail* headline 'Backstabber' in reference to the Liberal Party and the machinations within the Liberal Party of last week.' I will come to that shortly. I thought, 'I have lived 44 years and I did not think I would see anything as good as that in the *Sunday Mail*'. I thought that nothing could top that.

At 6.30 on Monday morning I went looking for my *Advertiser* on the front lawn and, as I did so, I thought that the *Advertiser* was bound to try to correct the *Sunday Mail*. By this time I thought the Liberal Party apparatchiks would have been working overtime within the *Advertiser* to fix things up. The front page headline was 'Backstabber identifies herself'. I thought, 'This is the only time in history that Brutus has revealed himself before plunging in the dagger. This is the first time Brutus has revealed himself before the dagger went right between the rib cage'. In fact, it would not have been between the rib cage; it would have been right in the back, right in the spine. That is where it was. I thought, 'I have had two magnificent days because I never thought I would see the *Sunday Mail* followed by the *Advertiser* reporting on the internal machinations within the Liberal Party.

It is true that on Wednesday last week we saw the Premier distance himself markedly from the Minister for Infrastructure, otherwise known as Banquo the ghost. As I have said, the member for Coles is otherwise known as Lady MacBeth. That is the analogy I would draw. During Question Time on Wednesday, instead of forcibly saying he supported his Minister for Infrastructure, the Premier said, 'I am advised by the Minister for Infrastructure. . . ' and 'I have been told by the Minister for Infrastructure. . . '. At the time, I interjected across the Chamber to the Minister and said, 'You have just been shoved right up to the pointy end.' In other words, the Premier was preparing to clear the decks and would see the Minister off at a time of convenience.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: The member for Mawson interjects and says that what I am saying is rubbish. The problem for the member for Mawson is that our phones were running hot. The telephone of the Leader of the Opposition and my own were ringing hot with a blow by blow account of all meetings held within the Liberal Party in the different Caucus rooms within Parliament House, and in particular the Caucus held by the Olsen supporters at the Festival Lodge Motel, where the member for Newland was already preening herself to assume office if called upon.

At the same time the floor was being anointed with oil by the member for Coles to make sure, because the member for Coles was berating the Premier. She was saying, 'Show you have some guts, Premier. This is the time, once and for all, to get rid of this person who is the only danger to your continued leadership of the Liberal Party. This is the time to slip it right into him and force him into a position of resignation.' This Government has been in office for 23 months, and I would have thought that the Liberal Party would want to cherish every one of those days because largely it has been irrelevant for the past 20 years as it has been in its rightful spot in Opposition. It was a very good Opposition and deserves to be in Opposition again, as it will be in two years.

Mr Leggett interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: The member for Hanson can interject as much and as loudly as he likes. He may as well get his name in *Hansard* as often as he can between now and 1997, because he will no longer be here after 1997 and his name will no longer appear on the record of this place. I know that the member for Hanson hates being referred to as 'a oncer' and I try to avoid that term as he finds it offensive, but he is a oncer. He is a goner, as is the member for Lee and a number of others—I do not have time to list all the Government members who will go out in 1997. I would have thought that the Liberal Party would cherish every day it is in Government. When a little bit of pressure is put on, with regard to EDS or the water contract, when the Bunsen burner is turned up—we have passed the orange flame and we are up to the blue flame, but it is not quite white hot yet—members opposite buckle. Members opposite cannot even hang together on philosophical grounds. They all believe in privatisation, but they are such a cauldron of petty hatred and jealousies, based on personality disputes, that they find it impossible to hang it together. A Government with a majority larger than any other Parliament this side of Singapore and they still cannot get their act together!

Members opposite comprise a simmering cauldron of petty jealousies, fiefdoms and factional heavyweights, and they cannot wait to shove the knife into one another before they run to the Opposition and give us a blow by blow description of every insult they have hurled at one another, while telling us which of the journalists they are cultivating to get their message across. Is it not magnificent that, within 23 months, a Government that at one stage looked as solid as the German Democratic Republic seemingly looked prior to the fall of the Berlin Wall is now crumbling?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I thank the honourable member for that Grimm fairytale.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I place on record the extraordinary support for youth given by an outstanding policeman, Constable John Hookings, of Streaky Bay, who in his own time and at his own expense has given the youth of Streaky Bay opportunities for socialising and for learning the art of sailing. When Constable John Hookings arrived in Streaky Bay in October 1992 there were no sailing activities at the sheltered seaport and no blue light discos. I am sure that all members are aware that police officers at their own expense run blue light discos as supervised entertainment for youth. John's first involvement was driving bus loads of children to blue light discos at Wudinna—a round trip of 298 kms. He assisted with supervision at the discos and then drove the children back to Streaky Bay, dropping them off at their homes.

In June 1993 Constable Hookings started a school intervention program, which addresses important issues involving police and youth. He speaks regularly to about 200 children from reception to year 12 in a program designed to encourage resistance to drug and alcohol abuse and to educate children to realise that the police are friends and not the adversary that some people make them out to be. The program has been warmly received by both the students and the community. In August 1993 John asked a class whether they would be interested in learning to sail, and two thirds of the class responded, causing him to telephone his various contacts around the State to lease or borrow a couple of sailing dinghies to get started.

Ross Haldane from Port Lincoln Yacht Club invited John and four children to participate in a sailing workshop at Port Lincoln the following month. The four children were selected from the 20 who wanted to go by drawing names out of a hat. It was the first time that any of the four had been sailing. The party camped in disused quarters above the Port Lincoln police station, rough but adequate. The group returned to Streaky Bay with two Holdfast trainers lent to them by the Port Lincoln Yacht Club.

Constable Hooking's reasons for being involved in sailing at Streaky Bay are: as a crime prevention strategy; to reintroduce sailing to Streaky Bay; to discourage children from drug and alcohol abuse; and to give children a supervised place to meet on Friday nights rather than hanging around outside the local hotel. Sundays from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. was the meeting time, and 12 children attended the first day of sailing on the second Sunday in September 1993. The children had never sailed, even though they had lived on the coast all their lives, and John found that it was necessary for him to get into the Holdfast trainer with them to show them how to sail. If members saw how big John is, they would realise how difficult this was with a crew.

In the following month (October 1993) Genevieve White, Junior Development Officer for Yachting SA, advised John of an old Heron sailing dinghy at Clayton, 850 kms away, which could be loaned to the club. John drove to Clayton, collected the boat and towed it back to Streaky Bay the following weekend and then spent six weeks refurbishing it to make it look like new. The children had an official launch, naming the dinghy *Bay Cruiser*. The addition of the Heron meant that eight children could be out on the water at the same time—four in the Heron and two in each of the Holdfast trainers. They were a bit squashed; however, the object was to have children sailing, and this was the only way to get them out on the water. The result was mayhem. None of the children could sail, and John realised that he was trying to get the children to run before they could walk. He could not be in three places at once. Even though John has been involved in sailing for a long time, it was his first attempt at teaching others to sail, but perseverance won out.

The group, called the Streaky Bay Police Sailing Squad, consisted of 12 children, aged from eight to 14 years, and Constable Hookings. The squad was given the use of an empty council building called the Shamble Shack, rent free, for clubrooms. This was a bonus for the squad, which had no bank account and no financial backing. Right from the start the children were encouraged to work as a team and to help each other. They lift the dinghies on to a cart at the Shamble Shack and then push the boats to the beach, which is about a kilometre away. There they rig the dinghies and go sailing. At the end of the day the children return the dinghies to the shack, wash down the equipment and pack everything away.

In April 1994 Constable Hookings began training nights every Friday from 7 p.m. to 8.30 p.m. to teach the children basic sailing theory and how to tie knots. The following month they began refurbishing one of the Holdfast trainers, sanding back the hulls to bare wood. There has been 75 to 100 per cent attendance on these training nights, with some children who are not interested in sailing coming along just to work on the boat.

Insurance was a major concern. Inquiries showed that public liability insurance was too expensive for a group with no financial backing and no funds. The hurdle was overcome in June 1994 when the sailing scheme was incorporated with the blue light organisation and was renamed Streaky Bay

Blue Light Incorporated. Its activities include sail training, boat handling, discos and camps. Having no rescue boat was another hurdle. A submission to Streaky Bay District Council resulted in Streaky Bay Foreshore Tourist Park, owned by the council, sponsoring a four metre rigid hull inflatable dinghy. Blancheport Fisheries, a local seafood processing company, sponsored a 25 horsepower outboard motor for the boat.

Streaky Bay Blue Light sailing team has represented the town three times in regional teams racing championships. It has been a good learning experience being involved in sailing at that level. In January this year Streaky Bay Kiwanis Club sponsored the purchase of two Puffin Pacers from Port Lincoln Yacht Club. Eighteen children aged from 5 to 17 years are now in the club. The children raised funds through catering and washing dishes at community functions to pay for a custom trailer to transport the rescue boat and two sailing dinghies. This will allow greater mobility for the children to compete in events.

While Constable Hookings praises the help given to him by Ross Haldane and Genevieve White particularly, this very positive work for the benefit of children and youth would not exist but for his commitment and enthusiasm. Since the start of the scheme just two years ago, Constable Hookings has conducted five blue light sail training camps and has introduced to sailing 40 children at Streaky Bay. Their present resources consist of seven boats in five classes. It would be greater value to have four or five boats of the same class. However, the first priority is to get the young people out on the water. The initiative and enthusiasm of Constable Hookings, his supporters and his team are to be commended, and are an example to us all. I know from my own children how the discipline, training, responsibility and team work needed to sail are qualities that are an excellent preparation for life.

In the time left, I want to speak about other opportunities in the electorate of Flinders. Eyre Peninsula and Kangaroo Island are not all about agriculture and aquaculture: we have other advantages that visitors envy, and one of these is our national parks. I understand that my electorate has more national parks than any other electorate in the State. Again, the potential to market these attractions is only just being realised. The first concern is the protection of the environment, then comes the removal of feral animals and plants, and then planned public usage. Interest in the parks has been fostered through the Friends of the Parks program. These groups are invaluable in expanding and extending the work that rangers are able to do.

On Eyre Peninsula, neighbouring councils are integrating approaches to development of facilities for visitors so that people have a wide range of wilderness to explore. Walking trails head the top of the list. The Endeavour walking trail in Lincoln National Park will eventually encircle the park, allowing many kilometres of ocean coastline to be observed by walkers. Coffin Bay also has walking trails, and Elliston District Council is coordinating the development of rest and toilet facilities, especially in its coastal reserves. The State Government is a strong supporter of protection of the environment, as evidenced by a \$30 000 grant recently provided for a viewing platform at Point Labatt Conservation Park in the Streaky Bay District Council. Point Labatt is home to a breeding colony of Australian sea lions—one of the rarest seal species in the world, with distribution limited to South Australia and Western Australian coasts.

Observations by officers of the Department for Environment and Natural Resources since the 1960s noted a decline

in the sea lion population, using Point Labatt. The erection of a stone wall in mid-1994 to prevent access to the beach reversed the trend and the restricted access, coupled with a viewing platform to protect the cliff edge, will see the sea lion population continue to increase. Along with the unique flora and fauna of these parks and reserves, we present an area of international significance in ecotourism. I quote from a letter from a constituent, Mr Dennis Chinner, of Coffin Bay, as follows:

Your recent activities in conjunction with the Minister for the Environment were a good move.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.8 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 29 November at 2 p.m.