

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 14 February 1996

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

STATE BANK

The **Hon. DEAN BROWN (Premier)**: I table a ministerial statement from the Attorney-General about the settlement between the State Government and the non-Executive directors of the State Bank over the State Bank issue.

KANGAROO ISLAND RESCUE

The **Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D.C. WOTTON**: On the afternoon of Sunday 11 February, an Austrian tourist fell from Remarkable Rocks, Kangaroo Island, into some of the most treacherous sea along the South Australian coastline. The incident occurred in an area that has claimed a number of lives previously and where danger signs urge visitors to exercise extreme caution, not only because of the violent nature of the sea but because of shark infestations which prey on a nearby seal colony. What could have become another tragedy was averted by the actions of an employee of the National Parks and Wildlife Service who put the life of another above his own.

Chris Bald is a fourth generation islander and a park assistant at Flinders Chase National Park. He is also an accomplished surfer. Despite the local district ranger being only too aware of the risk involved in allowing Mr Bald to attempt the rescue, Mr Bald insisted on trying because of the time it would take to enact alternative rescue methods. Chris Bald is a hero in the true sense of the word. In a race against time, he turned likely tragedy into triumph. He put the life of somebody else above his own. He has brought international recognition upon this State, and he has done the National Parks and Wildlife Service proud.

When we look for heroes, we often look to the police, firefighters and ambulance services. But let us not forget that those employed by other services make sacrifices as well. Not too long ago, a ranger at Belair, Mr Stichel, lost his own house to fire while fighting another fire elsewhere. I note the support by the Friends of Parks groups who have rallied to help Mr Stichel by sending donations from as far as the South-East. As far as Mr Bald goes, I have great pleasure in nominating him for a bravery award. It seems to me that the efforts of Mr Bald epitomise what true Aussie spirit is all about.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr **CUMMINS (Norwood)**: I bring up the eighteenth report of the committee and move:

That the report be received and read.

Motion carried.

Mr **CUMMINS**: I bring up the nineteenth report of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

UNITED WATER

Mr **FOLEY (Hart)**: My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure. Why did United Water fail to comply with its legal obligation to contact the Environment Protection Authority about a major leak from the Bolivar treatment works of effluent into a freshwater creek and nearby mangrove swamps? On Friday 2 February, a major flow of partially treated sewage leaked from the Bolivar treatment works through land owned by Penrice Soda Products and into the environmentally sensitive samphire mangrove swamps. However, the Environment Protection Authority was not notified until four days later—not by United Water but by a radio program. The EPA's principal adviser on waste water, Mr Neil Palmer, has reported that damage from the leak, which stretched for over half a kilometre, has killed off fish and other aquatic life, reeds, grass and has polluted mangrove swamps on land adjacent to Bolivar.

The **Hon. J.W. OLSEN**: If the member for Hart refers to the ABC report on the Murray Nicolls' program on Friday afternoon, he will get a detailed explanation by the EPA as to how it accepts the circumstances and the corrective action undertaken by United Water. I would have thought this was an issue of last week not this week.

CANCER TREATMENT

Mr **LEGGETT (Hanson)**: Can the Premier advise the House of action taken by the Government to improve treatment for cancer patients at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The **Hon. DEAN BROWN**: I am delighted that the member for Hanson has raised this issue, because the Federal Labor candidate in his area, the area of Hindmarsh, David Abfalter, has put out a pamphlet, and I have raised matters in this Parliament concerning how inaccurate it is and how, in fact, it contains straight-out lies. In that pamphlet Mr Abfalter has concocted a graph—literally concocted a graph—with no relevance to the truth whatsoever. In the same pamphlet, in which he is accusing the Liberal Government of actually cutting money for health services and taking money that the Federal Government is allocating to health services in South Australia and using it for other purposes, he has a photograph of himself, with two cancer patients, at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The clear implication is that this Government has downgraded cancer treatment facilities at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Let us look at the facts, because there is Mr Abfalter trying to tell the people of Hindmarsh—another of Labor's liars—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not have the call.

The **Hon. DEAN BROWN**: It's just that we like to deal with the truth. If Labor candidates are out there telling lies, I am prepared to stand up in this Parliament and highlight that they are no more than Labor liars. As I said, we have this heading and a photograph of David Abfalter chatting with cancer patients at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The truth of the matter is that we have substantially improved cancer treatment services at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. We have

established a comprehensive cancer service—one of the few such services in the whole of Australia.

In 1995 alone the Government approved spending of \$3 775 000 to upgrade cancer service facilities at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. We have put the following disciplines into that service: radiotherapy and medical physics; and medical oncology, haematology cancer/bone marrow transplants, and breast endocrine and surgical oncology. In addition to the \$3.77 million we spent last year alone, the Health Commission has recently approved the spending of a further \$670 000 to support the purchase of a new radiotherapy simulator with CT (CAT) scanning options. In addition—and this is all on top of the money already spent—a new cancer service utilising telemedicine technology has been established between the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Royal Darwin Hospital. In fact, as a centre of excellence for the whole of Australia we will use the Royal Adelaide Hospital to help treat patients on an ongoing basis at the Royal Darwin Hospital. In fact, late last year I was delighted to join with the Minister for Health to be part of that major conference and announcement.

However, in addition to that expenditure, the IMVS has received approval for an automated cytology unit, which is used in the early detection of cancer, and that will be at a cost of about \$500 000. The House can see that over the past 15 months the Government has put about \$5 million into improving cancer treatment at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. So, how can David Abfalder come out and claim that the Government is trying to downgrade cancer treatment at the Royal Adelaide Hospital when exactly the opposite is true? Let us be quite clear: the Labor Party is prepared to tell any lies it possibly can to try to win the coming Federal election, in exactly the same way it did at the last State election. It failed then. The one service that will fail is Labor lights—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Gordon is not helping the cause. I suggest to the Deputy Leader that he go out and enjoy the sunlight and have a cup of coffee, because otherwise he will be forced to go out and enjoy the sunshine.

UNITED WATER

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure. Has United Water breached the conditions of its contract by not notifying the Environment Protection Authority about a major sewage leak from Bolivar? What penalties apply and what action will be taken? The major leak on 2 February of partly treated sewage into the environmentally sensitive mangrove swamps, under law, requires immediate notification to the EPA. United Water's Northern Regional Manager, Mr David Williams, told radio last week that the managers at Bolivar, 'Didn't understand fully the reporting requirements under the EPA Act and they didn't report it.' On 6 February the Minister told the House in specific reference to Bolivar that United Water is 'meeting the higher performance standards locked into this contract', and 'they are contractual requirements, the EPA requirements, which apply higher standards than applied to South Australian water in the past'. Mr Williams also said that the Bolivar work force had been halved since United Water took over on 1 January.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member was commenting at the end of his question.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The spill occurred as a result of a breakdown of equipment at Bolivar. Of course, that

equipment is owned by the taxpayers of South Australia. United Water undertook action when it became aware of the spill. It has had discussions with the EPA—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Protocols are in place and, as reported by the EPA on radio last Friday, it is satisfied with the response of United Water and corrective action has been taken.

STATE TAXATION

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Treasurer update the House on the work being undertaken by the State Taxation Office to improve compliance procedures? In the 1995-96 State budget, specific reference was made to the allocation of funding to boost compliance programs.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: This is a matter in which every member of the House should have an interest because, if people are not paying their taxation, someone else bears the burden. One of the areas we have been concerned about for some time is compliance. I congratulate the State Taxation Office on the endeavours it has made over the past 12 months to key resources into this area. The State Taxation Office has enjoyed a reputation of being very supportive. It attempts to answer queries and questions as quickly as possible. It enjoys a good reputation amongst the business community because of its capacity, whenever there is a difficulty, to work through that difficulty with a client.

In early December 1995, we sent out about 8 900 letters in respect of land tax. The formula for sending those letters revolved around whether there was consistency amongst Government records. We ran the ETSA records of bill paying against the ownership records of the Lands Title Office. Where there were anomalies a letter was sent out which requested people to confirm that they were truly exempt for land tax purposes. Of the 8 900 letters sent out, we believe that approximately 3 000 landholders are no longer exempt. So, about a third of those people who received letters will be paying their just dues.

Some of those people had outstanding tax going back four years. The Government finds this unacceptable. But, given that there is some confusion about rights and responsibilities, the fact is that in many households people have not done the right thing about notification when there has been a change of circumstances. We have been constructive in the sense that we will not pursue back penalty taxes, but we will ensure that they do comply in future. From that point of view, the State Taxation Office has had a very successful campaign. We are assured that more people will understand their rights and responsibilities in terms of any claim for exemption under residential status. The program will net the State Taxation Office approximately \$1 million. I congratulate the State Taxation Office on its efforts.

UNITED WATER

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. What action has the EPA taken to ensure the clean up of the area polluted by United Water's half a kilometre spillage from the Bolivar treatment works, and what penalties will be applied to United Water under the EPA Act? The 1993 Environmental Protection Act lists a range of offences and penalties against those found to have polluted the environment as well

as powers to enforce a clean up. Penalties under the Act for offences relating to the pollution of the environment range from \$250 000 to \$1 million.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: First, I thank the Opposition for a question on the environment, as it is the first one that I have had since 7 April last year.

Members interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Minister has deliberately misled the House in that he knows that he receives a number of questions on notice.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition and other members know that that is a frivolous point of order and, therefore, is completely out of order. The Deputy Leader and other members who take points of order of that kind do nothing to improve the standards of the House.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I should like to raise another point of order, Mr Speaker. That was the first one. The second is that, if he wishes to accuse someone of deliberately misleading the House, as everyone is well aware, that has to be done by way of substantive motion. It is about time he learnt a few lessons.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the Deputy Premier has adopted the same tactic as was used by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in that he went far beyond a point of order. All comments which impute improper motives to anyone are out of order. The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The information that I have is that the EPA is perfectly satisfied with the response that it has received from United Water. As the Minister for Infrastructure has indicated, as a result of the discussions that have occurred, appropriate protocols have been put in place. I believe that the member for Hart is over-estimating the situation. After all, I understand that we are talking about an area of 50 square metres. I am informed that, as far as the EPA is concerned, United Water has given its full support to the environmental requirements and is satisfied with the protocols that are now in place.

Mr Clarke: No penalty.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a penalty under Standing Order 137.

TOURISM, MEDIA COVERAGE

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Will the Minister for Tourism explain the steps taken by the South Australian Tourism Commission to secure high level national and international media promotion of South Australia, and what is the worth of this media coverage?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: You will get another story today: it is a better one. I thank the member for Colton for his question. There are two very important issues that Parliament needs to know about. The first relates to the media trade familiarisation and visiting journalists programs which the Tourism Commission runs. We spend about \$390 000 a year inviting trade operators and journalists into this State and sending them out, particularly into regional areas, so that they can look at those regional areas, write articles and talk about them. It has been estimated that that advertising unit has brought in \$80 million worth of economic coverage for the State. Yesterday I talked about Major Events bringing in

\$8 million. This particular program, for just under \$400 000, is bringing \$80 million worth of coverage to South Australia. That means that in every major tourism journal in the world in the past 12 months we have had feature articles written about South Australia because of these programs. That is what this program is about.

The second point to which I should like to draw the attention of the House is the Federal Liberal Party's tourism policy, which was released yesterday. For the first time in the history of Australia tourism is being given the same status as an industry as the manufacturing, mining and agricultural industries. That means that all export facilitation programs and export grants can now be made available to all South Australian—

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Will you rule whether the Minister is responsible to the House of Assembly for the Federal Liberal Party's tourism policy?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The South Australian Minister is not responsible for Federal policy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Therefore, if the Minister is going to comment on these matters, he must link up his remarks in relation to the operation of the South Australian tourism policy.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Mr Speaker, I thank you for those words.

The SPEAKER: The Minister has no alternative.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The relativity is that all businesses involved in the South Australian tourism industry now have an opportunity, for the first time, to be part of the export marketing grants, and that means that, instead of our being left out of this whole marketing grant area, worth about \$5 million in grants a year to the South Australian tourism industry, we can now be part of it. A status is being granted that will flow through to all businesses in South Australia, and this is the sort of policy we need in our tourism industry.

UNITED WATER

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Has the Minister for Infrastructure investigated why the probity auditor responsible for the water contract left work early at 6 p.m. on 4 October, knowing that final bids from the two companies were being copied and distributed before the United Water bid was lodged, did the auditor act prudently, and what explanation has been given to the Minister? The report by the Crown Solicitor into events surrounding the lodgement of final bids states that the probity auditor from Deloitte was aware that other bids would be opened, copied and distributed before the United Water bid was received, and that the probity auditor raised no objection before leaving for home at 6 p.m.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Solicitor-General has already looked at and reported on this matter. I understand that today the Prime Minister released his major policy speech; I also understand that the Government has released details relating to the directors of the State Bank, and it is therefore a tight news day and, on tight news days, usually you do not put up your best questions. That is certainly the case today, because we are hearing some old, recycled questions simply to fill in Question Time. The matter to which the member for Hart refers has been reported on by the Solicitor-General. In addition, yesterday I referred to a letter I had received from MacQuarie Bank ticking off the process in South Australia.

LETA '96

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): Will the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development advise the House of some of the highlights of the major national conference, LETA '96, that support the Government's vision for economic development in South Australia? I understand that, this morning, the Minister launched this major national conference on education and technology.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Adelaide will be an international showcase for technological innovations in education through the Learning Environment Technology Australia conference, LETA '96, to be held from 29 September to 4 October. The driving force behind LETA '96 is and has been MFP Australia. It is a prime example of how MFP can provide a focus for economic, scientific and technological developments of international significance, show-casing South Australia not only nationally but internationally. The first of these conferences was held two years ago and attracted in excess of 800 participants.

This year organisers are expecting, given indications of interest, between 1 500 and 2 000 participants at the conference for September-October. The conference will cover topics such as multimedia, technology and health education, women in technology, work force reskilling, and whole-of-life learning. Malaysia's Deputy Prime Minister will be a speaker at the conference, as will the head of the Silicon Valley-based Collaborative Economics, Doug Henton, and that indicates clearly and showcases the level of importance this conference has established in a very short history.

LETA '96 will also include the international development program Education Australia, which will attract more than 650 delegates from Australia, New Zealand and the Asia-Pacific region to discuss the impact of new learning technologies on the delivery of education within the region. In summary, LETA '96 is a great chance to profile South Australia as a reliable provider of innovative solutions and quality education.

WATER SUPPLY, COUNTRY

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Minister for Infrastructure advise the name of the probity auditor overseeing the contract process for the \$300 million build-own-operate schemes for country water systems, and is this the same consultant from Deloitte Tohmatsu, who knocked off early before the final United Water bid and received criticism from the Solicitor-General.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart is commenting. He has now had two years experience in the House, and he was clearly in breach of the rule—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: That includes the member for Giles, who is very experienced. The member for Hart knows full well that to go on commenting in questions will attract the attention of the Speaker. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The \$300 million BOO project was started last year prior to the conclusion of the water outsourcing contract, and Deloitte is the probity auditor on the \$300 million contract.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Obviously the member for Hart does not understand it. The board of SA Water, which is responsible for this matter, has also called in and appointed

additional probity auditors to ensure the probity and integrity of the BOO project.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister and two members are having a discussion. I suggest that they cease forthwith. The member for Unley has the call, and I do not want him disrupted.

VEHICLE EMISSIONS

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources advise what efforts are being made to help cut extensive smoke emissions from vehicles on South Australian roads? There have been numerous comments this morning about smog levels in the metropolitan area, and research shows that vehicle emissions are the dominant contributor, at least on the Adelaide Plains, to air pollution.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I thank the honourable member for his question. As he would realise, South Australia is renowned for its relatively unpolluted atmosphere. Certainly tourists and investors from South-East Asia recognise the State's clean air and open space, which enhance the quality of life and provide another reason why South Australia is a good place in which to do business and to which to relocate. According to the EPA, smog levels were elevated in some areas this morning but were well below national levels. With most industries now having strict licensing conditions over their emissions, much of the smog can be attributed to poorly maintained vehicles. Exhaust emissions have become the major focus of the Environment Protection Authority, which is attempting to reinforce the fact that people with cars have an environmental obligation to maintain them correctly.

A seven week program towards the end of last year detected some 204 vehicles in metropolitan Adelaide with excessive smoke emissions. A further 35 vehicles were defected by police. As part of the campaign the owners of these 204 vehicles were sent letters by the EPA informing them of smoke levels and asking them whether they would address this defect. Questionnaires were then sent to the owners asking what action had been taken. Of those who responded, 41 per cent had a mechanic repair the vehicle, 23 per cent repaired the vehicle themselves and 16 per cent sought advice. Only 6 per cent said that they took no action, which I think shows that most motorists are aware of their obligations.

Following the success of last year's smoky vehicle campaign and its support by the community, officers of the EPA are planning another campaign for the end of this month, which certainly has my support. During this period owners of offending vehicles that emit smoke again will receive a letter from the EPA and come under close scrutiny from police. I suggest that it is now a good time to tune up our vehicles and ensure that we recognise the responsibility we have as vehicle owners.

WATER SUPPLY, COUNTRY

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is again directed to the Minister for Infrastructure. Why has the Government rehired the same company as probity auditors to oversee the process for the build-own-operate schemes, given the Crown

Solicitor's criticism of this company's handling of the earlier water contract? The Crown Solicitor said—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are interjections on my right.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. I will start the explanation again. The Crown Solicitor said:

I think that the probity auditor was in error in not requiring that the other proponents be informed that a submission would be late. I think that it is also unfortunate that he left the building before all submissions had been received.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Obviously, the member for Hart is a little hard of hearing, because he asked me this question a moment ago, and I indicated that Deloitte was appointed for the BOO project months ago but that the board of SA Water had taken the diligent step of appointing additional probity auditors to ensure that the unfounded false accusations and allegations thrown across this Chamber by members such as the member for Hart will, at the end of the day, have no substance.

Mr Foley interjecting:

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

PORT ADELAIDE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Will the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations outline the latest proposals for the Port Adelaide project and say whether criticism of the proposal by the member for Hart is justified?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I must admit that I was very surprised at the reaction by the member for Hart to the announcement yesterday about the Port Adelaide development. It is in his electorate and, as I said, I cannot understand it. Obviously, the next thing the honourable member will do is say that Port Adelaide should not go into the AFL—that is how negative he is. I noted that, despite the local member's not being interested—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart will come to order.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: —the Labor Senate candidate, Deidre Tedmons, tried very hard yesterday on the ABC to get some credit for the proposal that I announced. The previous Labor Government achieved very little at Port Adelaide, so perhaps the member for Hart is embarrassed by the record of his previous Government. Let us also not overlook the fact that yesterday he said in the *Advertiser*:

The Port Adelaide people have been promised so much but delivered so little.

You only have to look at the local member to see how little they have got out of the promises there. Of course, during all the years in which members opposite were in Government they did absolutely nothing at Port Adelaide. Let us have a look at the facts as far as this project is concerned. First—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: The honourable member is trying to say that it is up in the air, that it is not there. Well, let us have a look at what is there. First, the Urban Projects Authority has begun design work for some 300 metres of public promenade along the waterfront from Birkenhead Bridge to the end of No. 3 berth. The promenade development will see the existing bituminised wharf front paved and the addition—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: For the honourable member's benefit, I have actually been down there to have a good close look at what we are doing. We will have a promenade with lighting and seating. The money has already been allocated. We will still be able to use the area to accommodate events, and the important thing is that the money is committed. The Urban Projects Authority in conjunction with the Port Adelaide Community Art Centre is already working with an art consultant to incorporate public art in the final design of the promenade. Through this artist, a community consultation process has been undertaken to capture the creative expression of the waterfront's history and character, to enhance its appeal to the local community and to add to what will be a vibrant tourist attraction. As I have said, preliminary work has already commenced, and construction work will commence in May this year.

Let us have a look at the second fact. Work on the nearby 140 dwelling Harborside Quay development is also progressing with planning approval now in place. Development commencement is dependent only upon the finalisation of soil remediation, which is being undertaken in conjunction with the environmental and health authorities, and we are only awaiting final approval from the EPA to proceed. So, again, it is hardly pie in the sky stuff; it is actually under way.

Finally, after a lot of hard work by the UPA—and I give it full credit for this—agreement has been reached between the State Government and a group of local businessmen (Lipson Wharf Pty Ltd) to investigate a \$15 million development.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I understand the embarrassment of members opposite. They were in power for so long but did absolutely nothing, while this Government—

Ms White interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Taylor will cease interjecting. There seem to be two debates taking place in the House: one from the corner and the other from the Minister. It will come to an end. The Minister.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Because of the UPA's hard work, a company by the name of Lipson Wharf Pty Ltd is investigating a \$15 million development of a commercial and tourist facility on the site of sheds 2 and 3 at Port Adelaide. Those investigations will demonstrate the viability of the proposals and their compatibility with the Development Act. We have already begun tests of the soil and foundation conditions on the site, which is next to the lighthouse on the Port Adelaide waterfront. We are looking at the development of outdoor cafes, dining facilities and a whole range of retail facilities. It really is an exciting project. I certainly hope that it comes to fruition to complement all the work that we have already instigated in that area.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Health.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth has the call. She does not need any assistance.

Ms STEVENS: Has the Auditor-General cleared the process for the billion dollar privatisation of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and has he been advised of the Government's failure to appoint a probity auditor? The Opposition has a leaked Government document called 'The structure and

time frame for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital private development project', which states:

The probity auditor or white knight would be appointed before expressions of interest were called.

Yesterday, the Minister revealed that the probity auditor had not been appointed even though expressions of interest had been advertised—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms STEVENS:—on 20 January and negotiations would close at the commencement of the following week. The Leader of the Opposition has written to the Auditor-General seeking confirmation that the Auditor-General has cleared the process for this project and asking whether the probity auditor should have been appointed before the negotiations began.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The simple fact of the matter is that the process announced by the Premier was quite clear. That process will be used in projects in which the Government is involved. I mentioned yesterday that there are some legal matters which potentially we are looking at regarding the appointment of a professional auditing firm in this capacity. Thus far, the only process that has been undertaken in relation to the major redevelopment of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital campus, which was ignored year after year by the previous Government, is the insertion of an advertisement. I am not stupid enough to suggest that the calibre of person we are looking at for this important position will want to make sure that the cheque to the *Advertiser* was sent on time.

GRAIN BUNKER FIRE

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): My question is directed to the Minister for Emergency Services. What is the estimated loss or damage arising from the grain bunker shed fire at Taillem Bend last Sunday, and will the Minister say what caused it and what the damage might have been if we had not had the vital role of the disciplined, well trained, professional Country Fire Service volunteers—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the member for Ridley, who complained earlier about comment, that if he is not commenting he is very close to it.

Mr LEWIS: These volunteers were certainly more disciplined, trained and professional than members opposite. What might the damage have been if it had not been for the volunteers, who were quickly on the scene to control the fire?

The SPEAKER: The member for Ridley has breached the same Standing Orders as a number of other members. I suggest that he not do so again.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I can well understand the honourable member's enthusiasm for the CFS in his area, because the honourable member has been a long-time supporter of CFS groups within his electorate, and he is quite correct in describing their professionalism in the way he has. On numerous occasions I have had the opportunity and pleasure to rise in this House to commend Country Fire Service volunteers for their work in the community, and this is yet again another of those occasions worthy of public note. At 10.42 a.m. on Sunday, an employee of the Taillem Bend CBH silos, in a routine check of the grain storage site, found smoke coming from a grain storage shed. That shed was holding 24 000 tonnes of export market-grade barley, valued at \$5.8 million. Obviously, with that quantity of grain of that

value, in the event of fire, the potential for catastrophe is very real.

The Taillem Bend Country Fire Service was immediately called and it responded. In turn, it called for additional help from the Jervois and Murray Bridge CFS brigades. The local CFS crews and the CFS Regional Commander then assessed the situation, together with the technical staff from South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling. It was determined that carbon dioxide was the best way to extinguish the fire so that further damage was not caused to the remaining grain. A bulk tanker carrying 40 tonnes of CO₂ was ordered from Adelaide, along with an MFS technical crew and a hand-held thermal imaging camera. This piece of equipment is state-of-the-art technology that is capable of identifying the heart of a fire.

I will give members a mental image of the sorts of problems that were facing the crews. The fire was burning in a 10 metre high mountain of grain, and it was visually impossible to pinpoint the site of this fire. Therefore, the thermal imaging camera was used by the CFS crews to pinpoint exactly where the fire was smouldering. The fire was detected one metre below the surface in an area that was approximately 10 metres wide at one end of the storage shed. With the arrival of the bulk CO₂ tanker, CFS crews, wearing breathing apparatus and protective clothing, were able to commence cooling the outer edge of the fire using CO₂. Eventually the fire was extinguished, with the site being declared safe for crews to leave it unattended some 14 hours later, at 1 a.m. on Monday.

In total, I am advised that six tonnes of grain was destroyed, with a damage bill of just \$1 500. Given that \$5.8 million worth of grain was in that storage shed, it is a fantastic effort, through the response of the CFS crews, to have come away from that incident with just \$1 500 damage. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the CFS crews for the way in which they responded and used technology to combat this problem. These same units joined with many other units only a week before to battle the Tungkillio bushfire in the Adelaide Hills, and again they were dedicated to the task of saving life and property. It is incidents of this nature that highlight why this Government is so committed to expanding and protecting the State's volunteer organisations—a marked approach indeed to that which operated under the previous Government.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Why has the Government proceeded with the \$1 billion privatisation of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, called expressions of interest and commenced discussions with potential bidders before even deciding on the extent of the role of the Probity Auditor and whether the position should be part time? Yesterday, the Minister said that the Government was getting legal advice on whether the job could be part time to suit a business person with many other commitments around Australia. A leaked briefing note says that a white knight will be appointed to ensure 'there is a level playing field and fair play.'

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's question is very similar to a previous question.

Ms Stevens: Yes, but it is different.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will not answer the Chair back. I warn the honourable member that asking the same question dressed up slightly differently is not acceptable.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: If at first you do not succeed, try again. For the benefit of the member for Elizabeth, for members of her Party, for members of the Government and for everybody listening, we are not privatising the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. We have not privatised any hospital at all, despite the attempts by the Federal Labor Government in respect of the Department of Veterans Affairs. When it decided that it no longer wanted to provide health care to the veterans of our wars, what did it do? The very first thing the department did was offer for sale—not for private management—the veterans hospitals. In Western Australia and Queensland, those two hospitals have been completely sold—lock, stock and barrel. So that is what the Federal Labor Government thinks about privatising hospitals. It clearly thinks that it is a perfectly reasonable idea, because it has done it.

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker, under Standing Order 98, which provides that the Minister has to answer the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth's question related to the privatisation of the hospital and other matters. The Minister is responding as he thinks fit; therefore, the point of order cannot be upheld.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The process of privatisation of hospitals has become a *cause celebre* with the Keating-Carmen Lawrence axis, because that is what they have done. We are not prepared to do that. What we have done is look at totally different solutions to the same problem. We have not privatised any hospital in South Australia, and we will not do so. Once again, I draw the attention of the member for Elizabeth and that of members of her Party to the most recent of these exercises undertaken by the Government, that is, at Port Augusta. What happened at Port Augusta? I have told the member for Elizabeth before. It does not seem to get through to her, but I will reiterate it: in Port Augusta, where there was direct competition between the private and public sectors for managing the public hospital, the public sector won the bid. Why? Because it was the best. That indicates that the Government has absolutely no ideological blinkers. All we are interested in is providing world-quality services cost effectively, and we are not constrained as to who might do that. I reiterate: we are not privatising the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

HEALTHPLUS

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Gordon): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Does the South Australian Healthplus program have the support of the Federal Government and of the South Australian local health professionals?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Gordon for his question, because it is a particularly interesting one, given that yesterday a series of questions was asked; in fact, all 10 questions yesterday were based around this matter. Perhaps the fact that no questions have been asked on that matter today indicates that yesterday was basically a beat up—which we all know. In particular, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the coordinated care process of the Council of Australian Governments has been run by Carmen Lawrence. We all know that Carmen Lawrence has trouble with her memory; that was very publicly documented last year. It would appear as though she has another bad case of memory lapse in trying to put the kybosh on this project, because there is no question that all

the questions asked yesterday were written in Carmen Lawrence's office.

I wish to take members back to 26 October 1995. I have a media release from Dr Carmen Lawrence headed 'Coordinated care trials embraced', and I wish to read to the House what Carmen Lawrence then thought about coordinated care trials and contrast that with her efforts now to pull the rug out from underneath the feet of Healthplus, which perhaps one could say is done for narrow and base political reasons. Last year Carmen Lawrence said:

These trials will be cooperative ventures between Federal and State Governments and test new approaches to the delivery of health care services. This approach will strengthen Medicare and has the potential to benefit a significant number of Australians.

So far, so good. She went on:

Coordinated care is a way of breaking through service boundaries and overcoming service gaps to provide better overall care for those who need to utilise a number of health and community care services.

That is completely what the basis of Healthplus is. She goes on:

Participation in the trials is voluntary.

She goes on:

Funds that would otherwise have been spent by these patients under current Medicare arrangements will be redirected to enable the suite of services that would be most appropriate to that patient.

She further indicates:

The Federal Government has agreed that \$84.9 million from Medicare will be used for this purpose.

Clearly, back on 26 October 1995 the Federal Minister was embracing coordinated care trials. It is also interesting to see, according to Carmen Lawrence's media release—and I can only assume that it is true—that in New South Wales 30 expressions of interest in conducting coordinated care trials were received and there were seven from Queensland. Obviously, the Labor States also think it is a good idea. Given that these things are so important and beneficial, one can only wonder why Dr Carmen Lawrence would now choose to try to stop the South Australian Government from improving those trials and getting international expertise into them. I cannot follow it, other than the fact, first, that we are in the middle of a Federal election, and, secondly, that Carmen Lawrence has a lousy memory.

The member for Gordon asked whether the trials have the support of local medical practitioners. I want to read into *Hansard* a couple of paragraphs from a few letters I have received. One psychiatrist indicates:

Healthplus is an idea which deserves trialing because its aim is to provide a mechanism for coordinating care for patients which has not previously been available. I believe Healthplus is an exciting and innovative approach to tackling systemic problems in the health care system which promises improved health outcomes for consumers—which is exactly what we are trying to do—

and an appropriate role for medical practitioners and other health professionals.

A general practitioner writes:

The initiative of the South Australian Health Commission Healthplus has acknowledged the place of general practice and is in the process of integrating the general practice into the health system of South Australia. I support this initiative because of the potential benefits to our patients in general practice.

Mr Clarke: Name them.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am happy to show the Deputy Leader the letters. He can ring these people personally and authenticate them. I am happy to do that, but I can see

no reason to name these people publicly. Finally, I refer to this from the Flinders Medical Centre:

I am pleased to take the opportunity to advise you of our support for the Healthplus initiative. Our involvement and support is based on our recognition that significant improvements can be made, particularly for those people with complex long-term health problems.

The answer to the member for Gordon's question is 'Yes', the process has the clear support of the Federal Government—admittedly outside the election context—but let us not expect too much of Carmen Lawrence in the Federal election context. It is clear that the processes have her support and the support of the Federal Government, and they also have the support of local practitioners. I assure the House that we intend to progress these trials to ensure better health outcomes.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Who will make the final decision on the successful bid for the billion dollar Queen Elizabeth Hospital contract? Yesterday, the Minister told the House:

The decision. . . will be taken by the (QEH) board. It will not be made by the Government, but by the boards—by the individual fiefdoms.

The leaked Government document 'Structure and time frame for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Private Development Project' says that a selection panel will refer a preferred proposal to the Government for decision. Another leaked briefing paper says the Government will approve companies to be shortlisted, and the final decision will be made by a project steering committee consisting of 'three members from the North West Adelaide Health Service Board, three members from the South Australian Health Commission, one university person, plus people from central agencies of Government'. What is the correct position?

The SPEAKER: The last part of the honourable member's question is out of order.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: If the member for Elizabeth thinks that a major \$2.2 billion contract such as the Queen Elizabeth Hospital exercise to completely redraw the campus, which as I stated previously had been neglected by the former Government for two decades, would not get Government *imprimatur*, she clearly has absolutely no idea about the Cabinet process. Does the member for Elizabeth really believe that the expenditure of \$2.2 billion of taxpayers' money would be a decision not signed off by the Government? I repeat what I said yesterday. There are individual fiefdoms, and the member for Elizabeth has yet to acknowledge that those are the words she used yesterday. However, perhaps she will in her next question. Because of those individual fiefdoms, the boards of each incorporated hospital and health centre make such decisions for Government ratification. As I said before, it is absolutely clear, because there is no way we can allow such a process to occur without the Government's signing off.

FEDERAL ELECTION

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): Is the Treasurer aware of material being circulated in Adelaide which claims that the Government is 'selling off everything that is important to us: our water, our hospitals, our buses and trains to foreign companies', and what does he intend to do about it?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The Premier has referred to other material circulating in Adelaide. One interesting aspect concerns all the candidates who have met a woman with two children who said she would never vote Liberal again. This lady has become infamous. The suggestion by the scriptwriter was that, because of the sale of assets, she would never vote Liberal again. As the member for Kaurna said, the material states that this Government is selling off everything: our water, hospitals, buses and trains. However, we are not selling any of them. That is another Labor lie. We are not selling our water and hospitals and we are certainly not selling our buses and trains. Again we have the hypocrisy and deceit by Labor during the election campaign. I would love to meet this woman with two children that every Labor candidate has met, because she seems to be saying the same thing. Perhaps it was at a specially scripted Labor Party meeting.

I would like to comment about the campaign and the way it has evolved. When the Labor Party tries to undermine Liberal policies, let me remind it exactly what the Federal Government has done. It has not been shy in selling off banks, and it did not have a debt problem created by a previous Government. It has sold off banks and airlines; it is just about to sell off airports and OTC; and it sold off its embassy in Japan, which yielded a large sum. However, what has the Federal Government not sold off? It has not sold Australian National Line, the most corrupt shipping body in the world. It did not sell that because the unions got involved and would not let the Federal Government do that. It sold easy targets for easy money, and the result is that we still have the worst ports in the world, except here in Adelaide where the Minister for Transport has an efficient system operating. Of course, the Federal Government was keen to sell off Telstra as well but could not quite get that up the agenda. So, there are some very misleading statements being made by the Labor Opposition at the moment, and I trust that it will correct them in the next press.

OPERATION PATRIOT

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Does the Minister for Police support the practice within Operation Patriot of confiscating condoms and safe sex publications from brothels for the purpose of proving offences against section 21 of the Summary Offences Act and other prostitution related offences?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I do not know whether it is evidence or not.

TERTIARY ENROLMENTS

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education provide an update on tertiary enrolments for 1996?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Before answering the specifics of the question, I will put the role of the universities into the context of South Australia's economy. The three universities between them employ 6 500 people, contribute \$550 million to gross State product each year and last year contributed in excess of \$40 million in terms of export earnings as a result of overseas students studying here. So, a high level of economic activity is generated by our three excellent universities.

Recently, I raised with the Commonwealth Labor Government—but it will not be the Government for much

longer—the funding of universities, because that area needs to be addressed. At the moment, universities are funded on the basis of the number of students at the end of March. I do not believe that in this day and age that is a very sound approach, and I have asked that the matter be looked at.

I have also raised—and am pleased that the universities have started to address this issue—the way in which students are selected for programs such as medicine. In my view, it is not adequate simply to select someone on the basis of an academic score irrespective of whether or not they have empathy with and can relate to people.

The latest information from the universities reflects a demographic dip in that the number of places offered through the Tertiary Admissions Centre this year (20 996) is down from last year (22 473). That will change slightly in the next few weeks as the manual offers go out. Members may be interested to know about the competition to get into medicine at the University of Adelaide: this year the cut-off score out of 70 was 67.5. That in itself is both a good and a not so good indicator, because it reflects, as with law, that too many of our academically talented young people are focused on a narrow range of career options. I am not in any way reflecting on medicine or law, as we need both those important professions, but we also need to get young people focused on other career opportunities, seeing them as very worthwhile, professional pathways to follow.

It is pleasing to see an upsurge in interest this year in information technology and related areas, and some detailed information will be provided in the next day or so about that. One of the consequences of the demographic dip is that there is competition between the universities for students. That in itself is not necessarily a bad thing, provided students go into programs which are suitable for them and which they can reasonably complete. Of course, it means that there is competition between the universities and TAFE, and that will have consequences for young people being tempted into programs that they would not have otherwise considered. There is a down side to the current situation in terms of a shortage of those in their late teens and early twenties accessing university and TAFE education.

A recent article in the *Australian* indicated that TAFE enrolments were down by 25 per cent. That is not correct. The TAFE enrolment process has not yet been completed, and indications are that enrolments are up very strongly in areas of electronics, IT, business studies, and community and health services. In conclusion, we have very strong enrolment interest once again in our universities and TAFE. As a community we should be proud of our three universities and of TAFE, because they are all world leaders in their own fields.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurana): On Thursday 8 February we saw yet another example of the attempts of the Federal Health Minister, Carmen Lawrence, to reinterpret the truth and to convert accurate facts into her own special style of fantasy. This Federal Minister has become known as the

Minister for really rough recollections, because Thursday's reinterpretation of John Howard's statements about Medicare was just another one in a long line of lies, deceptions and misrepresentation which is characteristic of this Minister, who simply cannot stick to the truth. Let us look at the convenient adjustment that Lawrence made to John Howard's statement. In an interview on radio Mr Howard said, 'Just a moment, we're not moving to downgrade Medicare.' Lawrence adjusted that to claim that John Howard said 'he would not interfere with Medicare just at the moment'.

Was this a convenient mistake or an intentional mistake? The voters in Australia have to make a decision about that and, unfortunately, a lot of them do not bother to follow the situation closely enough to be able to decipher the actual truth from the fallacy. When she was caught out on that quote and did decide to apologise, she still could not tell the truth. The *Advertiser* article in this regard stated:

Dr Lawrence was forced into an immediate retraction, blaming the mistakes on staff at ALP campaign headquarters.

It was never her fault: she had to blame the staff. Further, she said:

The transcript was quoted in good faith but if there was an error, I apologise.

That also has to be a lie because, if she quoted the transcript, she would not have made a mistake from the transcript unless she intentionally changed what was said on that transcript. In making comment, Mr Howard asked for a detraction, which she provided. When Mr Keating was asked to comment about it, he said:

Let's not be too prissy about Mr Howard's quotations. . . or our use of any of them.

In other words, not only does Carmen Lawrence not have to tell the truth but also the Prime Minister of Australia is basically saying, 'Let's not be too worried about how we quote what they are saying; let's not worry about that, because that is not really important.' If you add those comments to the previous efforts she has had at lies and deceit, you find it very hard to be charitable and to believe that it really was an honest mistake. I will point out some of the other misinterpretations, if you like, of the truth.

Lawrence made a speech about domestic violence that was theoretically based on figures supplied to her by the Office of the Status of Women. However she was shocked by the forgetful processes of the Easton royal commission, where she was officially found to be a liar, she had some serious problems with interpretation once again. For instance, she quoted that one in three women were at risk of domestic violence.

These figures were actually based on a US study—not an Australian study—and it was stated that in one in three households you would expect an incident of domestic violence but that in half of those cases the victim was actually a man, not a woman. She further quoted that domestic violence comprised 70 per cent of all police work in New South Wales and that Victorian police had received 14 000 domestic violence calls in 1992. The 70 per cent figure was actually 3.5 per cent, of which .7 per cent, not 70 per cent, was domestic violence related. These figures are even lower when one takes out the male to male violence that is part of those figures. The 14 000 domestic violence cases quoted in Victoria were calls to family incidents, not domestic violence, and one-tenth of 1 per cent of Victorian households had call-outs for violence of any type. Eighteen per cent of those

involved male victims and 17 per cent involved children victims, not women.

She further claims that on any night in Australia 5 000 women and children seek refuge escaping violence. This figure of 5 000 is actually 6 607 housed on any particular night in Australia in refuges, of whom 1 271 are women, 1 614 are children and 3 722 are men. She also claimed that one in five women admitted to Brisbane hospitals were victims of domestic violence. The actual figure is one in 100, not one in five, and the one in five referred to were women—

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

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Today the Minister for Health revealed the extent of the money involved in the privatisation of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. We are looking at a \$2.2 billion contract. We have been thinking that water is a big contract at \$1.5 billion, but this is \$2.2 billion. We have a right to know and to be assured that the process will be proper and fair. What we have heard over the past two days leaves us in no doubt that we are on the same track as we have been along in relation to the water contract.

I want to read into the record the letter sent by the Leader of the Opposition to the Auditor-General in relation to some of these matters. It is dated 13 February 1996 and reads:

Dear Mr MacPherson,

On 19 January 1996 the Minister for Health announced that the Government would seek expressions of interest for the financing, construction and operation of new public and private hospital facilities as part of a redevelopment of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

The Minister said that the Government had decided to commence 'the tender' process at a cost of \$130 million.

The Minister also announced that to ensure 'that the whole process is beyond reproach we will also appoint an eminent independent person to whom both public and private bidders can turn in order to provide the Government with advice as to the fairness and probity of the tender process'.

The advertisement for expressions of interest in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital project was then advertised by the South Australian Health Commission in the *Advertiser* of Saturday 20 January 1996 with a closing date of 5 p.m. on 23 February 1996.

Today the Minister for Health has confirmed in Parliament that senior officials from the South Australian Health Commission commenced discussions with United States health care firm Kaiser Permanente concerning the Queen Elizabeth Hospital project and other matters relating to the provision of health services in South Australia. The Opposition also has a copy of a letter written by Anderson Consultants on 29 January 1996 which refers to areas where the Health Commission and Kaiser Permanente have apparently agreed on the company's possible role in South Australia, including the operation of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. As the process for privatising the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has obviously commenced, I was concerned when the Minister also informed the Parliament today that the probity auditor had not yet been appointed.

I would like your advice on whether the probity auditor should have been appointed to oversee the entire process before the South Australian Health Commission entered into detailed discussions with one potential tenderer or interested party. I would also like advice on whether you have been consulted on the process for the privatisation of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and informed about the negotiations that have already taken place.

Today we heard in Parliament, following what the Minister for Health said yesterday, that his department still has not decided the extent of this white knight's role and whether that person can do it part time. Expressions of interest close next week and they are still seeking legal advice. When will the probity auditor come on board? I suggest probably not for a further few weeks. I say that is completely out of order. Before the entire process commenced, the probity auditor should have been in place and been available, as he agreed.

Finally, I should like to comment on the Minister's statement in the House today that the Government would ratify the decision of the board. Yesterday, regarding the decision on the privatisation, the Minister said:

It will not be made by the Government, but by the boards—by the individual fiefdoms. I remind the member for Elizabeth that the decision will not be taken by the Government: it will be taken by the individual fiefdom.

I was surprised to hear the Minister say that, and that is why I asked the question again today. We should remember that it was the Minister for Health who yesterday said that the Government would have no part in that decision. Of course the Government will have a part to play in a \$2.2 billion outsourcing. The Minister for Health really cannot cope with his portfolio.

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

Mr VENNING (Custance): I refer today to the very important question of water for the Barossa vineyards. We have all heard of the enormous opportunities that await the Australian wine industry and the positive impact that this may have on the State and national economies. In fact, it is already happening, and I alluded to it yesterday.

Benefits to the Australian community accruing from the expansion of the wine industry are numerous, but importantly it will stimulate employment, regional development and tourism prospects, and improve Australia's export performance. Market analysis has led to the conclusion that a 5 per cent share of the world wine market value in the year 2010 is achievable given the competitive efficiency of the Australian wine industry. Australia's current share is a staggeringly low 2 per cent.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr VENNING: It is staggering to realise that we have only 2 per cent of the world market. The potential is enormous.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader to order and note his approach a little further along the bench in order to interject more effectively. The Chair does not intend to allow that.

Mr VENNING: I can hear what he is saying, Sir, but it is not worth commenting on. I often listen to the Deputy Leader.

A world wine market share of 5 per cent, which we hope to attain, equates to a 360 per cent or \$1.3 billion increase in wine export value. Predicted markets accommodating this increase are in Germany, the USA, Japan and other Asian countries. As the economies of these Asian countries improve, they are adopting the Western style of life and wine is a big part of it.

Demand for Australian wine in 2010 is expected to double from the current \$1.32 billion to more than \$3 billion. This translates to the national vineyard increasing from 42 000 hectares to 78 000 hectares, and we are well down that path. Considering all these figures, South Australia's part is more than 60 per cent of national production, and we must fight to keep it.

It is estimated that capital requirements to reach the 2010 planned target will require a total investment of \$3.1 billion, with about 70 per cent coming from the wineries and the remainder from independent growers. Investment in vineyards will amount to \$1.26 billion of the total \$3.1 billion,

with independent growers contributing 70 per cent of the capital requirement.

Grape tonnage is expected to increase in the important Barossa region by 20 per cent, where increases in production are limited by a scarce water resource. However, national tonnage is expected to increase by a staggering 86 per cent. I repeat, it is 20 per cent for the Barossa and 86 per cent nationally. Obviously there is something wrong with the equation, and it is all about water.

The efficiency of using irrigated water varies widely between grape growing regions. The Barossa region produces 4.5 tonnes of grapes per megalitre of irrigation compared with 1.8 tonnes for other areas. I will not be specific about the other areas, because that would be dangerous, but there is no higher region anywhere in Australia than this region with 4.5 tonnes of grapes per megalitre of irrigation water.

This twofold advantage for the Barossa is even greater when comparing economic return per megalitre of water used: \$3 253 versus \$644 equates to a fivefold advantage for the Barossa region if it can get the water. Higher productivity efficiency in the Barossa is due to greater winter rain and soil moisture storage. Another factor of lesser importance is the method of irrigation employed: the majority of irrigators in the Barossa use the more efficient dripper system. The economic advantage is due to better quality fruit and hence increased price per tonne. In addition, production and economic efficiency in relation to the use of irrigated water varies widely between types of crops: very broadly, wine, at a figure of \$1 100 per megalitre compares with rice at \$308 and cotton at \$89.

We, as a nation, must get our act together to maximise our very scarce and precious resources to get the most out of every dollar, and more water should be allocated to the Barossa Valley, particularly when one compares the Murray-Darling Basin where these other crops are growing. There are strong arguments for allocating more water from other regions to the Barossa Valley.

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

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): A member of the Fraser ministry in 1974 was John Howard, an honourable, decent and honest man: not as portrayed by a man who himself is guilty of telling lies, the current Prime Minister; and not as portrayed by the Labor Party, which fears it will lose power unless it can continue to tell those lies and convince the Australian public that there is a credibility gap between John Howard and what he says. That is simply not true.

All we have to do is look at what Howard has achieved during the term he has been in office as a member of Parliament since 1974. The Labor Party has also tried to get journalists, cartoonists and cameramen to portray John Howard as short in stature by comparison with Keating. If ever I knew of hypocrisy and double standard, that would have to be it. John Howard is, in fact, by some minuscule degree, taller than Bob Hawke, although Hawke was never photographed, drawn or otherwise shown to be short in a disparaging way, as is John Howard.

It is despicable that the ALP cannot acknowledge the truth of Howard's achievements. All one has to do is look at the fact that we would not now have enterprise bargaining, and we would not now have a nation financially deregulated if it were not for John Howard's guts in introducing those ideas into the mainstream of political debate early in his political career when, less than two years in the place, he became a

Minister in the Fraser Government and took up those two issues, the first being enterprise bargaining reform in the labour market in this country.

On the other hand, the Labor Party has failed, and has failed by its Leader, the Prime Minister, in the lies he has told. I will cite a couple of instances, and I quote from a press conference given by Paul Keating of 19 December 1991:

The second [pledge] is to deal honestly with the people, to tell them the truth. In tough times, of course, the temptation is always to gild the lily. I'll be resisting that temptation as much as is humanly possible. I'll speak honestly with them, and realistically, and I'll listen accordingly.

I quote another Paul Keating lie of December 1991 at the National Press Club:

Well, let me tell you something that I thought you might know—they've been legislated. They are not a promise, they are law—L-A-W—law. And the difference between a legislated tax cut and some Opposition speaker's manifesto is all the world of difference, and they were signed into law at the end of the last parliamentary sitting.

Where are they now? Who told lies? Who is the dishonest one in this Federal election campaign? Keating further said:

I mean, what are people going on about?

The two most important pledges Keating made after he became Prime Minister were to listen to the Australian people and act honestly. Clearly, that has not happened: he has broken both of them. This election is a referendum on whether he has fulfilled these commitments. In my judgment, he has not. Labor's record is one of empty rhetoric, dishonesty and distortion. I draw the attention of the House to the fact that, in addition to those L-A-W tax cuts, other promises were broken, such as no new taxes. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* three tables which illustrate the tax increases in the 1993-94 budget, the 1995-96 budget, and at the present time, totalling \$10.639 billion in new taxes and tax increases. I assure you, Mr Deputy Speaker, the tables are purely statistical.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are they extensive tables, because there is a requirement that they not be too extensive?

Mr LEWIS: No, Sir.

Leave granted.

HOW LABOR HAS FAILED

During the current 1995-96 year, the total cost of Labor's dishonesty to Australian families and Australian taxpayers is over \$7.3 billion.

The new taxes and tax increases were introduced as follows:
1993-94 Budget

Tax Increase	Cost to Taxpayer 1995-96 (million)	Cost to Taxpayer 1996-97 (million)
	\$	\$
1 per cent increase in Wholesale Sales Tax in August 1993 and July 1995	1 207	1 345
Tax imposed on unused annual leave and long service leave lump sum payments	155	175
Petrol excise increased in August 1993, February 1994 and August 1994	1 460	1 530
Deductibility of car-parking for self employed removed	70	35
Credit Unions lose tax exemption	24	29
Increase in tax on life insurance businesses of friendly societies	25	70
Fringe Benefits Tax extended to non deductible items	240	240
Fringe Benefits Tax rate increased to 48.4 per cent	8	8
Wholesale Sales Tax on wine and		

cider increased in three stages	40	45
Wholesale Sales Tax on luxury cars increased	10	10
Excise on tobacco products increased five times over a two year period	280	290
Departure Tax Increased from \$20 to \$25 per person	30	32
Total burden on taxpayers arising from tax increases in the 1993-94 budget	3 549	3 809

The above table covers taxation measures that were subsequently proceeded with where taxation measures were changed after the budget, such as the taxation of wine and alcoholic ciders, the costings reflect that subsequent change. The list does not include a number of new user charges and cost recovery measures that were announced in the budget.

1994-95 Budget

The 1994-95 budget announced a range of taxation compliance measures that were projected to cost taxpayers \$300 million in 1995-96 and 1996-97. In addition, there were a range of cost recovery measures announced. Following the budget, there were additional announcements of revenue and expenditure measures, the most significant being in the area of the fringe benefits tax.

1995-96 Budget	Cost to Taxpayer 1995-96 (million)	Cost to Taxpayer 1996-97 (million)
Tax Increase	\$	\$
Abolition of second round of L-A-W Tax Cuts promised to start on 1.1.96	1 605	3 549
Increase in Medicare levy from 1.4 per cent to 1.5 per cent	230	240
Extension of PAYE coverage	275	—
Increase in Company Tax from 33 per cent to 36 per cent	320	1 570
New measures to prevent trafficking in losses accumulated by trusts	90	185
Restrictions on claims for research and development tax concessions	45	105
Changed arrangements relating to commercial debt forgiveness	3	20
Amendment to dividend imputation arrangements to deny franking credits for profit shifting arrangements	21	25
Tax compliance measures	150	150
Increase in the fringe benefits tax rate from 48.4 per cent to 48.475 per cent then to 48.5 per cent	5	5
Increase in the wholesale sales tax on passenger cars from 16 per cent to 21 per cent	330	355
Amendment of wholesale sales tax provisions to regulate exemptions	150	160
Amendment to customs and excise duty to alter definition of light fuel oil	100	100
Increase in excise duty on tobacco	70	66
Total burden on taxpayers arising from tax increases in the 1995-96 budget	3 394	6 530

The above table does not include:

1. Measures that have to date been defeated in the Senate, such as a 12 per cent sales tax on currently exempt builders' hardware and certain building materials used mainly in the completion of buildings that would have cost taxpayers \$215 million and \$245 million in 1995-96 and 1996-97 respectively;

2. Cost recovery charges announced in the budget and the policy that the self-employed would only be eligible for government superannuation contributions if they elected that their contributions would be non-deductible. In the first year of operation, in 1998-99, this was projected to raise \$45 million in revenue;

3. The additional charges placed on banks that are projected to raise \$185 million in 1995-96.

Tax Increase	Cost to Taxpayer 1995/96 (million)	Cost to Taxpayer 1996/97 (million)
1993-94 Budget	\$ 3 549	\$ 3 809

1994-95 Budget	300	300
1995-96 Budget	3 394	6 530
Total	7 243	10 639

Mr LEWIS: I have referred to the fact that, according to Keating, there would not be any tax increases or any new taxes. I have incorporated in *Hansard* those taxes which are to be increased and also those new taxes which have been introduced and subsequently increased. In addition, a promise was given by Carmen Lawrence in June 1994—another liar in the Federal ministry—about the Medicare assurance:

Claims in this morning's newspapers that the Government is set to increase the Medicare levy are demonstrably untrue. . . There is no proposal to increase the levy and there won't be.

Even as it was introducing new taxes and tax increases and backing away from its tax commitments, Labor sought to deceive the Australian people on that Medicare charge: it went ahead. Broken promise No. 4 was on pensions and broken promise No. 5 was on company tax.

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): I wish to speak today on the difficulties some schools are experiencing in my electorate—and I assume in all electorates—in gaining access to the new round of back-to-school grants. The back-to-school grants was one of the great initiatives of the previous Government, and I am pleased that the present Government continued it, albeit in a decreased way with smaller sums but, nevertheless, it continues to all intents and purposes.

The Auditor-General examined the issue of back-to-school grants and made some comments about some schools not having spent their grants whilst new grants were being made available. All I can say is that, theoretically, the Auditor-General certainly has a point but, in the real world, some schools experience difficulties in spending this money in a proper way according to the old bureaucratic rule. The intention of these grants was that schools would have access to cash; they did not have to go through SACON, as it was in this those days. If the roof was leaking, they could call the local plumber and get the roof fixed. If the roof needed resheeting, they could call in the locals to resheet the roof, and so on. As I understand the current position, schools must obtain three quotes and send them to Adelaide to be evaluated, and so on.

Only one of the 17 schools in my electorate has completed the project acquittal statement that is required now before they are eligible to receive the first \$10 000 of their 1995-96 grant. I can go through a whole range of reasons why the money has not been spent, but I can assure members that, in some country towns, it is extremely difficult to get three quotes to replace carpet, for example. No-one will quote. One school, north of the Eyre Peninsula, has been trying for 10 months to spend the money on new carpets and it cannot get three firms to quote for the—

Mr Brokenshire: Whose fault is that?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The fault is one of geography. If the honourable member wants to allocate fault rather than solve a problem, then the fault is one of geography and of small business not being interested in quoting for these smaller jobs in rural schools. It is no-one's fault, but the system is so rigid that it does not allow for the difficulties of doing that in the real world. The grants were designed to have minimum bureaucracy so that the school community could have these small jobs done efficiently, using local labour,

without the whole paraphernalia that is obviously desirable if you are putting out a contract.

I will guarantee that almost every school outside the non-metropolitan electorate will be having the same problem. I am appealing to the Government to get together with the Auditor-General to sort out how schools can spend this money in a proper and legitimate manner, with full accountability, without going through procedures, because the geography and lack of businesses in some areas make it impossible for schools to go through those procedures and have work carried out. It is just not possible because small businesses will not quote to go hundreds of kilometres away, in some cases many hundreds of kilometres away, to do these small jobs. There is the question of carry over.

For schools that want to undertake larger projects, I hope there will be some means of an agreement and carry over so that the project can proceed in the second year rather than in the first year, and so on. The money has been made available by the Government: I am pleased about that and I am not complaining. I am saying that bureaucracy has to be taken out of the way to allow our schools in the non-metropolitan area to provide the service for which this money was designed. It was absolutely not designed to keep a gang of bureaucrats in business evaluating tenders for very small amounts of money when tenders can be found. In many cases you cannot find people to tender.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): It grieves me that members of the Opposition continue to misuse words in relation to what the Government is doing. It occurred again today when the member for Elizabeth in her speech continued to use the word 'privatisation'. I do not know whether the member for Elizabeth and other members on occasion need a hearing aid or whether they need things to be written down in large block print, but we have emphasised repeatedly that it is not privatisation but contracting out to the private sector. The Government still owns all the assets. In the case of water, it owns more than just the assets. It not only owns the assets but will be maintaining the pipe and the pricing structure; in fact, it has full control over it.

It grieves me that this Parliament is being abused by misinformation being spread by remarks made in this place which are fed through the verbal communication method and through *Hansard* in the written form. I say to Opposition members who are continuing to misrepresent the situation, 'Stop it please; give credit where credit is due.' Your Leader said, upon becoming Leader, that he would not seek to knock, carp and carry on about everything the Government was doing, that he would seek to be a responsible Leader. The Leader himself has failed on so many occasions, but he is being let down by his team—if you could call the group opposite a team—time and again. I simply say, for the sake of South Australia, 'Please acknowledge the truth and use truthful statements.' You know that you are fabricating.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder is finding it difficult when more than a dialogue is proceeding. The member for Mawson and the Deputy Leader are the main antagonists.

Mr MEIER: It is interesting to follow the Federal election campaign. On this occasion it is no different.

Mr Clarke: Neil Andrew feels under threat, does he?

Mr MEIER: No, Neil is an excellent member and I am sure that he will win his seat comfortably. Of course, he is in the hands of the electorate and I am sure it will recognise what Neil Andrew has done for the electorate as its representative over the past three years.

The polls seem to fluctuate from time to time and in today's *Advertiser* they indicate that the gap has narrowed considerably and that the election results could be close. We will find out on 2 March and will know one way or another. I was interested to see the *Bulletin* today. In this State, despite the misinformation the Labor Party has been trumpeting around for months—fabricating so much and misleading the public, getting headlines with complete lies and fabrications—the latest *Bulletin* Morgan poll indicates that the Liberal Government still holds a commanding lead over the Labor Opposition and is pulling ahead even further. This survey was conducted throughout December and January, right when the silly season was on us, and I had to shake my head at some of the misinformation being trumpeted by the Labor Party and its cohorts during that period.

In fact, the Government's lead extended to 47 per cent, up three points since October-November, thus boosting its supremacy over Labor, which was unchanged on 34.5 per cent, by 12.5 points. It is interesting that the Greens have doubled their support to 2 per cent and the Democrats have dropped one point to 11 per cent. I find it incredible that the Democrats hold 11 per cent because it is certainly a Party that should not be there after some of things Elliott has done. The two Party preferred vote shows a healthy 56 per cent for the Government and 44 per cent for Labor.

WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION (SGIC) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

GAMING MACHINES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Gaming Machines Act 1992. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Since their introduction in July 1994, gaming machines in licensed clubs and hotels have been taxed on turnover at a flat rate of 4.2 per cent.

In December 1995, shortly after the release of the Report of the "Inquiry into the Impact of Gaming Machines in Hotels in Clubs in South Australia", the Government announced a new progressive tax scale on turnover to operate from 1 July 1996, together with the establishment of a dedicated fund into which \$25 million from the proceeds of the gaming machine tax would be paid to provide additional funding for education, health, welfare services and community development.

The hotels and clubs indicated a strong preference for a tax based on net gambling revenue, rather than turnover, and proposed through the Australian Hotels Association and the Licensed Clubs Association a two-tiered tax structure using their preferred tax base which would have the capacity to raise an additional \$25 million to

support the operation of the new Fund. The Association is prepared to guarantee a full year tax yield of \$146 million from a two-tiered tax structure where a rate of 35% applies to the first \$900 000 of net gambling revenue on an annual basis and a rate of 40% applies to the excess above \$900 000.

In the event that the tax structure fails to produce \$146 million from its first year of operation, the two Associations have agreed that fall back tax provisions, which are specified in the Bill, will automatically come into operation. In essence, through a lowering of the \$900 000 threshold and, if necessary, the introduction of a third tax bracket with a marginal tax rate of 45%, the proposed tax structure will be modified to have the capacity to produce \$146 million in subsequent years (based on 1996-97 activity levels).

If there is any shortfall below \$146 million in the first year of operation, legislative provision has also been made for this amount to be recovered in subsequent periods through temporary increases in marginal tax rates.

The new Fund into which \$25 million will be paid annually, commencing in 1996-97, will be called the Community Development Fund. The moneys in the Fund are to provide additional funding for education, health and community development as well as providing additional assistance of \$1 million in 1996-97 to welfare groups. Expenditures from the Fund will be determined by the Governor in Executive Council on the advice of Cabinet.

The Bill also contains legislative amendments to give effect to restrictions on hours of gaming in licensed clubs and hotels with a mandatory six hour closedown each day, as well as a total prohibition on gaming on Good Friday and Christmas Day. The clubs have raised concerns about disparities in trading hours when compared to hotels. The matter has been referred to the Attorney-General for consideration as that area relates to the operation of the *Liquor Licensing Act* which he administers.

The Bill requires licensees to locate EFTPOS facilities away from gaming areas. To allow a period of time for licensees who have already installed EFTPOS facilities to comply with the new requirement, provision has been made for exemptions to be granted at the discretion of the Liquor Licensing Commissioner. Provision also has been made for exemptions to be granted by the Minister in exceptional circumstances.

Since the introduction of gaming machines, experience has identified that there is scope in some specified areas for licensing arrangements to be improved. The opportunity has therefore been taken to address these issues by appropriate legislative amendment.

Difficulties have been encountered in enabling clubs, particularly in regional centres, from holding a gaming licence on a co-operative basis. To facilitate sharing of gaming facilities, provision has been made in the Bill for gaming machine licences to be held by more than one club provided that no club, either separately or jointly, can hold more than one licence.

Persons holding positions of authority (such as directors) in a body corporate, which holds a gaming machine licence, are to be empowered to manage or supervise gaming operations in their own right. To date, it has been the practice of the Liquor Licensing Commissioner to deem such persons to be licensees within the meaning of section 48 of the *Gaming Machines Act 1992*. The Crown Solicitor has indicated that this interpretation of the provision is incorrect. The proposed legislative amendment will remove the need for deeming.

At present, a person is precluded from being approved as a gaming machine manager in respect of more than one gaming machine licence. With the benefit of experience, this enactment is not only unwarranted but acts as a hindrance to the industry. Removal of this provision will give greater flexibility in management arrangements for licensees.

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides for commencement by proclamation.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation

This clause inserts a definition of "approved gaming machine manager" which has the effect of allowing a director or member of the governing body of a body corporate that holds a gaming machine licence to supervise or manage the gaming operations under a licence. All provisions of the Act that give powers to approved managers, or impose duties on approved managers, will therefore apply to a director who at any time supervises or manages gaming operations.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 15—Eligibility criteria

This clause provides that a number of clubs can jointly hold a gaming machine licence. A jointly held licence can only relate to the licensed premises of one of the clubs. A club that is the joint holder of a licence cannot hold another gaming machine licence, either solely or jointly.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 27—Conditions

This clause provides that the hours of operation for gaming machines must be so fixed by the Commissioner that gaming is prohibited on Christmas Day and Good Friday and during a continuous 6 hour period on all other days.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 28—Certain gaming machine licences only are transferable

This clause enables an existing gaming machine licence held by a club to be transferred to the existing licence holder jointly with one or more holders of separate club licences.

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 37—Commissioner may approve managers and employees

This clause strikes out the current requirement that a person cannot be an approved gaming machine manager for more than one licensed premises.

Clause 8: Insertion of s. 51A

This clause inserts a new section into the Act. *New section 51A* prohibits EFTPOS, automatic teller machines and other similar facilities from being provided within gaming areas. The Commissioner may grant temporary exemptions for the purposes of the removal of existing EFTPOS facilities. The Minister may exempt a licensee from the operation of the section if exceptional circumstances exist for doing so. The definition of "cash facility" allows for other similar facilities to be prescribed by regulation.

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 72—Tax system operable to end of 1995/1996 financial year

This clause brings the current gaming tax system to an end on 30 June 1996. Certain subsections are deleted as these will be included in proposed new section 72B.

Clause 10: Insertion of ss. 72A and 72B

This section inserts two new sections. Firstly, *new section 72A* sets out the new tax system that will operate from the beginning of the next financial year. The tax for the first year is on a sliding scale and is set out in subsection (5) under the definition of "prescribed percentage". Although the tax liability will be based on annual net gaming revenue (i.e., all money bet on the machines less all prizes won), a licensee is required to pay the tax in monthly instalments, to be calculated and paid in a manner determined by the Minister. From the revenue raised by this tax, \$25 million will be paid into a special Treasury fund to be established for the purpose. The definition of "prescribed percentage" sets out the basic tax scale that will apply in the 1996/1997 financial year and provides for that scale to apply to subsequent years if the revenue it generates in that first year amounts to at least \$146 million. If the revenue does not reach that level, the tax scale for subsequent years will be fixed by the Minister, by adjusting the tax scale that applied in respect of the 1996/1997 year to such extent as would have generated that amount had it applied in that year. Subsection (7) allows a further increase in the tax rates (but no variation to the threshold or thresholds) in order to recoup any shortfall in 1996-1997. The surcharge will apply to all licensees until the shortfall has been cleared. *New Section 72B* provides for recovery in default of payment of tax, and is essentially the same as the current provisions in the Act. It applies to tax payable under both the old and the new systems.

Clause 11: Amendment of s. 73—Accounts and monthly returns

This clause provides that licensees will now have to include details of net gaming revenue in its accounts and monthly returns.

Clause 12: Insertion of s. 73A

This clause inserts a new section setting up the *Community Development Fund* into which the special allocation of \$25 million per annum will be paid. The money in the Fund will be applied, in accordance with the decisions of the Executive Council, for health, welfare or education services provided by the Government, and for financial assistance to community development and to non-government welfare agencies.

Clause 13: Transition provision

This clause is a transitional provision that requires the Commissioner to vary all existing gaming machine licences so as to ensure that gaming operations cannot be conducted on Christmas Day or Good Friday or during a continuous 6 hour period on all other days.

Mr QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

BIOLOGICAL CONTROL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Minister for Primary Industries) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Biological Control Act 1986. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This simple Bill accommodates changes that have transpired since the passage in 1986, of the Biological Control Acts of South Australia, the Commonwealth and other States.

As Hon. Members may be aware these Acts resulted from injunctions that for some time, restrained CSIRO from releasing agents for the biological control of *Salvadora macleayana*. Stated simply, the legislation provides that such an injunction cannot now apply where a biological control proposal has been tested publicly in accordance with prescribed procedures.

In basic terms the legislation also stipulates that any proposal to "target" an organism or do certain other things requires the approval of the Australian Agricultural Council. That body of course currently bears the title Agriculture and Resource Management Council of Australia and New Zealand (ARMCANZ) and includes Ministers other than those responsible for primary industries.

The proposed amendments will reflect these developments and clear up any doubts that might otherwise emerge over the powers of ARMCANZ. In addition, it will be clear that the Minister for Primary Industries will continue to be responsible for biological control as a member of the expanded Council.

Similar amendments are underway in other jurisdictions and collectively are appropriate when it is considered that ARMCANZ may be asked to ratify the release of rabbit calicivirus disease.

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation

Clause 2 alters the name of the Council to its current name and provides for another body if prescribed by regulation to be the Council.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 8—South Australian Biological Control Authority

Clause 3 ensures that it is the Minister for Primary Industries who is the Authority.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 9—Delegation

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 53—Service of documents on Authority

Clauses 4 and 5 alter the title of the Department to its current title.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PASTORAL LAND MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION (EXTENSION OF INTERIM BOARD) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989. Read a first time.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The Pastoral Board of South Australia, which has key advisory and regulatory responsibilities in the State's extensive rangelands, has operated quite successfully since 1990, when the *Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act*, which establishes the current board, came into force.

A key component to the breadth of expertise it brought to its considerations was the membership of two pastoralists—one from the ephemeral cattle country north of the Dog Fence and one from the sheep country inside the fence. This membership was enabled by

the provisions of the transitional clauses of the 1989 Act which established a six person board to include two pastoralists until the sixth anniversary of the commencement of the Act. This will be on 6 March 1996 when this current board's three year term expires.

After 6 March 1996 section 12 of the Act will come into operation which requires the board to revert from the current six member configuration to a five member board which would include only one pastoralist.

It is Government policy that the Pastoral Board, which has been a six member board since the operation of the 1989 Act to include two pastoralist members from the sheep and cattle industries, should continue as a six member board and be expanded later to include Aboriginal and recreational interests.

Over the past six years the six member board has operated in a very satisfactory manner. The issues facing the ephemeral cattle country north of the State's Dog Fence vary considerably from those within the sheep areas, and it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for one pastoralist to adequately input on all issues. This on-ground input is a critical component of the expertise provided by the board, which also comprises membership from the areas of conservation, soil conservation, administration and arid land ecology.

This brief Bill extends the current six member board for a further three years to the ninth anniversary of the commencement of the 1989 Act by amending the transitional and commencement provisions of that Act.

This time frame allows further consideration of wider legislative amendments to the current Pastoral Act that will address enlarged board membership to consider multiple use issues, more secure tenure for these uses and simplified rental assessment processes. These amendments have been deferred pending clarification of native title issues and Aboriginal access rights as they apply to land currently held under pastoral lease. I commend these interim amendments to the House.

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 2—Commencement

Clause 3: Amendment of schedule

These clauses provide that the board, as presently constituted, will continue for a further 3 years beyond 6 March 1996.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE AUTHORITY (REVIEW) AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 4, lines 5 and 6 (clause 15)—Leave out subsection (3) and insert new subsections as follow:

(3) Interest, at the standard commercial rate for accounts established under section 21 of the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987, will be payable on amounts held under subsection (2) and no fees or imposts will apply with respect to the maintenance or operation of the account.

(3a) Amounts held under subsection (2), together with interest accrued under subsection (3), will be applied for a purpose or purposes determined by the Local Government Association and reported to the Minister.

(3b) For the purposes of subsection (3a)—

- (a) a purpose determined by the Local Government Association under that subsection must benefit, or potentially benefit, all councils, and must not be designed to benefit specifically councils that have had dealings with the authority, or to influence councils to transact business with the authority; and
- (b) the Local Government Association may establish a process for the making and consideration of applications for funding from amounts available under that subsection in accordance with criteria set by the Local Government Association; and
- (c) the Local Government Association must keep proper accounts of amounts paid under that subsection and provide to the Minister, in respect of each financial year, an audited statement concerned the expenditure of those amounts; and
- (d) amounts will be paid out under that subsection in accordance with a scheme agreed between the Local Government Association and the Treasurer.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be disagreed to and that the following alternative amendment be made in lieu thereof:

Clause 15, page 4, lines 5 and 6—Leave out subsection (3) and insert new subsections as follows:

(3) Interest, at the standard commercial rate for accounts established under section 31 of the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987, will be payable on amounts held under subsection (2) and no fees or imposts will apply with respect to the maintenance or operation of the account.

(3a) Amounts held under subsection (2), together with interest accrued under subsection (3), will be applied for local government development purposes recommended by the Local Government Association and agreed to by the Minister in accordance with principles agreed between the Minister and the Local Government Association.

As the Government indicated in another place, there is no objection to including subclause (3) of this amendment in clause 15. The subclause specifies that interest will be accrued on the TER account and the account will attract no fees or charges. These accounts are not liable for taxes.

The other part of the amendment returned to the House has some serious deficiencies from a State perspective. In particular, by removing all responsibility for the disbursement of the TER funds or audit of disbursement of the funds from the State Government, the amendment denies the State the opportunity to discharge its responsibility for implementation of State and national competition policy should the need arise.

For very sound reasons, obviously this position is not acceptable to the Government. It has never been the intention that TER moneys paid by the LGFA would leave the local government sphere. What is needed is a mechanism to allow the money to be disbursed within the local government sphere, which would acknowledge both that it is essentially local government money and that the State has an interest in assuring itself that these possibly quite large sums of public money are spent in ways which broadly conform with State and, if necessary, national economic policy.

The Local Government Association does have an important role as a representative association of local government authorities and as a guardian of local government interests. However, local government as such is not a party to the legal instruments setting out State or national competition policy—that is for the State. The amendment now proposed by the Government in subclause (3a) has been the subject of considerable discussion and is crafted to provide a mechanism which meets the combined objectives. It is acceptable to the Government, and I am advised that it is also acceptable to the Local Government Association. I, therefore, commend it to the Committee.

Ms HURLEY: I am very pleased that the Minister now recognises the role of the Local Government Association in the management of funds, that it has an important role in local government and, as he put it, as a guardian of local government. I am also pleased to hear his assurances of the use of these TER funds, and I am particularly pleased that, finally, consultation with the Local Government Association has produced a compromise which is satisfactory to both parties. In view of that, I say that it is a satisfactory compromise for the Opposition as well. I commend the Local Government Association for its persistence and willingness to enter into negotiations on this subject.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I thank the Opposition for its support of the amendment because, as the honourable member has pointed out, we have arrived at a compromise which is acceptable to both the Local Government

Association and the Government. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, we had very strong reasons for wanting to have the matters referred to the Minister for approval: as I said, it must be either State or Federal if we are to ensure that we meet the requirements in respect of competitive pricing policies. I also indicate, in case there may be any misinterpretation of the honourable member's comments, that I have always respected the Local Government Association as the umbrella organisation for all local government.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I am very happy to respond to that interjection by the Deputy Premier. If he has been listening to the media at all—

Mr Quirke interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Yes, he is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Quirke: He is not the Deputy Premier yet.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: No, and I don't think he ever will be. He's just keeping the seat warm until someone moves there after the next election. As I was saying, I am very happy to respond to that interjection. If the Deputy Leader has been following the media at all, he would know that I have been using the City of Tea Tree Gully as a model in relation to the way in which it is now responding to the provisions of the Local Government Act to allow councils to go into camera. That is something that I pushed when I was a member of that council, and I am delighted to see that it has now occurred.

However, I digress. As I said, I recognise very much the role of the Local Government Association. I appreciate the way in which the negotiations have occurred between us and representatives of the Local Government Association—they have occurred on a very friendly basis and there has been no acrimony whatsoever. The end result is that both parties are happy with the amendment, which is now before the Committee. Again, I thank the Opposition for its support.

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on the question:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for consideration of the Bill.

(Continued from 13 February. Page 1021.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Every now and again, issues emerge in members' electorates which reluctantly surface in this place. One such incident that has been reported to me as the local member occurred in the Paddocks area, which is between Pooraka and Para Hills West. It involves the rape of a person on Sunday afternoon. Although I do not have all the details yet, the rape occurred in broad daylight at 3 p.m. It has been reported to me that the victim was male and he was raped by two other males. A number of people have come to my office over the past six years and told me that there is a problem in the Paddocks area. Police officers, including a very senior officer, have told me that there are a number of problems in that area and that the level of policing—although in many respects it is probably much more pronounced than in other areas of my electorate—has not resolved some of the problems.

At the outset, I want to say that at every opportunity in this House I have voted for what I believe to be the progressive line. What consenting adults do in their own bedroom is their business. In particular, I make no bones of the fact that I take

the view that the homosexual law reform that took place in this State 20 or so years ago, largely because of the George Duncan drowning, has my full support.

There is a problem in this area. This afternoon, I will tell members how I think part of the problem can be cured. I raise this matter because many constituents have told me about a number of activities that are taking place in what should be a prime public asset—the area known as the Paddocks. It contains a number of ponds which provide a recreational facility. Unfortunately, no-one in my electorate—or anywhere else, for that matter—with a family goes to that place for three good reasons: first, wherever you go, you find used condoms thrown all over the place; secondly, needles are left there by IV drug users; and, thirdly—and this has been reported on regular occasions (even in my office)—persons hang around in automobiles at every opportunity, right through until the hours of 1 and 2 a.m.

When I drive home from Parliament House past that site, I see persons who are all too willing to expose themselves, as they have done on numerous occasions to my constituents, some of whom are not as lucky as I am to be in an automobile but who have to walk through that area. In the past few years a number of incidents have occurred at this site. However, given the nature of this latest incident, I am afraid we have reached a stage where something has to be done about the area.

The council has spent quite an amount of money in that area—for which I congratulate it—to provide a series of facilities, including change rooms. Last year, a senior police officer suggested to me that those change rooms should be demolished; he suggested that they might be part of the problem. It appears that a number of people hang around the public lavatory in that area. I suggested that the destruction of a \$40 000 building is a fairly poor way to go about fixing the problem. I did not support that. The evidence that he showed me that he and a friend had collected over a three-week period concurs with the evidence that has come through my office over past years as to the extent of the problem.

I want to make clear that I do not have any problems with what consenting adults do in their own bedrooms, in private. That is fine; that is all right. However, I have a real problem with what is happening in the Paddocks, and I want it stopped. I will send a copy of this speech and a letter to the Police Commissioner and tell him that I want to see some police cars in that area. I will tell him another thing, too: I do not care what measures are necessary to clean up this problem. I do not care if they go to the area and check all the cars for roadworthiness, because that is one of my suggestions to help solve this problem.

I will also call on the council. The council—and I commend it for this—has built a lovely recreation park, but no-one can visit it—not even in broad daylight. The council must clear out the supposedly beautiful native shrubs which close up everything and which no-one finds beautiful, except the council conservation people. The council ought to clear away all that vegetation so that there is clear visibility from the road, so that people can see what is going on in there. That way, at least during daylight hours, people can take their children there, have picnics and indulge in some recreational activities, which is what it was intended for.

I will write to the council and suggest that the toilet block not be pulled down, because that would be a retrograde step. I know people say that I do not have much of an aesthetic eye for nature, and I do not. I am no greenie, but I believe that no-one goes around hugging the trees in this area. The bushes in

this area are ugly, and they obscure the view. If they were removed and the whole area was landscaped so that it was visible from the road, police officers could patrol it—at least during daylight—and some of the incidents that have occurred would not be repeated.

What happened last Sunday afternoon has been met with enormous regret in my area. Some people are very fearful about what is happening in this area. It is an area that needs considerable attention and more policing. The council needs to clear all the rubbish, bushes and trees, so we can see clearly what is happening. A year or so ago, an offender, having committed certain antisocial and violent offences in the local petrol station, ran into the bush and some three or four police patrols could not find him. On two or three occasions, persons have exposed themselves in a library near the primary school and then run into the Paddocks area and again evaded lawful arrest.

I have not raised this matter in the House before, because I thought commonsense would prevail. I do not like making these sorts of comments and I do not like to become involved in matters of this type. However, it is about time that something was done about this problem to allow families and others to enjoy some recreational activity in the area, which they are legitimately entitled to do. The area was intended for that, and many thousands of dollars was spent on that by Salisbury council.

I do not want to take up any more time of the House. I am sure that this speech will bring some results. If I am told by the council or others that they do not believe it is their job to clear all the trees, shrubs and so on, no doubt I will have to raise the matter again. In the meantime, I hope that an incident such as happened in the middle of the day on Sunday, at 3 p.m., will not happen again.

Mr WADE (Elder): I support the Bill and commend the Government on its successes to date in tackling the difficult and daunting task of restoring our State's prosperity and promise. After hearing that very disturbing speech by the member for Playford, I must say that it might be necessary to look at a Bill to amend the Biological Control Act to control the biological mechanisms of some of the people in his electorate. This Government came to power not only with the will to reform but with strategic directions to reform our financial, economic, industrial and social structures—reforms that will position this State towards the twenty-first century in such a way that we as South Australians can take the best advantage of and take part in world competitive markets.

As a State, we are in the right place at the right time for economic and social growth. We are ideally situated to take much more than our traditional share of expanding Asian markets. The European continent is looking forwards and outwards for new entrepreneurial spirit. We need the inner strength to challenge this changing world. We need the confidence to grasp these golden opportunities. We need a sound economic base from which we can build a future of our making—a future of spectacular growth, unimpeded by the ghosts of despair that plagued our State until late 1993 and regrettably still haunt our nation's capital but not, thank goodness, for much longer.

It is toward this restoration of inner strength, this confidence and this sound economic base that the Government has directed its efforts since gaining an overwhelming majority from the people to get the job done. Somewhere in their dark burrows, I can almost hear the derisive chattering from those who allowed, and indeed by the nature of their inflated egos,

aided and abetted this State's economic decline over the past decade. I can almost hear their disbelief that I can hold such a positive and robust view of our State's future.

I am not alone in my view. The erstwhile and internationally acclaimed economist, Hamish McRae, in his 1994 book *The World in 2020* (page 260) stated that the combination of our location and our ability to absorb migrants is enormously advantageous, for it will help bolt our economy onto what will eventually become the world's largest economic region, that is, Asia. He also said that it is easy to see an Australia starting to pull ahead of Europe and North America in our living standards. He has no doubt from his vast and respected knowledge of economic reality that we will benefit enormously from our location and long history of political stability, and our potential to be a leader in our geographic region. South Australians have been shown a window of opportunity to this brave new world and, in fact, we were offered entry to it in the 1980s, an offer which was ignored by the previous Government but which has not been ignored by this Government.

South Australia can never be an assertive and respected player in the world competitive game if it limps onto the field, overburdened with debt, ill equipped and gasping for each economic breath. It is not a level playing field and it never will be. We need to unburden ourselves so that we can grasp opportunities quickly. We need every ounce of energy to take these opportunities and use them to our advantage. We need the proper equipment and training. We need the sure confidence that comes from being part of a focused leadership team.

We have a strong Liberal Government committed to achieving the objectives of restoring our State's financial health and removing the albatross of debt from around our neck, and of restoring confidence in our economy by rebuilding our job base. In itself, that is powerful medicine for restoring South Australia's confidence in its future. We have a strong Liberal Government committed to reforming our public sector so that Government services are of the most consistently high standard. It is certainly appropriate that we should look at our accomplishments, now that we are half way through our first term of office, within the four broad areas of, first, our financial situation, secondly, our employment opportunities, thirdly, rebuilding our economic base and, fourthly, the provision of efficient public services to the South Australian public.

Financially, we were faced with a spiralling State debt and a huge underlying budget deficit. It does not take an economist to figure out that, if we are paying out more than we are earning, we are in serious trouble. Our State was in serious trouble. However, two years on and our net debt in real terms is falling, and falling rapidly. This Government is cutting State debt. By June 1998 our net debt will have been cut from over \$8 billion to \$6.8 billion—a magnificent achievement by any standards. Budget forecasts see the underlying budget deficit being turned into a significant surplus in the 1997-98 financial year. In other words, we will have balanced the books by 1998. That is our State Liberal Government.

Let me compare it with our Federal Labor Government. At present Australia has a net foreign debt of \$180 billion. Australia has the seventh highest ratio of net foreign debt in the industrial world, yet in 1983 we were ranked eleventh. Again, since Labor has been in office federally, our gross foreign debt has multiplied 15 times and our net foreign debt has multiplied almost 21 times. There is no comparison: the South Australian Liberal Government is moving forward and

the Federal Labor Government is dragging the country backwards.

As to employment, the State Liberal Government is restoring confidence through action to back up its words. South Australia's unemployment rate is at its lowest for almost five years. When this Government was elected, the State unemployment rate was 11.2 per cent. It is now tracking at 9 per cent and is still falling. Last November, 6 000 people gained full-time employment in South Australia. Last December, 3 900 people gained full-time employment in our State and more employment opportunities are opening up for the people of South Australia. We can now look forward to 3 000 more full-time employment opportunities becoming available from just four recent developments: EDS, the SA Water contract, the Westpac Mortgage Centre and the Bankers Trust Investment Management Centre.

Our economic health is looking more and more rosy every day. This Government's reform program has seen a boost to our gross State product that puts the other States to shame. New South Wales and Victoria both reported .6 per cent growth in the September 1995 quarter and the national average was also about .6 per cent. South Australia recorded a September quarter growth of 1.7 per cent, which was nearly three times the percentage increase in other States. In fact, South Australia performed better than all the other States in terms of gross State product growth from September 1994 to September 1995. That means that our State's production of goods is on the increase and leads the nation in this growth. Our Government supports small business and has reduced water and electricity rates for small business. Electricity tariffs for small business have been slashed by 22 per cent and are now the second lowest rates in Australia.

What can I say about the Federal mob, because 15 067 South Australians have been forced into bankruptcy since 1983 because of Federal Government inaction, with 87 per cent being in the small business sector? Between 1983 and 1992, the years for which small business figures are available, more than 24 800 jobs were lost in South Australia in the small business sector because of the Federal Government. We have put back 21 400 jobs in South Australia.

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

Ms WHITE (Taylor): As the Opposition has guaranteed to support Supply, I wish to raise a couple of my concerns which, judging from the most recent survey of my constituents, are fundamental concerns to them as well. I refer to Government accountability and responsibility. It is clear that since the Liberals came to power 26 months ago there has been a change in the way the State Government sees its responsibility. More and more Ministers are reducing the gamut of services which they define as core business for their portfolios and departments and, increasingly, we have seen community services eroded because they are no longer regarded as core business for those portfolios.

Significantly, many of the services that have been cut cost little to run because they are staffed largely by volunteer labour and, in getting rid of them, the Government saves little but throws away the free labour contribution of volunteers. Instead, it transfers the need to other already stretched agencies and departments. A by-product has been that the problems that were prevented by these services which are now cut develop into even larger problems which are costly to remedy and which are compounded into higher demand for

FACS, hospitals, the Housing Trust, the police and mental health services.

Under the Liberals, Government responsibility to the community has changed. It has changed not only in the level of services which it is willing to provide but through a shift in what the Government is willing to accept as State Government responsibility. While the South Australian economy was growing at the pitiful rate of .1 per cent in 1994—in spite of the growth rate the previous year under Labor of 4.3 per cent and despite national growth during 1994 of 5.3 per cent—we are told that it was not the State Government's fault. The State Government said, 'Do not blame us: blame Labor.' Every time the unemployment news is bad, again, the State Government blames Federal Labor.

When it started down its road of privatisation in hospitals, water, electricity and harvesting rights in forests—with schools yet to come—again, the State Government said that it is not its fault. We are told that 87 per cent of people polled do not want the management of water in this State privatised. But, it is still not the Government's fault. To the Government it is just a marketing problem. It is all the fault of that annoying Opposition which keeps reminding the Government of its responsibility to the people of this State. The Opposition will continue to press the Government to acknowledge that responsibility to the people of South Australia and to uphold the community's expectation of adequate standards in Government. I might add that this is a subject about which the Auditor-General in his latest report was strong in his concern about Government accountability in this State.

Over the last year we have seen the water and EDS contracts, and now the Minister for Health has suggested that a Kaiser Permanent health deal will rival the water and EDS contracts. The export bonanza that we expected in respect of the water deal does not stack up and we now know the promise of 60 per cent Australian equity in the company to be false. There are still some misguided Liberals asserting, despite their own polling—which shows that nine out of 10 people are against it—that people want the water privatised. We have seen the absolute debacle of the water contract process and the Minister's appallingly limited handle on the implications of the contract for South Australia. We have seen the distressingly apparent split between the Minister for Infrastructure and the Premier, which permeates the whole of their respective departments and which has caused the chasmic divide in the Liberal caucus to the point where Liberals are falling over themselves to damage their factional enemies. Of course, the margin securing the Premier's hold on his job is being chipped away with every conspiratorial whisper in the Liberal corridors. We have all this from a Government with a massive record majority in this House.

One would have hoped that, after having spent over a decade in Opposition, the Government would have a clear, progressive plan for South Australia and that it could not possibly have ran out of ideas only 26 months into its term. Given the desolate legislative program before this House, we know that that is exactly what has happened: the Government has run out of puff. In addition, the events of recent months have shown that it is incapable of keeping its backbenchers from working, at every opportunity, to ensure that the Liberal leadership is undermined. With respect to the Premier's plans of openness and accountability in Government, no member in this Chamber believes that codswallop from a Government—

Mr EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. The member for Taylor is inferring that no member

of the Chamber believes certain issues. She cannot make that statement as it is incorrect. She can refer only to members on her side of the House.

The ACTING SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. The member for Davenport can make his comment in debate while the member for Taylor can say what she likes in her contribution.

Ms WHITE: As I said, no member of this Chamber believes that codswallop from a Government which at every turn has sought to make sure that this Parliament and the people of South Australia do not have access to the facts which would allow them properly to scrutinise the decisions of this Government. Instead, we have ministerial statements, Government-funded marketing and mere words in the pretence of signalling greater accountability. But, as the advertisement says, it is just a game of pretends.

Mr EVANS (Davenport): I refer to the member for Taylor's comments about the 87 per cent of polled South Australians who allegedly do not want the management of SA Water outsourced. I make the point to the member for Taylor and other hypocrites on that side of the House that, if they were genuine in their belief about Government by polling—

Ms WHITE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I object to the member for Davenport's referring to me as a hypocrite.

The ACTING SPEAKER: That wording is against the member for Taylor, and in previous times it has been ruled out of order. I ask the member for Davenport to withdraw that comment.

Mr EVANS: I withdraw that comment but I continue to let others judge. The member for Taylor runs the argument that 87 per cent of those South Australians polled oppose the outsourcing of the management of water supply. If the member for Taylor wants to spend her parliamentary career running around and governing by polls, she will be seen as a hypocrite if she is not one already. I accept the point of order that she is not, but she may well be seen as one, and that is a danger that she may have to be aware of. We all know that, when Mr Bannon was Leader of the Opposition, the polls clearly showed that very few wanted the Roxby Downs development to go ahead. In fact, Bannon spent day after day, Question Time after Question Time, belting the then Government about Roxby Downs not proceeding. If the then Liberal Government had been a Government that governed by polls, Roxby Downs would not be there. Even the member for Taylor would agree that Roxby Downs provides good employment and good economic growth for this State and that, in the end result, it has been a good thing for this State.

If the member for Taylor is genuine about our being governed by polls, I look forward to her standing up in this Chamber and supporting the legislation that will provide for voluntary voting, because voluntary voting has the support of well over 70 per cent of South Australians. If the member for Taylor is not to be seen as a hypocrite, let her stand up in this Chamber and say quite openly that, because the polls show that 70 per cent of people support voluntary voting, the member for Taylor and her Party will march behind the legislation and support voluntary voting. I put it to the member for Taylor that she will not have the courage to do it. If she will not support voluntary voting, which is supported by the majority of South Australians, will she have the courage to stand up and say that she will support the members for Lee and Kaurna in their proposals to reintroduce the death

penalty—capital punishment? Everyone knows that 78 per cent of South Australians support that.

If members of the Labor Party want to tell this Parliament and the people of South Australia that theirs is a Party that will govern and develop policy by polls, the South Australian community will see it as a weak Party. The South Australian community will see the Labor Party as a Party which has no vision. Members of the Labor Party will simply run out to the community, distribute their two bob photocopied polls, and say that 52 per cent of the people believe something, thus it is their policy. I do not think that the South Australian community will accept that from the Opposition at election time, whether Federal or State. The member for Taylor and others opposite should seriously think about the way that they are going to run their Opposition.

The member for Taylor talks about the leadership of the Liberal Party. She ought also to consider her future leadership ambitions. Her naked ambition is well known around the Parliament. The Parliament knows about the ambitions of the member for Taylor. We know about deals done to get certain people into the position of Secretary of the State Labor Party, with voting in certain ways after the election when the member for Ramsay will not be here. We are not fools; we know about these ambitions. At the end of the day will the Labor Party vote for a leader who basically will run around the State saying, 'We have a poll which shows that 52 per cent of the people like this, so that will be our policy'? I do not think so. If the member for Taylor is proposing to go down the path of running a parliamentary career based on polls, it will be a sad day for her and for the Labor Party.

I also wish to comment on Mr Keating and the Federal election, particularly the debt that Mr Keating has got Australia into and some of the great comments that he has made about foreign debt. In 1983 foreign debt was \$23 billion. In his budget speech that year, Mr Keating said that '1983-84 holds great promise of a considerable improvement in economic performance'. In 1984, just one year later, when the debt had increased to about \$28 billion, he said, 'We now have strong economic growth, many more jobs, a substantial fall in inflation and declining interest rates. The Government's policy is on track.' The debt is increasing but the Government's policy is on track! In 1986 he said, 'The 1986-87 budget, which I have presented tonight, rings the changes for a more robust and aggressive Australian economy.' In those two or three short years the debt had blown out to \$75 billion.

Then, of course, in 1988 Mr Keating is on record as saying, 'Our foreign debt burden has already stabilised and begun to fall.' That was from his budget speech on 23 August 1988, but in that year the foreign debt had climbed to \$92.8 billion.

Mr De Laine: It is not Government debt.

Mr EVANS: The facts are that the debt has climbed considerably under this Labor Government. If we analyse what has happened to Australia and its States over the past 13 years, we find that we cannot trust Labor with the management of our money. Consider what happened to Cain and Kerner in Victoria regarding the amount of money that was lost there. Kerner got her reward: she is now in an advisory job in Canberra. In Western Australia under Labor, with WA Inc, we know that Lawrence has been rewarded with her current position as Minister for Health. We should also consider what happened here with Bannon and our huge debt. We all know that Mr Bannon has been rewarded with a position on the ABC board. The people of South Australia

need to take a very hard look at how the Australian and South Australian economies have been affected by the mismanagement of various Labor Governments.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I have certainly listened to an interesting debate. However, since the Brown Government was elected, on many occasions my colleagues and I have brought to the attention of this House issues which have demonstrated that this Government has not kept its commitment to provide proper services for the people of this State or to protect our communities.

Mr Condous interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: Nor did this Government tell us its intention for our State-owned assets or, for that matter, how it intended to provide services to the people of this State.

I will highlight some of the hidden agendas from which I suspect members on the Government benches are now back pedalling at a rapid rate. Great unfairness is now occurring, and the Brown Government and its supporters should hang their heads in shame. Rarely do we hear backbenchers calling for changes, so I will talk about the injustice that is forced upon injured workers.

Mr Condous: Oh!

Mrs GERAGHTY: This is quite true, and to prove it I will highlight a couple of instances. I refer to the way that those who have innocently injured themselves in the workplace are treated as a result of Dean Brown's and Graham Ingerson's WorkCover legislation. Frankly, it is nothing short of disgraceful. I am contacted all the time by people who are affected by this grubby piece of legislation.

Mr Condous: Cheats.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Here we go: anyone who has been injured in the workplace is obviously a grubby cheat. I will quote what has been said by an injured worker:

I and my family have gone through hell because I had an accident at work and had to go on WorkCover.

No-one would argue, surely, that a work-related injury—

Mr Condous: That is one person.

Mrs GERAGHTY: It is not one person: there are dozens of them. No-one would argue, surely, that a work-related injury will not impact on the family, but the changes to the WorkCover legislation ensure that families of injured workers do go through an unnecessary nightmare. Injured workers are treated as industrial criminals, and this directly impacts upon their families.

I will cite two more of the many cases that I have raised in the past. This worker suffered a work-related injury and was given the choice, under the changes to the legislation, of taking weekly compensation payments or a yearly lump sum payment of approximately \$17 000. WorkCover then handed the case to a private insurance company case manager. When the worker's case came up for review, the case manager directed that fresh medical reports be carried out. The result was that the worker was fit to carry out employment which was deemed to provide an income of \$15 000. The powers that be then calculated that the balance of compensation entitled the worker to \$3 000 per year. Imagine trying to live on that.

I will now outline the situation where an injured worker may have encountered a secondary injury—for example, a stroke—incurred possibly by the harassment of the employer or haranguing by a representative of WorkCover. Section 30A of the legislation—I will not read it all, but I will pick out the parts that are of interest—provides:

A disability consisting of an illness or disorder of the mind is compensable if and only if—

- (a) the employment was a substantial cause of the disability; and
- (b) the disability did not arise wholly or predominantly from—
 - (i) reasonable action taken in a reasonable manner by the employer—

this is regarding discipline, demotion, and so on—

- (ii) a decision of the employer based on reasonable grounds. . .
- (iii) reasonable administrative action taken in a reasonable manner by the employer. . .
- (iv) reasonable action taken in a reasonable manner under this Act affecting the worker.

The question that one is forced to ask is: what is determined to be reasonable action by a representative of the WorkCover Corporation in the handling of a claim by the contracted insurer? The Minister must clarify this question, because in the case of someone who may have a secondary injury—for example, a stroke—I believe that such clients of WorkCover, who, like many clients in the main, wish they had never heard of WorkCover, are treated in a most unfortunate and undignified manner. If clients were considered as injured workers, not as numbers on the computer, such secondary injuries may not occur. Proving that they have been unreasonably dealt with under the current legislation is nigh on impossible.

Through no fault of their own, workers are injured in the workplace and then crushed by this workers' compensation system. In the first case I mentioned, the Government has determined that the worker is able to work and forces that person onto unemployment benefits because there are no jobs for injured workers. So, who is the beneficiary of this? Certainly, not the worker, and it is definitely not the worker's family. Indeed, one worker told me that, when inquiring with the private insurance case manager about her case, she was told that the case manager could not care less because she was going on leave and she could speak to someone the next day, and this is a tale we hear quite often.

Workers have a right to know what is happening about issues that affect their lives. As it now stands, they are kept in the dark, which adds to their frustration. I would argue that this is a direct intention of the Brown Government's legislation. It is also true that, when on WorkCover, injured workers have lost fundamental rights that are available to the general public. For instance, there is no right to question decisions and, in some cases, there is simply no right of review. Injured workers want to get back to work but are being forced onto social security and denied access to rehabilitation programs. They want to contribute to society with their skills and, most of all, simply want to be able to earn a living.

Injured workers are being treated with contempt, but what is their crime? They were injured carrying out their employment in the workplace. As one worker put to me: no person can even begin to understand how hurtful and degrading it is to be on WorkCover. I believe it begs the question of how a system can justify its practices when the outcome is that often the greatest injury is to those it purports to protect. I wonder how many WorkCover clients have been damaged permanently by the treatment dished out to them? I wonder how many workers who could not cope for all the stated reasons ended their lives. When this question was asked of the WorkCover Corporation, the reply was that such statistics are not kept. Perhaps this is due to the fact not that such records would be an invasion of privacy but that such statistics may cause great concern.

I have spoken also of my opposition to the privatisation of the administration of the Modbury Hospital. It was not just

my opposition but, in particular, the opposition of those of us who reside in the area and who, at times, require the services of the hospital—a hospital we fought hard for and have been fiercely proud of. If this move has been so good for our community we ask: 'Why can't we view the contract?'

The same can be said of the Brown Government's action in the reduction of SSO hours. Parents have made it quite clear to me that they oppose this policy and that their children, the students, are suffering in the most important years of their lives. Their education is the building block for their entire lives. In fact, many schools are now levying parents to pay for the services of SSOs, because those schools know that SSOs provide a necessary function in the proper provision of education to our children. But it is not parents who should be burdened with the cost of that service, because it is a Government responsibility—a responsibility that this Government—

Mr Rossi interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: Absolutely amazing.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I call on the member for Lee to withdraw the remark that my colleague is a dickhead.

Mr Rossi interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass): The honourable member will resume his seat. I was speaking to the clerk at the time and did not hear the comment. If the member for Lee made that comment, it is unparliamentary and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr ROSSI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I did not make the comment alleged by the member for Hart, and the other point I would like to make—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. If the honourable member says he did not make the comment—

Mr ROSSI: I wish to take a point of order.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member for Lee will resume his seat. I did not hear the comment that was made. The member for Lee says he did not use the words alleged by the member for Hart; therefore I cannot ask him to withdraw something that was not said. Does the member for Lee have a point of order?

Mr ROSSI: I believe that the point of order, if there was a point or order, should be from the person—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order. The member for Colton.

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I rise to speak on one of the most important local issues affecting my electorate of Colton, and that is the clean-up of the Patawalonga-Sturt Creek catchment. The Government will soon make a decision on which option it will adopt in addressing the environmental clean-up of the Sturt Creek catchment once the Patawalonga is sealed off. I feel confident that, having gone through the lengthy process of lobbying the 13 Ministers of Government, including the Premier, option three, which is the open channel option, will be rejected. Alternatively, I believe a decision will be made that is acceptable and environmentally responsible to the people of Colton and to the people of South Australia.

Option three in itself is a disaster, totally unacceptable to the electorate, and an irresponsible step in the long-term solution to an effective clean-up. There is, as I stated to the Ministers, only one acceptable option, and that is for a series of wetlands to be established between Stirling and West Beach, which will act as the filtering ponds and kidneys of

the wetlands. The first of these wetlands has commenced at Urrbrae. Other suggested locations are Science Park, near Flinders University; the south parklands in the city of Adelaide; Morphettville racecourse; another that should be established in the West Torrens council area, close to West Beach; and a final ponding basin near the Glenelg sewage treatment works.

Ponding basins are recognised as being rich reserves that benefit every person in the community. They can now be created by man, treasured and protected and utilised to play a vital role in the environmental responsibility associated with cleaning up polluted catchments, such as the Sturt Creek and the Patawalonga. These basins filter out heavy metals and pollutants but, more importantly, they can act as an invaluable resource by relocating water in the winter months, which can be used for the irrigation of parks and reserves in the dry months of summer. In the driest State of the driest continent in the world, they are priceless assets to be valued, protected and respected.

We have seen the world acclaimed wetlands created at Salisbury by the MFP, which will filter one-third of the State's stormwater, and a similar concept will enable the Sturt Creek to be filtered before it is put out to sea. The option proposed for the Glenelg North-West Beach area should not be wetlands but a ponding basin, because of its close proximity to the Adelaide Airport and the urgent need not need to attract birds. It can be diluted with fresh sea water and allowed to stand for some 48 hours in sunlight to kill off the bacteria, which will then produce water going out to sea that is 95 per cent pure, compared with the pollution that is now emanating from the Patawalonga.

Wetlands take the peak off floods by storing water and releasing it slowly. They convert nutrients, which in excess can create problems, into assets such as aquatic plants and microscopic animals, and wetlands are also breeding grounds for ducks and fish. I display a photograph of an area of land located on Burbridge Road, which was once wasteland and is now a marvellous wetland. The wetlands themselves hold onto sediments and toxins, keeping them out of rivers and streams and providing shelter for native animals and birds. Reeds are also planted and surrounding trees add to the landscape. Wetlands also support fringing trees and shrubs, which shelter additional birds and animals, as well as adding beauty to the area.

We are also learning from the Salisbury wetland experience that wetlands, using their valuable function, help to solve major problems, the most important aspect of which is the need to manage stormwater and waste water. However, let me speak about the most important of these wetlands which I have mentioned (and that is one that will cost approximately \$3 million) and which I believe should be jointly funded from the catchment levy now currently being collected by the State Government and the Adelaide City Council: the wetlands being proposed by an area bounded by Goodwood Road, Greenhill Road and Sir Lewis Cohen Avenue.

This area spans probably 50, 60 or more acres and is currently not used due to the poor quality of the Bay of Biscay soil, which renders it useless as parklands. However, with proper vegetation and planning, these wetlands could be the most significant of all. When properly vegetated with marshes and estuaries the city wetland can provide rich Australian breeding grounds for native water fowl and water breeding nurseries. Correct plantings can form ribbons of lush shelters for these water birds and native animals, and the

volume of water stored can be increased by sinking holes into the underwater table to provide endless clean flowing water, which the council could store during the winter months to irrigate the south parklands during the dry summer months.

What could be created in this significant area on Goodwood Road is a series of boardwalks built over the entire area of the wetlands, which would then play a role not only in purifying the water going out to North Glenelg but also to create one of the greatest and most significant ecotourism projects ever seen in the world. We would then allow our own community, along with tens of thousands of interstate and overseas visitors, to see one of the greatest functional wetlands which would also house many Australian native birds and water fowl. In fact, in time it could become one of the great ecotourism attractions of the world. No other city in Australia could create such a significant ecotourism project, which would double as a filtering system for the Sturt Creek catchment as well as becoming one of the major tourist attractions in Australia.

As the Government we must be responsible and send a clear message to the whole of the State that in cleaning up both the Torrens River and the Patawalonga we will put into action one of the most environmentally responsible projects which will be acceptable to people of all political persuasions. Let us not forget that the Labor Government, over the past 20 years, totally ignored the environmental responsibility of doing something about cleaning up the Patawalonga, the Sturt Creek and the Torrens River, along with the Murray River. I certainly intend to push for this project because I believe there would be nothing more significant than many hundreds of thousands of people being able to come right into the heart of the city to see a project initially built to filter the water going down into Glenelg and West Beach but, more importantly, that we took the opportunity to create an ecotourism project with a series of boardwalks. I believe that it could become a world-renowned tourism facility.

I also believe that the time has come when the demands of the people of Colton should be respected and met, and the only way that will occur is by listening to the community and the people we represent and not by saying that we will continue the legacy of the past Labor Government, which was to open up the Patawalonga sluice gates every two weeks and allow black sludge to filter in and travel north, polluting the beaches of West Beach, Henley and Grange and not allowing the people to have a clean environment, which is the responsibility of any Government that believes that it should address the people. I look forward enthusiastically to the Government's announcement, which I believe will come forward in the next few months.

I believe that the talks that have been going on between the community of the western suburbs and the Government will be listened to and we will finish up with a clean up of the Sturt Creek, the Patawalonga and the Torrens River, which will be environmentally responsible. This Government will then receive the accolade it deserves in being the first Government over the past two decades to address the importance of acting responsibly towards the children of South Australia in providing them with clean catchments.

Ms HURLEY (Napier): I was pleased to hear the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development again announce the Virginia pipeline scheme. This must be the most announced scheme in the past 10 years. His predecessor in the former Government, Terry Groom, must have announced it at least three times, and this

Minister must be on his third time also. The Minister's statement is long on the benefits but short on detail and on the time line for its being implemented. However, it contains some small hope that it might happen soon. A number of the growers who will benefit from this pipeline are in my electorate, and they are anxious to see some action in respect of this scheme.

In his statement the Minister said that Cabinet had signed off on the upgrade of Bolivar at a capital cost of \$32.5 million and had fast tracked the funding to ensure increased availability of water resources to the region around Virginia, which is very important. He listed the amount of production in that region in the way of market gardens but did not mention the export potential for that region as well. Growers in the region are already exporting vegetables and flowers to the Asian region. It is a developing industry, one which the council and the local business community are keen to foster. This additional water will be essential in that process.

The Minister's statement says that the next phase of the scheme is to get the parties together. The Virginia Irrigation Association, Euratech and Water Resources Consulting Services will be talking with SA Water and the MFP to develop a heads of agreement to define the principles under which the project will be implemented, and it is hoped that this will be resolved by next month. I hope that that happens and that we get some action soon. The Minister and previous Ministers have failed to properly highlight that the growers in Virginia have played a major part in getting the scheme to this stage.

They also have a heavy financial commitment in terms of the amount of water they are prepared to take from this pipeline. The growers are committed to taking much more water than they currently use. It will mean that they are committing themselves financially above the level of water that they are expected to take. For that reason it has been difficult to get growers to totally commit themselves to the scheme, because they are uncertain about committing that level of finance when they do not have a great deal of detail about the project and its chance of being a success.

Governments are always keen to take credit for schemes, but sometimes they fail to acknowledge the hard work put in by people on the ground. This is an instance of that. Another scheme in the Elizabeth area is the Safcol project, which I have heard the Minister mention. The Government has failed to acknowledge the work of the Elizabeth council, and Mayor Marilyn Baker in particular, in encouraging Safcol to set up its factory at Elizabeth. I understand that it undertook a deal of work to get the Government involved and that it finally became involved at the last moment. However, the Government pre-empted the announcement and then left Elizabeth council off the acknowledgments in its press release.

I would also like to discuss briefly some areas of my shadow portfolio. Late last year, a new Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations was appointed. I was interested to see that Mr Ashenden had nothing to say—

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, may I assist the member for Napier? It is not proper to refer to members by their family name or by anything other than the title of the office that they hold in Parliament or their electorate.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I did not hear what was said by the honourable member. If she transgressed, I ask her not to do so.

Ms HURLEY: I am sorry, Mr Acting Speaker, it was a slip of the tongue. During the lengthy debate last year on the major legislation regarding the amalgamation of local government, the new Minister for Local Government did not make one single contribution. So, I will be interested to see with what vigour he pursues reform in the local government area, reform in which the Government invested so much time and effort last year. Although the Opposition bent over backwards to try to ensure that the legislation got through, the Government insisted on almost every clause and told me that, in the interests of the State, it was incredibly important to get this legislation through. This new Minister, who in spite of his background in local government with the Tea Tree Gully council did not make one single contribution to the debate, is now in charge of this very important piece of local government reform. At the end of the year I will be interested to see the results of that legislation.

Very soon after being appointed, the Minister made some statements about the Highbury dump. As the member for Wright, I understand that he held off making any statements about the Highbury dump until he saw the way the debate was going. He finally came out and announced his vehement opposition to the dump after he was made Minister. As the new Minister he had to make the final decision on whether the dump would go ahead. However, having finally come out and opposed it, he walked away from making that decision and hand-balled it to the Minister for the Environment, arousing quite a bit of disquiet in the area. The community finally thought that at last they had a Minister who had a reasonable knowledge of the local area, one who had made a strong statement against the dump, and that he would be the one to make the decision. I do not know whether it was too hard, but he handed it to the Minister for the Environment to make the decision.

I am not quite sure what were the sins of the previous Minister which caused him, as opposed to all the others, to be dumped. The Minister for Health has made significant gaffs during the course of this Parliament, as has the Minister for Emergency Services.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: I just thought that as you were here I might as well. The Minister for Education has put offside most of the education community and most parents with savage cuts in several significant areas of education which parents, in particular, have opposed. The most obvious one is the reduction in the number of school services officers. Now that school has started, I note that in my own son's school it is making a significant impact in spite of the willingness of the remaining SSOs to do extra work.

In the area of urban development, the new Minister will face quite a challenge. There is wide speculation about the future direction of development approvals. Rumours abound that there will be renewed attempts to introduce legislation to give the Minister sweeping powers to approve development proposals. This legislation was brought in previously and thrown out by the Opposition with the support of the Democrats. In spite of this, proposals such as the Wirrina development and the Woolworths building at Gepps Cross were approved.

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

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): If members and other readers of *Hansard* care to cast their eyes back 13 pages they will find incorporated in the remarks that I made during the grievance

debate following Question Time three tables which illustrate the incompetence and deceitfulness of Paul Keating as Prime Minister and the way in which he now seeks yet again to deceive the Australian people.

Mr D.S. Baker: Not scumbag!

Mr LEWIS: That term is a debasement of Parliament. Not only was it a lie in the way it was used in that it did not accurately describe the person at whom it was directed, but it is quite unparliamentary to use those terms. Those terms do not inspire respect for the institution of Parliament nor do they add to an understanding of the issues of the day; they simply detract from the standing of Parliament in the mind of the public. Those people who do see some value in it see it only as entertainment value and in no way as a contribution to a wider or clearer understanding of issues. It is regrettable that that is how many young people have come to see Parliament: as a source of entertainment. They do not understand its relevance to their life today or their future, and that is very much thanks to one Paul Keating who seeks re-election.

I referred during the course of my earlier remarks to some tables which I incorporated in the record. Keating promised no tax increases and no new taxes, but now we have increased taxes and new taxes. The tax increases in the 1995-96 budget amount to just over \$3.5 billion, and in the 1996-97 budget they will be a little over \$3.8 billion: altogether about \$7.4 billion.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes. The tax increases in the 1995-96 budget will come to about \$3.4 billion and \$6.5 billion, giving us a grand total of a further \$9.924 billion. That leaves out the 12 per cent sales tax on currently exempt builders' hardware and certain building materials, measures which were defeated in the Senate but which would have added further to those totals. If you add that to the tax increases and new taxes, you come up with a figure of almost \$18 billion—some sort of a promise to break! Tell the Australian people and Australian business that it will not happen, and then belt them with an \$18 billion bill.

It is no wonder that we are in trouble with our national accounts and that we have a balance of payments problem, because business has to borrow that money to pay those taxes. It cannot just snap its fingers, increase its prices and expect to get increased profit from which to pay them. A good deal of business—for instance, primary industry, whether it be mining or agriculture—relies on world prices to obtain those taxes for the revenue which the greedy Federal Government promised it would not pursue or obtain, and which it now does. So much for the first two broken promises.

The third broken promise was the Medicare assurance: the lie that was told by Carmen Lawrence in June 1994. The Government finally increased the Medicare levy by 7 per cent even though it promised that it would not, and that was a whopping 4 per cent more than the CPI. The fourth broken promise was on pensions where the ALP policy document said:

Labor's commitment to removing all age pensions from the tax system by 1995 would benefit pensioners paid at the part rate as well as providing some assistance to retirees with income beyond the pension cut-out point.

That was in the 1993 ALP policy document. It was callously broken. Labor's promises given at election cannot be believed. Who is saying that his opponent cannot be trusted? It is Keating accusing Howard of that. Yet the record clearly

shows that it is Keating himself who cannot be trusted, and that is usually what scoundrels do—accuse their opponents of their own sins.

Promise No. 5 involves company tax. Altogether the breach of company tax has resulted collectively, in the 1995-96 and 1996-97 budgets, in about \$1.9 billion—\$320 million in the 1995-96 budget and \$1 560 million in the 1996-97 budget as it goes through. Again, that has serious implications for our foreign debt, because firms have to borrow to pay those taxes. Promise No. 6 has been broken. With regard to a proposal to sell off Telstra by the Liberal Party to finance its environment policy and some other initiatives, the Prime Minister has the gall to say, 'We won't let them do that,' and 'It's naughty to do it.' He said that the Government had no intention whatever of further reducing its shareholding in the Commonwealth Bank. In the legislation that was passed by the Parliament to authorise this sale, we made quite clear that we would not go below the 50.1 per cent mark. An interviewer of Ralph Willis at the time asked:

So, unlike before, this time your commitment is iron clad?

The answer:

Absolutely, yes.

That was on 31 October 1993. Yet that iron clad commitment was broken. So much for the Labor Party's record on promises!

We also ought look at its record on performance measured against its own claims and commitments: unemployment is over 8 per cent (in fact, it is around 8.5 per cent, and it has been as high as 11 per cent); growth is nowhere near the 4.5 per cent we need to get unemployment down to Keating's forecast of 5 per cent by the turn of the century; and foreign debt is up from \$23 billion from when Keating first came into senior office in the Labor Government in Canberra and is now over \$170 billion.

There are failures in microeconomic reforms such as in regard to the ports around Australia's coastline, and that has direct impact on the competitiveness of our exports. There is the failed sale of the Australian National Line, because the Keating Government did not have the guts to deal with the maritime unions, and then the non-implementation of the important so-called Creative Nation document. That was the most destructive document I have ever seen. All one has to do is look at the KPMG report, which states:

The delay in implementing the policy has weakened the signal that Government regards culture as important and caused some frustration from the stakeholders.

The next item of which I remind members—and I have already mentioned this—is the debasement of the Parliament itself by the shaming of the Speaker. Also, Keating shirks Question Time in the Parliament and breaks major policies and announcements, and worse, he makes those policy announcements outside the Parliament. Those promises to which I have already referred are the sorts of things that distress me.

In addition to that, the Labor Party does its bit, and the old silver bodgie Bob Hawke did his bit by further destroying people's trust and respect for the Parliament. At the time he left the Parliament, he had already pre-sold an 'exclusive' of his resignation speech to a television station. I would have thought that really was the pits: to make up your mind that you are going to go and then before you do, while you are still in public office and being paid your salary and your expenses and everything else, to make a deal to sell your resignation speech exclusively to one television station is the

pits. We must remember that it was the Labor Party that used the armed forces to help break a strike, yet hypocritically against that is the current policy of the Labor Party. We have to look only at prominent Ministers during these Labor years, such as the man who put Paul Keating in the office, a self-confessed liar, Graham Richardson, who follows on his master's heels pretty closely in that regard.

Further to that, we have the sorts of things that Paul Keating, Neville Rann and Malcolm Turnbull did with the Australian National Line: it has now been given back to its real owners, that is, the unions, and they screw the rest of us with it. There is Neville Rann as honorary consul of Ghana, chumming up with its ruler Flight Lieutenant Gerry Rawlins, who is an awful fellow—

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

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I support the Supply Bill. Just over two years ago, Dean Brown made a commitment that his Government, of which I am proud to be a member, would reduce the debt, remove the budget deficit, rebuild our economic base and give South Australians confidence in their future. We do not have to go back too far before that commitment to know the shape that South Australia was in. For 11 years the Labor Party had ruled this State and, of course, it has ruled it over the past 20 years, with the exception of 1979 to 1982. We have delivered not a Utopia, because no-one can do that—not a Liberal or a Labor Government—but a realistic base to ensure that the prosperity of South Australia and South Australians, regardless of background, will be restored in the future.

It has not been an easy task, but nevertheless we are on track. The Government is cutting the State debt even more quickly than promised at the election because of the successful asset management program, which has resulted in higher values being realised for major assets than previously forecast, and I cite the sale of the State Bank, the Pipelines Authority and SGIC.

The 1995 State budget estimated that net debt in real terms would be \$7 146 million by June 1988. The revised forecast is \$6 890 million—an improvement of \$256 million. That is a considerable achievement, and we are well on the way to rebuilding jobs. The South Australian unemployment rate is at its lowest for almost five years: there has been a fall from 11.2 per cent at the election to 9 per cent, and full-time employment rose 3 900 in December after a rise of 6 000 in November. There has been major job creation under such projects as the EDS contract, 900 jobs; the contracting out of metropolitan water services, 1 100 jobs; and Westpac Mortgage Centre, 580 jobs.

The Opposition might well quote other statistics, and you will always find statistics to support the argument that things are not so rosy, and no-one is pretending that they are rosy. This is a matter of knowing whether we are on or off track, whether we have a base for the future or are stagnating. That is what was happening under the previous Government. You had 11 years of it. Being a former economics teacher, I know of a lovely law called the law of diminishing returns. After a certain stage of any business, there is the danger that it will stagnate, and that extra time will lead only to a point where it does not have returns. The Labor Party has reached that. No doubt a Liberal Government could reach that point after 15 or 20 years, but, by being aware of the problem, hopefully we can rectify that before we get to that stage. We can revitalise

our position. No doubt, after 13 years the Federal Government has reached the law of diminishing returns.

Two weeks ago, I was fortunate to be asked by SBS Radio in Melbourne to comment, in Italian, on the Federal election. SBS Radio had a Labor member from an Italian background speaking as well. It was no surprise to hear comments that the Federal Opposition will be a Thatcher or Kennett type of Government with continuous philosophic references to 'us and them'. Opposition members have failed to realise that the Iron Curtain has come down. If they listened to a former Labor Party member who is a great academic and for whom I have much time as a former lecturer of mine, Dr Neal Blewett, they would recognise that the polarity that the Opposition talks about between the major Parties does not exist. The extreme right and left of the magnitudes that Opposition members talk about do not exist. Those extremes do not exist, and that is why Australia has stable government overall.

The reality is that after a certain time Governments tend to diminish in their delivery and there is no doubt that the Federal Government has reached that point. We can see that it has reached that point because it is resorting to focusing its campaign on personalities as it is short on policies.

I now intend to quote newspaper reports to show how South Australia has fared in the past two years. The *Advertiser* of 3 January 1996 carried the headline 'South Australia's economy rebounding: report'. This is not a Liberal Party speech note or taken from a Liberal Party pamphlet: it is from the *Advertiser* front page. When did we see headlines such as that in the past? Carol Altmann's article states:

The South Australian economy is now one of the strongest performers in the nation, a new report has found. The survey shows a significant turnaround for South Australia over the past 12 months, with the State moving from the bottom of the performance table to second place. The independent report, compiled by New South Wales Treasury, is considered one of the most influential in measuring the economic health of the States. It showed South Australia outclassed Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia to fall only marginally behind leader New South Wales. The South Australian recovery has been fuelled largely by a strong growth in retail sales, home buying, commercial property approvals and steadily improving jobless figures.

The report goes on. This sort of headline tells us that we are on track, that the economy is picking up. On 2 January the *Advertiser* carried the headline 'Campaign to create 5 000 jobs'. I will be brief, because I am running out of time. The Brown Government is on track. On 10 January there was the heading 'Wine exports rocket to record \$406 million'. The Opposition might claim that the State Government is not responsible for growing vines, but it has given significant investment incentives to the industry. The Liberal Government is promoting growth and encouraging people to have confidence, which is what this is all about. On 11 January the *Advertiser* carried an article headed 'Tourism boost for South Australia', and it goes on:

South Australia is enjoying an unprecedented boom in Asian tourism. The influx of tourists from the region has leaped a staggering 51 per cent in 12 months.

If that is not a significant indicator, I do not know what is. As I said, these are *Advertiser* articles and not Liberal Party pamphlet comments. These are reports in our daily paper. Another headline was 'South Australia's teaching ratio the best'. True, there are concerns and we would like to be in a position where we do not have to make cuts. However, it is a bit like blaming the firefighter who puts the fire out for

starting the fire. The Brown Liberal Government has been responsible within existing constraints and we are putting the State back on track. The *Advertiser* of 24 January carried the headline 'State economy back on track'. That is where I started from: South Australia is back on track and will continue on track.

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

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): In supporting the Bill, I want to make two separate comments. First, I want to congratulate the Brown Government, the Premier and his Ministers on the initiative they have shown over the past two years and then I want to discuss briefly an *Advertiser* article of 13 February 1996 by Carol Altmann headlined 'Horror of child rape revealed', which is a stark report indeed.

The Brown Liberal Government is to be commended on reaching its key objectives over the past 24 months. Congratulations must go to the Premier and his Cabinet for restoring the State's financial position, culling the State's debt and essentially restoring confidence to the State's economy which, of course, had been devastated by 11 years of Labor Administration. This has been done by rebuilding jobs and reducing the public sector work force while at the same time providing high quality Government services: that is a perfect balance and shows good housekeeping. The Brown Government is cutting State debt even more quickly than was promised at the 1993 election. The Government has been able to cut the massive debt through its asset management program, which has resulted in higher values being realised for major assets than was previously forecast. I cite three examples: the sale of Bank SA, the Pipelines Authority and SGIC.

The 1995 State Budget estimated that net debt in real terms would be \$7 146 million by June 1998. However, through excellent management, the revised forecast is now much less—\$256 million less—down to \$6 890 million. I could go on to talk about restoration of confidence in the State's economy with the rebuilding of jobs: South Australia's unemployment rate is at its lowest for almost five years, having fallen from 11.2 per cent at the election to 9 per cent. The level of full time employment increased by 3 900 in December after a rise of 6 000 in November. There have been major job creation projects, including the EDS contract involving 900 jobs, as some of my colleagues have mentioned: the metropolitan water and waste water services contracting out involving 1 100 jobs; the Westpac Mortgage Centre, an exciting concept involving 580 jobs in the first phase of staff intake; and the Bankers Trust Investment Management Centre involving 400 staff. These developments all amount to jobs, which are the key to South Australia's future.

My second point does not focus on the economy for the first two years of the Brown Government, because I refer to the article in yesterday's *Advertiser* of 13 February. It was extremely disturbing to read about the horror of child rape reported by Carol Altmann. Certainly, the disturbing figures of 1994-95 issued by South Australian Police Commissioner Hunt smash beyond all doubt the myth that the majority of sexual attacks are carried out by strangers on the street. True, many are carried out by such people but more than one-quarter of all South Australian rape victims are children under 14 years. Like the member for Hartley, I have had a lot to do with children as a teacher for many years and this report concerns and distresses me.

The article states that most offences are committed by people familiar with the victim. I applaud the article by Carol Altmann, which states that, of the 656 reported rapes in 1994-95, 478 (73 per cent) of the offenders were known to the victims. That makes it a matter of even more concern. The most common offenders, whether they be sexual molesters or rapists, were often friends, acquaintances or relatives of the family. The article went on to state that children were often the victims of the rape and that 28 per cent of reported attacks involved boys and girls up to the age of 14, which is quite horrendous. Young people under the age of 25 accounted for two-thirds of all rape victims. I will quote the last part of the article, because it is extremely relevant, as follows:

Previous studies by the Australian Bureau of Statistics reveal only a quarter of sexual assaults are reported. . .

This means that up to 2 500 rapes or sexual assaults in South Australia each year are not reported. As a result of this, many lives are affected. These are disturbing figures and we are naturally horrified with these trends. We need to ask ourselves again and again why we seem to be getting worse than better in our so-called civilised society, where there is responsible Government. We seem to be following a worldwide trend at the moment. I have some evidence, compiled by Dr Judith Reisman, which was presented to the United States Attorney-General's Commission on Pornography a couple of years ago. In her report Dr Reisman claims that in leading adult magazines there is an increasing emphasis and increasing levels of extremes involving children in sexual contact with adults, with much of the material appearing in subtle cartoon form.

She says that this challenges social taboos. She reported to this commission that there were 520 illustrations with a child in some form of sexual encounter with an adult, which is almost mind boggling, and 60 illustrations with an older child. Dr Reisman cited three magazines which had an overseas market. I believe that that market extends even to Australia. The magazine targeted children between the ages of three and 11. The ages most often depicted or targeted were those between six and 11. Two child development specialists were asked to report on this. The report states:

One possible dangerous effect of these pictures is that they inhibit the prohibition making young people less secure.

That is emphasised by the lack of security young people experience in our society. As we know, child pornography is abhorrent and unlawful. Nevertheless, it is still very much with us. Years ago, when pornography laws were examined and put into operation, many said that we should be able to see, read and hear what we like. In other words, over the years the mentality has grown that we can do what we like within reason and to hell with the consequences. So, generally, society as a whole has become a living hell for many young innocent people whose lives have been permanently scarred and whose young bodies have been violated and ruined for life. As counsellors, my wife and I still work with some of these young victims—males and females—who are trying to put their lives back together again. Some of them were molested when they were about three or four years old, and now that they are in their mid-twenties they still have very severe psychological problems.

The false attitude about so-called 'freedom and liberty' must be checked and reassessed. I venture to suggest that we are not free to do as we like. With the liberalisation of our laws there is the danger that we will erode and even lose the basic life principles which I think are important: consider-

ation for others, self-discipline and self-control. Not only must we have severe penalties for child sex offenders but we must clamp down on the child pornography that feeds and stimulates the fantasies of many of these very insecure people. People in society must stand up, voice their disapproval and refuse to tolerate this depravity, which affects so many of our youths today.

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): I take this opportunity to indicate how the budget process is being successfully used in my electorate of Kaurna. Frankly, when I sat down to write my speech notes I hardly knew where to start. The activity in my electorate is absolutely incredible. I do not think that the people of the electorate of Kaurna quite understand where their members have been for the past 25 years. First, I refer to the new Seaford 6-12 school which opened on 29 January this year as planned. It is the first high school in South Australia to be built by the State Government in about 12 years. It opened this year with years 7, 8 and 9 and will expand to year 10 next year. In a staged process it will develop each year to take in year 12. The new Principal is Tanya Rogers, and I congratulate Tanya on the way in which she has come into this new position. She has taken over and set up a brand new building. Currently, her office is in a small transportable building, which is probably a bit of a come-down for Tanya, but she has done very well. The students are enthusiastic and have fitted in really well.

I congratulate Fred Livings and the interim school council on taking the bull by the horns, because they have knuckled down to tackle a really difficult situation. Recently, we visited the site with Dennis Ralph. We actually called in unexpectedly at the school on day 1 and noticed that there were a few problems such as school library facilities not yet up and running, but that is part of the forward staging program. The most exiting thing about the Seaford 6-12 school is that it has an IT focus, which is very important for this Government. I look forward to an announcement in due course that the Seaford 6-12 school will become the IT focus of the south. I would really support such an announcement.

Secondly, traffic lights were activated on Commercial Road on 25 January prior to school starting. I give special thanks to a few Department of Transport employees: Jim Armstrong, Rick Burt, Wayne Carey, John Shaw and Steve Charles. I single them out and thank them because they had very little notice that they would be expected to have these lights working before the school opened. They did a magnificent job to get those lights installed within six weeks. I also acknowledge the amount of community input that went into lobbying and obtaining support for those lights to be operating before the school started, because it is an extremely busy corner. With the main street development that will now occur along that road, it will become even busier.

On the same street and in the same locality, construction has now started on the Seaford Health Centre. This will be part of a joint venture between the Seaford Health Centre and the Ecumenical Centre. It is a very unique development. It has put Seaford on the international map. The Seaford Rise area is now attracting attention from around the world, because it is the first such development in Australia. It certainly saves money, too, because there are shared facilities between the Ecumenical Centre and the Health Centre.

In that region, we are about to start building the new recreation centre, which will have a child-care facility attached to it. This will be a shared facility between the Department of Education and the community, as will the new

community library, which will be a shared facility between the new Seaford 6-12 school and the community. It is all very exciting for Seaford. No-one could say that the electorate of Kaurna in that area is not getting its money worth.

The new CFS/St John Ambulance volunteers station at Aldinga will be opened, I hope, in the very near future. This is also a very exciting project for the Aldinga area. A lot of work went into the planning of this project. It took some time but it has come together very well. It was almost completely funded by the State Government. The project recognised the need for a far better location for Aldinga CFS. It is now on a main road and has very easy access to all areas that it services. The project also acknowledged the need existing for the Aldinga St John volunteers, who did not really have a home. It has now collocated them with the CFS, which was a very sensible thing to do. Certainly the volunteer groups in that area are worthy of this new building and are working very well together on that site.

Establishment of the Aldinga treatment works has been announced. It involves a staged process and tenders have been called for that project at Aldinga. The Aldinga treatment works is the same treatment works announced three times by the previous Government but never built. I am very pleased that finally the Aldinga area has been recognised and that stage I will cater for the first 5 000 connections in the limited scheme. It will be a land-based disposal system, which is extremely important because it is in one of the policy statements of this Government. It proves that we are not merely paying lip service to this important environmental issue. It will also offer unique opportunities for the local area in terms of water usage, as members will know, because of the number of times that the member for Mawson and I have mentioned the need for additional water in the Willunga Basin. This local treatment works with reused water will offer a valuable source of water for increased agriculture within the Willunga Basin area. This Government has declared that area not to be housed, so we have protected it for agriculture which will need this extra water.

The Government has recently announced the provision of the Old Noarlunga sewerage scheme. We held a public meeting some time ago and there was agreement that a particular style of sewerage scheme would be provided to the suburb of Old Noarlunga. The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, who was the previous member for that area, fought for many years to have Old Noarlunga sewered. Old Noarlunga feeds its septic tank waste into the Onkaparinga River, which is not an appropriate use of the river: it is not meant to be a sewage dump. Therefore, I am pleased that work is to begin on that system in 1996-97. It is very much needed and will be a worthwhile project for the department to take on.

Recently the Noarlunga Community Police Station was opened at Colonnades Shopping Centre. Again, Colonnades is the key regional shopping centre for the southern area and needs to be promoted as such. Locating the Noarlunga Community Police Station there has been extremely successful. It has been very well received by all the tenants. It is the second police station to have been opened by this Government in Kaurna since the election, the first being at Aldinga, which is also an extremely satisfactory police station, although we would like its operations to be expanded to 24 hours.

We have also overseen the amalgamation of the O'Sullivan Beach Junior and Upper Primary Schools. Anyone who saw the O'Sullivan Beach Primary School previously

would have noted that it was a fairly run-down, old, tired-looking school. It has now been amalgamated into one major building, and this has made a huge improvement to the outlook of that area. It has certainly improved the learning environment for the students of O'Sullivan Beach. It was officially opened by the Minister late last year, which was also a great community event, attended by almost every parent. I greatly appreciated being invited by the students to look through their new school, of which they are very proud.

We have recently launched the Port Noarlunga Neighbourhood Watch scheme, which was very well attended by the community. They have been waiting for a long time for a Neighbourhood Watch branch in Noarlunga. I thank and acknowledge the efforts of Jason Pinnock, the officer who has volunteered to take on the job at Port Noarlunga Neighbourhood Watch. There is great community support in my electorate for Neighbourhood Watch throughout the whole area. The Aldinga Neighbourhood Watch AGM was held recently, and about 100 people attended, so it was a very good response.

We are currently doing some fencing in the sand dune areas around Southport Surf Club, which is a recognition that it is a popular surf beach. It has lots of foot traffic associated not just with the surf club but with surfers visiting that area, so dune protection was certainly needed and that has now been started.

The protection of the coastline from poaching of shellfish, which was originally put on as a trial by the previous Minister for Primary Industries, Dale Baker, has now been extended to a total ban on the taking of shellfish. That is extremely important for the whole of the southern coastal area.

The start of the Onkaparinga Catchment Authority interim group, which was also a very important process for our area, is currently being chaired by Val Lewin. It involves a lot of consultation with all councils in the catchment area. Obviously this will be an ongoing process. However, I congratulate the people who have started it.

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I wish to put on record an issue of continuing concern to my electorate and to the whole State, and that is the impact of fruit-fly outbreaks and the importance of maintaining fruit-fly-free status for our commercial industries. It is a threat that will undoubtedly not go away and requires ongoing proactive reassessment in terms of its strategy, in which I have been involved to some degree, and an action plan which I believe the Government is achieving and should be congratulated upon.

On 5 January this year two male Mediterranean fruit-flies were caught in traps monitored by the Pest Management Unit of PISA. Their detection caused the imposition of a 1.5 kilometre radius eradication zone to be established. Produce able to host the fly which is sent out of the State is subjected to certain treatment requirements. This applies within a radius of 50 to 80 kilometres, depending where the produce is being sent. As the outbreak occurred in a metropolitan area, the response by the PISA authorities was to concentrate measures to eradicate the fly within that 1.5 kilometre radius as distinct from a 15 kilometre radius if the outbreak had occurred in a commercial area.

On average over the past 20 years there have been five outbreaks per year in this State, with most being of the Queensland variety rather than the Mediterranean fruit-fly which comes only from Western Australia, as in this case. So far this season there have been four instances, with Salisbury East being the only case of Mediterranean fruit-fly outbreak.

Fruit-fly outbreaks are caused by flies, their eggs or maggots being brought into this State irresponsibly by members of the public or illegally by commercial operators.

This State has a horticultural industry worth \$500 million, and a significant degree of its ability to compete in the marketplace is due to the maintenance of our fruit-fly-free status. In particular, the Riverland, which I represent, is justifiably sensitive to threats against our fruit-fly-free status. Access to potentially lucrative markets in the United States by Riverland citrus growers is due to our fruit-fly-free status and the perseverance of growers in supporting it. In 1994, this market was worth about \$12 million, and it has been escalating significantly. The history is long in terms of our ability to access and maintain overseas markets, going back many years to our initial access into New Zealand because of our fruit-fly-free status.

The Riverland supports the Fruit-fly Standing Committee, comprising industry, PISA and Australian Quarantine Inspection Service representation. This committee is constantly monitoring the situation and has instigated a number of measures to ensure the security of the region's industries against an outbreak of this pest. I congratulate and commend it for its initiative and commitment in this regard. The region is part of a fruit-fly exclusion zone in south-east Australia as part of a tri-State program with New South Wales and Victoria, and it is working well.

South Australia has had a very successful record in responding to fruit-fly outbreaks and is well regarded for the expertise that it has developed over many years in this process. A campaign to run through the summer months was started last December to increase community awareness and participation in keeping fruit-fly out of South Australia. When the flies were detected in Salisbury in January there was a record number of inquiries on PISA's 24-hour hotline.

This recent outbreak was dealt with successfully by extensive trapping, early detection and rapid response strategies developed through previous experience by PISA officers who worked with growers in the affected areas, especially in the Northern Plains and the Adelaide Hills, to establish treatment procedures and facilities to meet interstate movement requirements involving fruit going out of this State.

However, the mediterranean fruit-fly, as distinct from the Queensland variety, has not been subjected to the same extensive research and, in particular, research on disinfestation of fruit. Neither has a national code of management been developed, as there has been for the Queensland fruit-fly. Without nationwide consensus on approved treatment there has been increased anxiety over access to markets and measures used to manage an outbreak. This has certainly been the case in the Riverland where produce that required treatment for interstate trade could be brought into the region without undergoing disinfestation.

Of particular concern to the Riverland growers has been the apparent inconsistency in the requirement to treat produce being transported from a zone out to a radius of 50 to 80 kilometres surrounding an outbreak. This has been applied only to fruit leaving the State, which gave no protection to regions in sensitive areas, such as the Riverland, and so the close proximity of Adelaide produce markets at Pooraka to this recent outbreak has highlighted concerns in this area. The measures that have been employed in this and previous outbreaks have been shown to be proficient and effective in preventing the pest from establishing itself in this State, and

there is no evidence that the recent outbreaks have been of greater threat than before.

Procedures which are currently and routinely employed within South Australia and which have been demonstrated to be effective include a number of measures. Extensive fruit-fly trapping grids have been established in the metropolitan area, the Riverland, the Iron Triangle and Ceduna, as an early warning system in respect of fruit-fly outbreaks. The Riverland grid is essential to provide assurances to our trading partners that the area remains free of fruit-fly. The Adelaide metropolitan area is a major source of these outbreaks, and there is no doubt that they have occurred as a result of travellers either not declaring fruit or smuggling infested produce into South Australia.

Also employed are inspections at the wholesale market and other importer premises. A number of PISA inspectors are based at the Adelaide produce markets. Roadblocks are installed on four major roads entering the State from high risk areas. During 1994, 72 tonnes of fruit and vegetables were detected at roadblocks, and 49 instances of fruit infested with fruit-fly, or evidence of such, was established. There is an ongoing community awareness program about the dangers of fruit-fly, as well as an eradication program, and the recent outbreak is an example of that early detection.

The issues raised during this recent outbreak have caused, and I believe justifiably, a review of our protective measures—all the more crucial with respect to the increasing trade in our fruit and vegetables from an export perspective. This review has resulted in new initiatives being introduced to protect the State from the threat of fruit-fly. On 2 February, the Minister for Primary Industries announced a number of specific Government initiatives to raise the level of protection, including maximum on-the-spot fines of \$300 and maximum fines of \$15 000 for commercial operators bringing fruit illegally into South Australia, together with increased signage.

There will be increased surveillance on trains and aeroplanes where they enter the State, in terms of upgraded fruit disposal facilities, as well as the establishment of a sterile fruit-fly rearing facility at Netley to assist the eradication programs. Together with these initiatives came the announcement of a random 24 hour operation at the Oodlawirra roadblock for a trial period, because currently it is manned for only about 16 hours a day. Those who abuse the system or attempt to circumvent this roadblock system will now have that opportunity more restricted. There will continue to be the operation of a 24 hour a day hotline providing fruit-fly information, and the Yamba and Ceduna roadblocks will operate around the clock. The Pinnaroo roadblock will operate for 16 hours a day and there will be continued vigilance by PISA staff.

Riverland growers strongly support moves to negotiate a code of practice, which will include the establishment of the appropriate protocol for the mediterranean fruit-fly, and this may be reflected in the size of the suspension zones around outbreaks and the period of suspension following the detection of the pest. I am particularly pleased with the response from the Minister for Primary Industries who has been quick to appreciate the importance of fruit-fly free status for South Australia. Also, the local industry should be commended for its suggestions and, in particular, for containing the level of emotion so that an objective reappraisal can be conducted. I commend all those involved. It has been a team effort by the industry and all concerned to achieve this proactive result.

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

Mr De LAINE (Price): I want to deal with the role of the Opposition in this Parliament. Some fairly solid criticism is made at all times, but it has been particularly pronounced during this debate in respect of the role of the Opposition in this Parliament. I would remind members that this is a democracy, and members are entitled to handle their position as a Government or Opposition member as they see fit, providing he or she does not transgress Standing Orders or act in an unparliamentary way, and also, Sir, ruffle your feathers. That is the prerogative of each individual member, and particularly Opposition members.

They have a responsibility to themselves, their Party, to the Parliament itself, their constituents and to the people of South Australia. Many members in the Government ranks have been here only since the last election and, while they are critical of the Opposition's role, they have nothing by which to gauge it, in terms of comparing it to previous Oppositions, although some members opposite who have been here for some time still criticise this Opposition. In the 10 years that I have been a member I have noticed that Oppositions perform much the same. In fact, I would say that the Opposition, over the past two terms, has been particularly bad in some areas but, overall, Oppositions perform much the same.

It is the responsibility of the Opposition in particular to criticise where necessary, to question, probe, investigate and use any other means at its disposal—providing it does not transgress Standing Orders or parliamentary decency—to try to find weaknesses in the Government and the Government's policies and exploit them. That is the role of the Opposition in this Westminster style of Parliament, and certainly it is the role of an Opposition in a democracy.

I refuse to resile from that. This system is part of democracy, and I would not want it any other way. I want to live in a democracy, and the system in South Australia and Australia generally is one of the best in the world. I can understand the annoyance of Government members at times. I have been there and done that when I spent eight years on the Government benches. I can remember times when the Opposition annoyed us very much, but that is its role and to do otherwise would let down one's political Party, the constituents and the Parliament that we represent in this State.

The ALP Opposition at the moment is lucky. With some of the Government policies in place at the moment we have fertile ground with which to work. We exploit it to the best of our ability, as is our role. I turn now to some of the Government's policies, such as the privatisation of water and health services. The Government says continually that these services are not being privatised. I beg to differ because the administration and delivery of services by the private sector is privatisation in my view. Admittedly the infrastructure is the property of the Government, but that is only one aspect. The way the services are delivered and administered, in my view and in the view of my Opposition colleagues, determines whether something is run by the private or public sector.

Sir Thomas Playford, that long serving Liberal Premier of this State, said over and over again that some things are best done by Government. He made particular mention of things like public health and safety. All members on this side would agree with that, because there is no profit motive. The Government delivers services to the people of the State—that is its role. Health and water are two of the most important

services. The profit motive must be taken out of the delivery of those services, otherwise they deteriorate to the point of threatening the health and safety of people in the community.

I do not criticise the private sector—it must have profit motives. It has a responsibility to the shareholders—I do not blame it, as it must make a profit—but once it gets into contracts and the delivery of services it tends to be greedy. I make no criticism of that, because it is human nature. However, it gets greedy and cuts corners to make more profit, which is only human nature.

The Government says that it outsources many of our services for efficiency and savings. I may be a simple working-class person, but I have ample commonsense and know that, in order to deliver a service to people—whether it be water, health, education or whatever and irrespective of what body or organisation delivers that service (public or private)—it takes people, procedures, programs and planning, and tasks need to be performed physically in order to get a job done. I cannot see any difference in whether the administrative body that provides that service is private or public. If the private sector can deliver a service efficiently to the community, I cannot see why the Public Service cannot do the same. All that is needed is the will of the Government to ensure that this happens.

If the private sector can employ managers, supervisors and the people with the necessary skills, knowledge and managerial abilities to achieve an outcome for the people with efficiency in savings, I cannot see why the Government cannot do the same thing. It needs the same sort of people, it can employ the same sort of managers and supervisors, it can deliver the service the same way and it can make efficiencies.

The only difference is that three factors enable the private sector to deliver savings and provide services more cheaply than can the public sector. Those things threaten the health and safety of people in our community. The first factor is that the private sector can and usually does overwork and exploit people who work for it in order to provide a service with fewer people. That is okay in the short term. The water contract has been running for only a few weeks and there are no problems but, as time goes on, if the company with the contract starts to cut down on staff, overworks and exploits people, problems will arise. It is not a sustainable position and will deteriorate with time.

Secondly, with the privatisation of the delivery of services the company, whoever it is, will gradually cut the quality of the service by cutting corners, using inferior materials and adopting inferior procedures and standards. It is false economy: it looks good in the short term, but in the long term it catches up on the people and the Government.

Thirdly, it is not a level playing field. The taxpayers provide, in this case, the infrastructure and all that goes with it and the private sector simply takes off the cream. I have nothing against privatisation as such. In the case of health, if the private sector comes in and builds the hospitals, maintains, upgrades and equips them (with the millions of dollars of equipment needed these days), staffs and runs them, it can go for its life. However, under this Government the long-suffering taxpayer provides the infrastructure and the hospitals, maintains and upgrades them, provides expensive equipment, staffs them, sets up all the procedures and systems within them and the private sector comes in and takes off the cream. Even then it only runs the services that are profitable and not the non-profitable ones.

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

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mrs HALL (Coles): I wish to participate in this debate with a significant degree of disgust. This follows the unwarranted remarks and the injustice of the attack on my friend and colleague the Federal member for Adelaide, Trish Worth, yesterday in this Chamber by the Deputy Leader, the member for Ross Smith. Clearly, the Federal member for Adelaide, Trish Worth, is a winning woman who is worth supporting, otherwise why do the Labor Party and members in this Chamber spend so much time attacking her? I believe that Trish should take pride in the fact that in just one term of Parliament she has made such an impact and achieved such a reputation for work in her electorate that it augers well for her future in a Coalition Government after 2 March. Today, I received a letter, which states:

Dear Joan,

Thank you for faxing me the *Hansard* copy of the speech made by the member for Ross Smith yesterday [in the House of Assembly]. It would seem Mr Clarke has caught election fever and that he is suffering from the symptom of being blind to the facts. I would be grateful if you could place on the public record and in particular draw Mr Clarke's attention to the following facts.

I have been involved in the issue of the Collex Waste Treatment plant at Kilburn since . . . July 1993—only four months after my election to the Federal Parliament. The member for Ross Smith claimed yesterday ' . . . but what have we heard from the Federal member for Adelaide with respect to this matter? Not a word, not a letter of protest, not a public comment in support of her constituents in Kilburn.' How wrong he is. Did he fail to do his homework or far more likely given the proximity of the Federal election, thought a cheap political shot—

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

The SPEAKER: Order! When a member calls for a quorum, the member will stay in his place.

A quorum having been formed:

Mrs HALL: The letter continues:

How wrong he is. Did he fail to do his homework or far more likely given the proximity of the Federal election, thought a cheap political shot on his part would assist my opponent?

I am enclosing for the information of the Parliament and to ensure that the member for Ross Smith's claims are corrected, copies of my correspondence on the subject of Collex Waste. You will note a copy of a letter from the then Minister Greg Crafter written to me on 3 September 1993 following my letter to him of 16 August 1993. In this letter Mr Crafter explains that under the then Labor Government the Collex Waste Treatment was 'approved by the Waste Disposal Committee, which is a committee of the South Australian Planning Commission, on 26 July 1993, subject to a number of conditions'. Enclosed also is a copy of a letter written to me by concerned Kilburn residents in August 1993 in which I refer to my correspondence with Greg Crafter.

For further information is a leaflet put out by the then Housing Trust Tenants' Association calling on residents to contact both John Bannon and Trish Worth and including our respective phone numbers. Tony Ollivier (Assistant Secretary of the Housing Trust Tenants' Association) has written to me on 19 August 1993 thanking me for 'your time spent and interest shown in the liquid treatment plant'. This evidence shoots down the member for Ross Smith's 'not a word or letter'.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ross Smith was warned earlier today. He will not get further benefit if he continues to interrupt.

Mrs HALL: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. The letter continues:

Through 1994 and 1995 there has been ongoing legal argument between Collex and the Enfield council. While following the issue and maintaining contact with residents over the issue, I—like everyone else—have had to await the outcome of this legal challenge. Because I am aware of the fact that Enfield council has

a proposition in relation to Collex Waste to put to the Minister for Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development and Infrastructure, John Olsen, I have arranged a meeting between Johanna McCluskey, Mike Stock, Harry Wierda and Mr Davos, John Olsen and me for this Friday (16th) at 2 p.m.

This meeting was arranged in early January and was made well in advance of my opponent's attention-seeking action of spilling waste on the steps of Parliament House. If [the member for Ross Smith] had [bothered to keep] in contact with either Enfield Councillor, Johanna McCluskey, or Mayor of Enfield, Mike Stock, he would have been aware of these facts.

The member for Ross Smith seems preoccupied with where I live. It is true I live at Netherby but the Deputy Leader probably should have pointed out to him that it is on the western side of Fullarton Road and that it is about as relevant to say that Netherby is near Springfield as it is to say Bowden is near North Adelaide. North Adelaide is on the eastern side of Park Terrace and Bowden on the western side. Given the Deputy Leader's preoccupation with this detail, perhaps he should also know that the street I live in with my teenage children, who I believe are entitled to security and privacy, is four streets outside the Adelaide boundary, and [as he well knows] boundaries are subject to change.

The Deputy Leader might hope that I do not have a commitment to the people of Kilburn, but he is quite wrong—I do have that commitment and I enjoy my association with the people I work with there. For the record, I have had ongoing discussions with not only the local people on this issue but also Greg Crafter, John Oswald, John Olsen and Scott Ashenden. Just where has the Deputy Leader been and when will he learn that cheap shots just don't wash with the people.

Yours sincerely,

Trish Worth, Member for Adelaide.

I believe that the women of this State can be proud of the work and achievement of the women in my Party. They are there, but they are not there through a selective discriminatory system of quotas, and they are there in strength: Chris Gallus, the member for Hindmarsh; Trish Worth, the member for Adelaide; Sue Jeanes, our candidate in Kingston; Trish Draper in Makin; in the Senate we have Amanda Vanstone, shadow Attorney-General and shadow Minister for Justice; and on our Senate ticket, Jeannie Ferris and Maria Kourtesis. It is probably because Trish Worth, the Federal member for Adelaide, is doing such effective work that she generates such concern from the State Opposition.

Finally, the senseless and personally directed thoughtless comments we have come to expect from the Deputy Leader deserve some sort of apology. That content should concern all MPs and their families: his taking cheap political pot-shots over where Trish Worth lives is surprising and horrifying. I wonder whether he checked that line of attack with his own Leader. I believe that the Deputy Leader, the member for Ross Smith, should do the decent thing and apologise to the Federal member for Adelaide—and not just to her but also to her teenage family.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When the House comes to order, we will proceed.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I would like to discuss a number of issues in my contribution tonight.

Mr Condous: Water.

Mr FOLEY: I do actually want to discuss water; I am quite enjoying the water issue.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I will ignore the interjections from the member for Colton. The new Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations announced in the *Advertiser* yesterday morning that there would be a \$15 million redevelopment of the Port Adelaide waterfront. As the local member and someone who is very much a part

of what is happening in Port Adelaide, I welcome any investment, particularly a commitment from the private sector to inject urgently needed funds into Port Adelaide. However, I criticised the fact that the Minister for Urban Development was very keen to preempt the announcement by the developers, to preempt what I would call due process, and give an exclusive interview to the *Advertiser*. I criticised that in the paper yesterday.

I said that perhaps the Minister was just a little over-excited. I can forgive him, as a new Minister, for wanting to get a story into the *Advertiser*, but the redevelopment of Port Adelaide is a very sensitive issue. As I have said repeatedly, the redevelopment of Port Adelaide has been promised for many years. Under both Governments, we have had announcements which have simply been good headlines in the morning paper but which have not been followed up with real action. In most cases the reason for that not occurring was that Government Ministers decided that a cheap headline was more important than the behind the scenes negotiation to secure the investment.

I am critical of the fact that, as of yesterday, from discussions I have had with the developer, this investment was not yet ready for public announcement. One lesson the Government has to learn—even a new Government such as this, which is having real difficulty dealing with commercial realities even though it professes to be a Liberal Government—is that it must give developers and investors the courtesy of signing off on the bottom line, arranging their finance and getting their plans finally approved, and then allowing the developer and, if possible, the Government to make joint announcements. Governments' continually making early announcements about such developments really puts in jeopardy the hard work being done behind the scenes to get significant development off the ground. I give the following gratuitous advice to the Minister for Urban Development: he should not treat the people of Port Adelaide as his headline, as a vehicle through which he is able to get a cheap, quick story in the morning press.

Quite frankly, I do not want to see that development jeopardised: I certainly do not want to see the development jeopardised by an over excited, eager Minister who is keen to get something in the paper before the developers themselves are ready to make the announcement. It is very important that the Minister should understand that and realise that getting hold of private sector investment in any part of Adelaide, particularly Port Adelaide, is a difficult process and one that should be handled with a degree of care from this Government. As I said earlier, this is a new Government which is showing that it has significant problems and which is displaying some shortcomings when it comes to dealing in the commercial world and accepting the commercial reality of what is required of a Government.

I want to touch briefly on the issue of water, which I raised in the Parliament just on a week ago. I made a very serious allegation in this Parliament, one that I thought long and hard about making. It involved the Government's negotiation process over the letting of what has been the largest water contract of its type anywhere in the world this year. I do not want to recap the many words I have spoken on this matter, but the issue is not of United Water but of the way in which North West Water, one of the losing companies, has been treated.

As you, Mr Speaker, would recall, last week I made an allegation saying that I believed—and had been given the advice on very good authority—that certain threats, certain

comments had been made to senior management of North West Water suggesting to them that they should not appear before a parliamentary select committee into the whole tendering process. Of course, if we cast our minds back to last year, we know that North West Water made a request to the Opposition for it to have an invitation to appear before a parliamentary select committee.

That request from North West Water to the Opposition was facilitated, and North West Water was, therefore, extended an invitation to come before the parliamentary select committee because it felt aggrieved: it felt that it had been poorly treated and that the Government's handling of the negotiation process of the water contract was less than satisfactory. It had some real grievances that it felt had to be made clear not just to the Parliament but to the people of South Australia. That invitation was extended to North West Water. Its senior executive, Dr Gerry Orbell, flew from Manchester in England upon that request being made and arrived in Adelaide the day before the parliamentary select committee was due to hear evidence.

The allegation I made was that something happened in the 12 hours leading up to the select committee meeting. On information with which I was provided, some very robust discussions occurred between Mr Ted Phipps, the Chief Executive Officer of SA Water, and the Adelaide management of North West Water. Many members opposite derided me for making outrageous allegations. They commented to me that I should not have made such allegations, that I did not know what I was talking about, and so on. What happened at the parliamentary select committee last Friday when North West Water officials attended? I was there, because it was a public meeting, and I took notes. I have no doubt that the notes that I took will reconcile with the *Hansard* record. One of the committee members, Mr Cameron, asked Mr David Knipe, the Adelaide Manager of North West Water:

I put it to you that Ted Phipps requested you not to appear the following day, or suggested that it would be best for you not to appear; is that correct?

Mr Knipe answered:

Well, we had a meeting that lasted I suppose an hour, an hour and a half, and covered wide-ranging issues. We probably discussed this issue for only half an hour at that time. I expressed my strong concerns. I said, 'In my view, there is a huge down side here.'

That is a bit odd, given that it was North West Water that wanted the invitation extended. This is what Mr Knipe said about Mr Phipps:

And he agreed with me. He said, 'There are down sides.'

Later, Mr Cameron asked:

You both had the same view about this?

Mr Knipe said:

I do not see any up sides for North West Water. I can see huge down sides. Mr Phipps agreed with me.

Later in the meeting, Mr Cameron asked:

Did Mr Phipps agree with you that it would be best for North West Water not to appear before this committee the following day?

Mr Knipe answered:

It was a general consensus.

Mr Cameron asked:

That is a general agreement?

Mr Knipe said:

It was a general consensus of the meeting.

Mr Knipe admitted that that meeting took place the day before, and that it was only he and Mr Phipps in that meeting. I will let other members draw their conclusions. Clearly, we will never know the full content of that critical meeting but it certainly supports my decision to raise in this place what I considered to be a very serious breach of protocol by the Chief Executive of SA Water.

I believed it to be a most unfortunate use of Government power, because North West Water is still in for the bid process for the build-own-operate treatment plants. Members can draw their own conclusions. There was a robust and frank meeting, according to Mr Knipe. Mr Phipps said there were down sides to North West Water, and that was the outcome of the meeting; so that vindicates—

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I will ignore the comments of the member for Colton, who simply would not understand an issue of such commercial complexity. I do, but most importantly those people reading this *Hansard* report tomorrow will understand exactly what I am talking about. They will understand the context of my comments. Unfortunately, it is simply another case in what has been a very shabby exercise.

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

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I want to raise several points. First, as to the contribution of the member for Coles earlier this evening, let me say again—I said it the other night—that the Federal Liberal member for Adelaide has absolutely no interest in the welfare of the residents of Kilburn. Why else would she support and be a member of a Party that supports the destruction of Medicare, the Industrial Relations Commission and most of the benefits that the people of Kilburn receive from the Federal Labor Government? From the various dates read out by the member for Coles purporting to show the interest of the Federal Liberal member for Adelaide, Trish Worth, in the Collex waste treatment plant, all the correspondence seemed to dry up by the end of 1993, after the Labor Government was defeated at the State election.

Instead, all we heard from the member for Coles is that an appointment has been made with the Minister for Infrastructure to get a few soothing words to the Mayor of Enfield and various people to say, 'We won't rush through the Collex development plan until after the Federal election, on 2 March.' The member for Adelaide has shown absolutely no interest in the Collex waste treatment plant since the election of the State Liberal Government. She will not rock the boat. She does not oppose the Collex waste treatment plant in the middle of Kilburn and, as I said last night, she has absolutely no interest in the people of Kilburn. The Federal member for Adelaide is more than happy to try to trade on a few free kicks at Laurie Brereton, who is a member of a different political Party. But, when it comes to taking on her own lousy State Liberal counterparts, she does not have the guts to do it and she certainly has not the interests of the residents of Kilburn at heart. I am happy to repeat that anywhere.

Turning to other matters, I suggest that the member for Coles concentrate her efforts on destabilising the Liberal Party and on stacking the sub-branches of the members for Unley and Mitchell. They may well laugh, but they laugh only because what I say is true. We can see the stiletto heel marks all down their backs, which are like pin cushions. Those members know that the member for Coles is dedicated to their political destruction. I wish the member for Coles

well, because her efforts will assist the Labor Party no end in winning those seats. However I can encourage the member for Coles to continue with her machinations, I indeed do so. Certainly, there is no need for her to flee from the Chamber while I am speaking on this matter.

As to the contribution by the member for Custance earlier today, I regret that he was not made Minister for Primary Industries because, if ever a man knew a lot about the rural industry, and primary industries in particular, it is the member for Custance. He gave us the benefits of his thoughts in this area *ad nauseam*, both today and last night. He won me over completely in terms of demonstrating that he knows more about rural affairs than any other member of the House, including you, Sir, because he has not lost his roots in respect of looking after his country cousins, unlike so many of the rural rump in the Liberal Party—and dare I say that that extends to all members of the Liberal Party who are members of that caucus, except for the member for Custance. He is a lion and a tiger who fights for the interests of country people, and he should have been made the appropriate Minister.

Certainly, I do not say that from a feeling of ill will towards the member for Frome, who is currently a member of the ministry for a short time before the member for Kavel makes his strike and becomes Premier. The member for Custance would then really get his deserts and be made Minister responsible for rural affairs, the position that should be his, while the member for Unley will probably not scale such lofty heights because he will be like Brutus: he will be the one who will deliver the death blow to the Premier. The member for Unley is in charge of counting the numbers. It is a little dangerous for any pretender to the throne to have the member for Unley as his numbers man. Certainly, I would put more of my faith in the member for Coles, because she has buried more people than the member for Unley has made hot cakes for. Nonetheless, the member for Unley will still continue his role of going around trying to bury his own Premier.

Also, I point out to the House the act of ingratitude by the new Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations who, in answer to a Dorothy Dix question today about the Port Adelaide redevelopment, gave absolutely no acknowledgment, thanks or gratitude to the member for Morphett, Mr Oswald, who was the Minister for two years and the brains behind the Port Adelaide redevelopment project. The new Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations, who has been in office for six weeks, is still finding his way through the ministerial bathroom and cloaks himself with all the knowledge about the Port Adelaide redevelopment. He takes all the credit for it, without making any passing reference to his immediate predecessor. That is a bit rough and an act of absolute ingratitude on the part of the new Minister.

In my remaining minutes I will direct attention to the Minister for Industrial Affairs concerning his absolutely scandalous appointment of Matthew O'Callaghan as Director of his department. This is the Minister who only recently said, 'I will advertise the position nationwide to get the best person for the job.' No advertisement—

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: The Minister says he did not say that. He cannot even believe his own words. The Minister made that commitment—

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: Only the best man—not the best woman! The fact is that the Minister went out of his way to appoint

one of his mates. It is amazing when one considers all the criticism by this Minister and other Ministers when in Opposition claiming that the former Government appointed its mates. It is amazing, because Matthew O'Callaghan is the former Director of the Employers Federation and is now the Director of the Industrial Affairs Department. We then have Peter Hampton, former Deputy Director of the Employers Federation, now in charge of enterprise bargaining in the Industrial Relations Commission. Nick Wilson, former Senior Industrial Manager of the Employers Federation, is now Manager, Industrial Relations, Policy (Private Sector), Department of Industrial Affairs. The litany goes on.

This has become a retirement home for all the superannuated people who used to work for the old Employers Federation and who were not good enough to get a job with the merged Employers Chamber. We, the taxpayers, are picking up the redundancy packages for these ex-Employers Federation people at the behest of this Minister. It is an absolute scandal. If I were the Minister and a Labor Government appointed John Lesses as Secretary of the Labor Council; Chris White, as the Assistant Secretary; and Jude Elton, as the other Assistant Secretary, to the three most important positions within the Department of Industrial Affairs, all hell would break loose from a Liberal Opposition. It is rank hypocrisy and it is an absolute pay-off to all the Minister's employer mates.

Frankly, the fact is that this Minister does not care about or understand industrial relations as he finds it all too hard. It interrupts his golf; it interrupts his tourism portfolio; and it interrupts his trips to the races and various other social events. The Minister's attitude is that industrial affairs is too important and he therefore passes it off to the bosses, because that is what all Liberal Governments do. They are not interested in industrial relations. They support the boss anyway; so, let us turn the whole bureaucracy over to them!

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): It would probably be considered unparliamentary of me by you, Sir, were I to refer to any member opposite as a grubby little worm. So, I will instead refer to the member for Ross Smith specifically as a vindictive, vicious, lacklustre, puerile trade unionist whose only redeeming virtue is his wife and daughter.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I was not aware that they may have been in the gallery, Sir; my eyes see only you. The debate in this Chamber has, indeed, reached a new low when we are subjected—

Ms White interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I know. The member opposite is right; I say that every time. I did not think that it could get any worse but tonight, after dinner, I came in here trying to let my meal settle and I heard first the member for Hart and then the member for Ross Smith. It is true: I did not think it could get any worse than it was a couple of days ago but, again, the Opposition proved us wrong. The member for Ross Smith seems fixated with backstabbing, graves and who within the Liberal Party is trying to do in whom. I suggest that the member Ross Smith recall the look and the words of Caesar as he lay dying. Caesar looked up, saw his best friend and said, 'Et tu, Brute'. The member for Ross Smith would do—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: And you, too, Brutus! Given the way by which the member for Ross Smith obtained his coronet—and the person who sits to his left—he would do better to watch

his own back than to speculate on the backs of those who sit here.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: We can hear the wind whistling through the holes in the member for Ross Smith, and they are not very tuneful. As I said, the member for Ross Smith is fixated with this Party and allegations of grave digging, back stabbing and all those sorts of things. I can assure him that I have not to this date ever indulged in back stabbing, but I have proved—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Ross Smith and the member for Hart have both been warned twice.

Mr BRINDAL: I freely confess that I have developed a certain talent for saying prayers for the repose of those who are dying. I hope that I may survive long enough in this place to say a few prayers for those opposite who are really digging their political graves. Sir, this is a grievance debate—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I do not need to stand up for my colleague the member for Morphett. The member for Morphett is a very honourable member of this House, and there is not one person on this side of the Chamber—and I would hope on the other side of the Chamber—who would not stand up for the member for Morphett.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: If all of us were as honourable as the member for Morphett, the standard in this Chamber would indeed be much higher than it is. He does not need me to stand up for him: he is quite capable of standing up for himself. I do not know what puerile rubbish—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Ross Smith interjects now. The member for Hanson is the member for Hanson; the member for Morphett is the member for Morphett. The member for Hanson has made statements quite publicly about what the member for Hanson intends to do. The idle speculation and wish list of members opposite is not part of the agenda of this side of the House nor, the member for Hanson has told me, of his agenda. So, members opposite can try to cause as much trouble as they wish: it is idle speculation—

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Hanson is too wise to want Unley; he would have to join the queue of about 105 others. He is not quite that silly. This is supposed to be a—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Probably more.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: If the member for Hart is interested in who is setting them up I suggest that he pay his \$45 and join the Liberal Party. I am sure that we can supply him with a list and welcome him onto this side of the House. The Supply debate, which we are supposed to be addressing, is a time for us to reflect on the processes of Government. Virtually from the development of the democratic system, the system of Executive Government or the Cabinet actually derived from the Crown power. As you would be aware, Sir, the word 'cabinet' came from a small private room adjoining the bedroom of the King where often the King would meet with his confidantes and Ministers, who would be delegated the authority to run the Government.

Necessarily, with the development of a democratic system, there was a splitting of power between the Executive and the Government. This is supposed to be a debate where sensible points of view are put, but members opposite seem to want

after dinner entertainment this evening. I am not sure which creates the bigger laugh: my being offensive to them so that they can all chortle at the discomfort of their peers; or their trying to score a point on the Liberal Party. I suggest, judging from the smirks on their faces, that they are actually rather happier to see the knife going in between the ribs of one of their own colleagues than they are to see us discomfited.

As it was put to me today, the demise of the Labor Government is largely attributable to a factional system, which meant that there were those sitting here who outwardly showed solidarity and all but stood up and applauded as various Ministers bit the dust one after the other. One could see the joy on the back benches, the blood lust and the result. We had an election and there were 10 left.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: No, it has nothing to do with the Liberal Party's dirty linen, because we keep our sheets quite clean and well washed. Any deals or agreements that might be done by the Liberal Party are front room.

Mr Clarke: It's just a bad dream.

Mr BRINDAL: Sir, I believe it is pointless to detain the House further in the face of such awesome opposition from members opposite.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): The member for Unley has been known on occasions in this House to talk a bit of sense. I am afraid that the ramblings of the past 10 minutes have diminished him somewhat in my estimation. Also, I thought that his speech was in the worst possible taste.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am advised that the member has already spoken in this debate. Therefore, his rising is quite out of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Not in the 10-minute grievance, Sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understand that the member spoke earlier.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I apologise, Mr Deputy Speaker. I will save it for tomorrow.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): It is amazing to hear the member for Giles speak about other members rambling. Tonight we have seen it all. We have even seen the visiting minstrel, the member for Ross Smith, wandering in and out of the Festival Fringe and heralding the start of the comedy festival. We have heard the member for Ross Smith talk about the preselections for Unley and for Mitchell. I can assure the member for Ross Smith that the AGM for Mitchell was held last night with great dignity and good results. We are looking forward to the love-hate relationship between the members for Playford and for Ross Smith. At the moment, I cannot work out whether the member for Playford loves the member for Ross Smith or whether the member for Ross Smith hates the member for Playford, or whether they love to hate each other.

I wish to address my remarks to health. Over the past few days a number of us have listened to the ramblings and innuendos of the member for Elizabeth. It was of great amusement to me and to those who were present to listen to the member for Elizabeth at a press conference in 1995 when she attended a delegation of trade union officials from the Flinders Medical Centre. At that conference the United Trades and Labor Council officials said that they had put forward a scenario: that, if certain circumstances occurred, a particular scenario might occur and a patient's life may be put at risk. That was the scenario put forward at the

conference. Then the storyteller and fabricator reached the optimum. Within 10 metres the story had changed. The member for Elizabeth had changed the story put forward at the press conference to the extent that a patient's life had been lost. In the space of 10 metres the member for Elizabeth had completely changed the whole story.

Falsification of the truth and the creation of the perception that health care is in strife in the southern suburbs was also brought to the fore by the member for Elizabeth yesterday. The member for Elizabeth is a prevaricator of the first degree and should be widely condemned for her fabrications by the Parliament and public at large. The member for Elizabeth has no interest in the health care of South Australians. It is obvious that the facts must be brought before this Parliament to ensure that the public is aware of the very good health care that we have in the southern suburbs.

First, the Government was involved in the approval of the accident and emergency upgrade at the Flinders Medical Centre. Prior to this Government coming into power, in the past 11 years there had been very little capital expenditure at the Flinders Medical Centre. The accident and emergency upgrade was well overdue. The Flinders Medical Centre has proposed a private hospital development costing about \$50 million, and that is coming before the Minister for Health. I understand that the Ramsey Group is behind that proposal.

We are all aware that the Flinders 2000 project is ongoing and longstanding. The Opposition, when in Government, did very little to address the problem of private beds at the Flinders Medical Centre. The building of this \$50 million development at the Flinders Medical Centre will relieve most wanted beds at that hospital and most wanted funds for public patients and public health care in the southern suburbs.

The community health centre, due to be developed in the northern part of the Marion triangle, is another project of this Government. Prior to 1993 the then Government failed to address the needs of community health in the south-western suburbs. It allowed the Clovelly Park Community Health Centre to languish in second rate, poor standard facilities. It also allowed the Marion youth project to languish in the poor facilities of a transportable hut at the former Oaklands Park Primary School. In the past couple of days this Government has announced the expenditure of \$1.2 million for the purchase of a new CT scanner for the Flinders Medical Centre. The previous equipment was 10 years old and well overdue for replacement.

The four instances that I have brought forward represent a commitment to health and to top quality health care in the southern suburbs. That is quite contrary to the fabrications and falsifications which have been brought before the House by the member for Elizabeth. In the last 11 years of the previous Labor Government there had been little capital expenditure in the south-western suburbs of Adelaide. We are now well aware that in excess of \$400 million of capital expenditure will be spent in the southern suburbs by private and Government enterprises.

In addition, we should look at what has occurred with respect to waiting lists. In November 1995, 8 115 people were on waiting lists at the six major metropolitan hospitals, which represented a 16.3 per cent decline. In the southern suburbs the Flinders Medical Centre has recorded the largest relative fall in respect of waiting lists—down 29.8 per cent. For those people who had been on the waiting list for 12 months or longer at the Flinders Medical Centre, that figure was down 44.6 per cent.

It is obvious that health care in the southern suburbs is very much in hand. The member for Elizabeth had a number of things to say with regard to Healthplus. It is obvious that the member for Elizabeth is unaware of what SA Healthplus is all about. South Australian Healthplus is a new management support system for people with ongoing complex health conditions. South Australian Healthplus makes use of the now well-established principle that many chronic conditions, such as asthma, in the vast majority of cases need less frequent hospitalisation if the individual properly manages his or her own condition.

South Australian Healthplus will make much more use of general practitioners and other health professionals who can offer early advice and intervention before a person needs hospitalisation. As a trial concept, SA Healthplus has not yet been approved to go ahead. The Government is negotiating with the Commonwealth to conduct a trial over two years. Patients will benefit from SA Healthplus as it involves integrating care around the needs of individual patients. People with complex or chronic health conditions needing lots of different services will have better integrated care.

Healthplus moves the focus of care from care providers to patients and, through individual client care planning, develops strategies to maximise patient health, hence it will provide services more responsibly and efficiently. Under the pilot program, each person will be given individualised health services, which will include personalised specific information about his or her own illness and ways to avoid becoming ill. They will be given clear information to enable them to monitor their own health, and medical advice will be readily available to ensure early intervention to stop the illness from requiring hospitalisation. South Australia's health services are in good hands.

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council with a message drawing the attention of the House of Assembly to clause 29, printed in erased type, which clause, being a money clause, cannot originate in the Legislative Council but which is deemed necessary to the Bill. Read a first time.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON OUTSOURCING FUNCTIONS UNDERTAKEN BY EWS DEPARTMENT

The Legislative Council requested that the House of Assembly give permission for the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development to attend and give evidence before the Legislative Council Select Committee on Outsourcing Functions Undertaken by EWS Department.

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

That the request be not agreed to.

I move that motion with a great deal of seriousness. We are all aware of what is happening in this Parliament, and the way in which certain members of the Upper House would wish to take the business of Government out of the hands of Government. It has been a time-honoured tradition in this

Parliament that the Houses are separate: they have their own rules and responsibilities. There has always been—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: We have a few other examples that the honourable member may wish to remember, in terms of who did or did not front up to select committees of another place. I would remind members that the Hon. Don Hopgood and the Hon. John Bannon refused to front up to select committees and, of course, there have been other precedents in the past. I am saying, before this House, that I will not have a partisan Upper House dictate what the Government should or should not be doing. I believe it is absolutely inappropriate for a Minister of this House to be required to attend another place for the purposes of appearing before a select committee.

It is a vicious select committee. It is a select committee with a very disjointed membership. It comprises a majority of members from both the ALP and Democrats. We know the agenda of the ALP, but we never know the agenda of the Democrats. On this occasion, we have quite clearly seen every possible effort made to destroy what will be one of the great contracts for South Australia. It is not the intention of this Government to allow the process to be hijacked by a partisan select committee of another place. It is not the intention of this Government to allow important information to be floated out in the public arena simply at the wish and whim of people in another place.

We have seen how these select committees work; we have seen how they have dishonoured their responsibilities time and again. So often information given in camera gets out into the public arena five minutes after it has been stated, to the detriment of everyone concerned. It may be just a game for the ALP, but the Government takes it very seriously. The Government takes very seriously the fact that it cannot trust select committees to hold the confidence with which they are entrusted by the Parliament. We see it day after day. We have the member for Hart who tick-tacks with his ALP colleagues in the Upper House. He sends the questions up, he listens at the door, and then he says, 'Well, what can I get out into the public arena?' We have seen—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: It is not the intention to have the process of Government in any way depreciated by the efforts of the ALP to ruin this contract. As a Government, we are sick and tired of the ALP Opposition at every moment trying to destroy contracts and arrangements which will be to the benefit of this State. We do not believe that this Government can function properly in this State with the low level of confidence we have in members opposite. We cannot allow them to use their numbers, in combination with the Australian Democrats in another place, to take away from the Government's agenda, which is to provide jobs and an economic future for this State.

It is not our intention to grant this request. I remind members that, when we have Estimates Committees, for example, we put it in the same form. During the Estimates Committees it is a requirement of this Parliament that Ministers subject themselves to questioning, and that is a time-honoured tradition. This is not the same situation, because no Minister of the Crown should be subject to the vagaries of a partisan committee that operates in another place. No-one should have to put up with the antics of particular members on that select committee, whose only interest is total destruction of the parliamentary process and

total destruction of contracts which are to the benefit of this State.

I do not intend, as a senior member of this Government, to allow this to continue—to allow the Minister to subject himself to the wishes, whims and destructive talents of those in another place. It would be different if we were really interested in facts and figures but we are not, are we? Members of the Opposition have continued to tell untruths and to misrepresent a whole range of issues associated with this contract. It is not the intention of the Government to allow a Minister to be subjected to that sort of Chamber scrutiny, because we know the agenda. The agenda is destruction rather than to seek information that should be in the public domain. We do not believe that it is appropriate in any shape or form that a Minister be hijacked by the Upper House or by a select committee of the Upper House in this process.

I reflect on the way in which this motion has been generated and the fact that it has come from the floor of the select committee, put forward by the Chairman, as is his duty to the Upper House. I will not reflect on that process. It is obviously an orderly process, at least as far as the Upper House is concerned, and the Chairman has done his duty in terms of the majority of that committee. However, we know who comprises the majority of that committee. Now it is up to the Government here in the Lower House—the house of Government—to make up its mind. It has made up its mind.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The Deputy Leader says that we want total secrecy. How many questions have we and the Minister answered in this House on the water contract? How many? Day after day we have answered questions. Even with the State Bank issue, which involved \$3 billion, we had Ministers on the front bench who waffled on for the whole of Question Time without ever answering a question. The issue involved \$3 billion, yet all we got was soap suds. The record of the Opposition, the then Government, was appalling. In this case the Minister has on all occasions answered the questions and we have had them week after week, day after day.

The Opposition has had every opportunity to scrutinise not only the major features of this contract, which have been made public, but also the circumstances behind them. Members opposite have made certain criticisms and that is appropriate: that is what the Opposition is for. However, I will not stand by and let people from another place, in this partisan select committee, destroy the contract and destroy all future contracts in South Australia. I ask that the request be refused.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY (Hart): What hypocrisy! What absolute hypocrisy from the Deputy Premier! We remember full well how former select committees, established by the present Minister for Infrastructure, into such issues as Marineland—

The Hon. J.W. Olsen interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: If not you, the member for MacKillop—whoever was Leader of the Opposition. The Minister might have been Canberra bound at that point. I recall that Lynn Arnold, as a member of this House, did not need a motion to go before the select committee: he agreed to it. He agreed for three years to go before a select committee. Do not let the hypocrisy of the Deputy Premier fool anyone, because there is precedent.

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I am trying to avert a disaster. There is precedent. The Government is so timid, so sensitive and so uncertain about its position that it will not allow arguably one of its better performers to attend a select committee. What great fear does the Minister for Infrastructure have about sitting with a number of members of the Upper House before a select committee? Such a polished performer in this Chamber, I hear many people say. What possible fear can the Minister have? I have no idea.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart should not invite interjections.

Mr FOLEY: What fear can the Minister for Infrastructure have? Despite the rhetoric of the Deputy Premier, this is not an Opposition about wanting to destroy any contract: this is an Opposition about putting probity back into the process, an Opposition about scrutinising the largest contract that this or any Government of this State has ever entered into. This is an Opposition about protecting the interests of South Australians. This is an Opposition about putting safeguards in place to ensure that we do not have repeats of the past, that we do not have repeats of the State Bank or SGIC. This is about putting in place the all important safeguards. This is a Government that talked about accountability. This is a Government that said that it would be accountable, that it would provide scrutiny and be accountable to the Parliament.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Hart is ranging well away from the subject of the debate, which is simply that the Minister should or should not appear before the select committee.

Mr FOLEY: This is an issue about accountability, and the one person who is accountable for the water contract in this State, representing Executive Government, is the Minister for Infrastructure. He is the Executive Government's representative on this contract and he should have the right—indeed he should volunteer—to appear before that committee. His Chief Executive Officer will do it, as will other members of Government; Malcolm Kinnaird will do it; North West Water will do it; and all other players in the contract are prepared to appear. But the one man who sits around the Cabinet table and carries the responsibility—the Minister for Infrastructure—hides behind the protection of this House. I ask why.

If the Minister fears nothing and is so right, why does he not appear? The Opposition, in conjunction with the Democrats, wants to question and put the Minister under intense scrutiny to find out who is telling the truth. From the first day that this contract was announced, the Minister and the Premier have been in total conflict with the views of Malcolm Kinnaird (the Chairman of United Water), in conflict with the views of North West Water and in conflict with the views of many people involved in the process. We are simply attempting to ascertain who is telling the truth. What is the situation? Let us look at the issues at hand.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, I wish to ask for your clarification on a ruling that you just gave on relevance. As I understand, the motion before the House is whether this House should or should not grant leave to the Minister to appear before the select committee. The honourable member appears to be canvassing the issue of truth and all sorts of other issues. Surely, we are debating whether this House should grant leave for the Minister to appear and no other issue.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Unley is correct. The motion is very narrow. The honourable member should debate the motion itself.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir. What I am doing is formulating argument as to why the Minister should—

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I am debating why the Minister should appear before the committee. I have to put forward my reasons because I am attempting to convince—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Hart will resume his seat. His previous remarks impugned impropriety on behalf of the Minister while he was canvassing this very point. He said that he wanted to establish whether it was the Minister or Mr Kinnaird who was telling the truth. The inference behind that is that the Minister could possibly have been lying to the House. That, of course, is impugning impropriety to the Minister. Even in canvassing, the honourable member is transgressing the rules of the House.

Mr FOLEY: Not at all, Sir. It is consistent with rulings of Speaker Gunn in saying that there are untruths—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is the ruling of the Deputy Speaker who is currently in the Chair. I warn the honourable member that, if he wishes to dissent from my ruling, he can move a substantive motion in writing immediately. If he does not, he can carry on debating the narrow context of the present motion.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir. What the Opposition wants to establish by having the Minister for Infrastructure appear before the committee is who is telling untruths and who is not. There are inconsistencies. We have Malcolm Kinnaird saying one thing, the Minister saying another, and the Premier saying another. The Minister is a representative of Government. Therefore, he must explain to the committee what is fact and what is not, because we have heard Mr Kinnaird make the statement regarding the issue of Australian equity: 'That was to some extent a beat-up.' Now, Sir—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member is defying the ruling of the Chair. The subject matter before the select committee and the contract itself are not the subject of the debate before the House. The debate before the House is simply whether or not the Minister should be allowed to appear before the select committee. It is as narrow as that.

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

Mr Brindal: Sit down, you fool, you're wrong.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Unley is generating more heat than light with a comment such as that. The member for Spence has a point of order.

Mr ATKINSON: It seems to me that the question of whether the Minister for Infrastructure appears before a committee in another place—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a point of order?

Mr ATKINSON: Yes, I do. It is a point of order on relevance. Surely, the importance of ramifications of the issue upon which the Minister is to be called is relevant.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member has no point of order. The Chair was referring specifically to the fact that the—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I inform the member for Ross Smith that the Chair is still ruling. The Chair was referring specifically to the fact that the member for Hart was debating an issue—

Mr FOLEY: I humbly apologise, Sir. I have not debated one of these motions in this place before. I was not sure. I am learning quickly. What I am learning is that this Government is about cover-up and not being prepared to own up to its responsibility as Executive Government.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order—

Mr FOLEY: This is nothing but a stunt.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Unley has a point of order.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The member for Hart continues to impugn improper motives to a Minister. Your ruling and that of previous Speakers is that that must be done by way of substantive motion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Unley's point of order is correct.

Mr FOLEY: I am not attempting to impugn improper motives to the Minister nor am I saying that the Minister is telling untruths: I am simply saying that there is a conflict of issues. A number of issues raised by the Minister and the Chairman need the Minister's assistance before that committee to clarify. That is my point. Surely the Minister's attendance before a select committee—

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Is that better? Thank you. Would you mind coaching me through this one?

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Thank you. I now have a coach on whom I can rely for about two seconds. We simply want the Minister to appear before the committee to give us the opportunity to clarify how the statements made in this House by the Minister compare with statements made by Mr Kinnaird before the select committee. Mr Kinnaird has appeared before the select committee and said certain things, and he has said certain things to the Opposition. We simply want clarity and clarification. I believe that the Minister's appearance before the committee is critical and central to the select committee's being in a position adequately to resolve the proper, diligent investigation into this matter.

I simply do not know why this Government wants to frustrate this Parliament, the Opposition and perhaps the people of South Australia. We have seen what it has done when it comes to polling. If polling is bad, they stamp 'Cabinet confidentiality' on it, and they hide that away in the bowels of the Cabinet office. We cannot allow this contract to continue to be kept under lock and key by this Government without scrutiny. As we have seen with Upper House select committees in the past, Lynn Arnold had the integrity—

Mr Caudell interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Lynn Arnold had the integrity to appear before the Marineland select committee. The member for Norwood can wave his arms and the member for Mitchell can interject, and even the member for Goyder can lash out at me, but they cannot deny the fact that Lynn Arnold appeared before the Marineland select committee for three years—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call members to order.

Mr FOLEY:—and he gave appropriate and due recognition to the importance of that committee. On behalf of the Government, he was prepared to face the music. Whether other Ministers of the Labor Government did or did not, I do not recall. What I do know is that Lynn Arnold did. For three years, Lynn Arnold attended many meetings of that select committee, which was chaired by the Hon. Rob Lucas in another place. That committee was all about the Opposition

of that time wanting to investigate an issue. Whether that was a lapsed contract or a contract that had tipped over, the Opposition of the day felt that the issue was serious enough to require the scrutiny of a parliamentary committee. The Government agreed, as this Government has agreed about the water select committee. Lynn Arnold was the Minister responsible for that issue—he might not have been responsible for many of the decisions, but that is another story for another time—around the Cabinet table and in Executive Government, and he therefore appeared. I might add that his ministerial assistant appeared also.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: That wasn't me. No, not at all. I started after that. I was part of the clean-up team. The reality is that Lynn Arnold set a precedent. I simply ask the Minister for Infrastructure, 'Why not show a similar courtesy to a parliamentary inquiry that will allow proper scrutiny', because there are so many unanswered issues, whether they be the conflicting issues of Australian equity or the public float in terms of whether mums and dads can buy shares. On that issue this Minister has stood in this place—

The SPEAKER: Order! This is a very narrow debate. The honourable member cannot canvass issues that are currently before the select committee. We are debating a motion as to whether the Minister should or should not appear before the committee.

Mr FOLEY: I am attempting to establish the reasons why I believe the Minister should appear, and I believe that is within the guidelines.

The SPEAKER: It is a narrow debate, as the honourable member understands.

Mr FOLEY: I am keeping it as narrow as I can. I am just saying that the Minister has said certain things in this House and we have had members coming before the select committee saying things that are contradictory to the Minister's comments. The Chairman of United Water in briefings with the Opposition has said certain things which are in conflict with the Minister.

We need the Minister before the select committee so that we can clarify his understanding of these issues. I happen to think that there is a misunderstanding on the part of the Chairman of United Water as between what he believes are United Water's obligations and what his obligations are.

The SPEAKER: Order! The views and comments of the Chairman of United Water have nothing to do with the motion before the Chair. I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the motion.

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. By way of point of explanation to try to understand your ruling, Sir: is your ruling that the member for Hart cannot talk about the substantive issues of the water contract because that matter is before the select committee and, therefore, cannot be discussed by the House, or is your ruling that we can discuss the question of a Minister from this House appearing before a select committee of another place only in the abstract? Is it one or both of those?

The SPEAKER: The ruling of the Chair is that matters currently before the select committee are not the subject of this motion. Therefore, the debate should focus on members' comments on the motion before the Chair. The member for Hart.

Mr FOLEY: Can you explain to me why—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not have to explain.

Mr FOLEY: I will not ask that question. The Deputy Premier went about as wide as you can get. It seems to me that extraordinary latitude was given to the Deputy Premier to berate the Opposition—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is reflecting on the Deputy Speaker. As I understand it, the Deputy Speaker was of the view that this is a narrow debate and, therefore, that is also the view of the Speaker.

Mr FOLEY: I will attempt to keep this debate as narrow as I should.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! As you will.

Mr FOLEY: As I shall, Sir. This is not about the Upper House hijacking this issue or about members in another place taking control of this issue but about the Upper House of this Parliament having its proper process of reviewing Government actions. That is no different from what has happened in years gone by; for example, no different from a Marineland select committee that had the participation of the former Premier of this State, Lynn Arnold. It is not about hijacking or about destroying a Government contract. The Deputy Premier made the comment that members on the select committee were all about hijacking this issue, taking it away from this place, from Executive Government—wrong, wrong, wrong!

The Upper House select committee has done this State a great service. Had it not been for the select committee of another place, we would not have heard issues that have come into conflict with the Government. It was the select committee of another place that was not about destroying a contract but about clarifying a contract, about discovering new elements of the contract and about bringing into the public arena, particularly the parliamentary arena, vital issues to do with that contract. That is the role of that Upper House select committee; that is the role of a parliamentary select committee. Surely the Minister does not have the same view about other committees of the Upper House, such as the Statutory Authorities Review Committee. That is an Upper House committee that has a certain set of responsibilities. I do not hear the Deputy Premier rising in this place—

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Were you just saying that to the Speaker—telling me to hurry up? How about just worrying about your issues, and I will continue—

The Hon. J.W. Olsen: Why don't you worry about speaking?

Mr FOLEY: If we do not continually have interruptions, stalling tactics and attempts to gag the Opposition, I will.

The Hon. J.W. Olsen: For a gag, you're not doing too badly.

Mr FOLEY: I could be here all night should I decide to filibuster.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The Government has now said that it can move that the motion be put. We know why this motion is being debated at 8.30 at night—because members opposite were not brave enough to have it before the cameras tomorrow in this Chamber in Government time. Yet again members opposite are avoiding parliamentary scrutiny.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker, and again ask that you rule on relevance.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart is aware of the parameters of the debate, and I ask him to stay within those parameters.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you for your ruling, Sir. I come back to the essence of the motion, and that simply is that the Minister should appear before the committee, and this House should give the Minister leave to do so. I have no doubt in my own mind that the Minister would have no difficulty in appearing before the committee. He seems to think he handles Question Time pretty well in here, and I am sure he does.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson.

Mr FOLEY: I am sure what we see on the evening news is nothing more than a Minister performing his portfolio well. However, at the end of the day, that select committee is performing an important function. It is probably the most important parliamentary select committee this Parliament has seen for many years. It may well be a defining moment for this Parliament, because what it has done—

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: No, I said that the select committee may well be a defining moment for this Parliament.

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

Mr FOLEY: It has served an important role.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Well, I think it has caused the Minister a fair degree of angst, pain, embarrassment and stress.

The Hon. J.W. Olsen interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I don't think you have. That all occurred over the leadership battle. I know that the select committee has caused the Government considerable pain, but that should not be an excuse not to appear before it and avoid scrutiny, because this is a very important issue. The Opposition will continue to probe the Minister in Question Time over his role, and I suspect that that questioning will lead all the way to the next State election.

The Hon. J.W. Olsen: I'll be here all the way.

Mr FOLEY: That's right; all the way to the next State election. We will look at all the faces opposite as we get closer to that election and at the margin in Norwood rapidly dissipating because the water issue has grabbed hold.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I do not think that Vinnie will have too much trouble with the member for Norwood.

Mr BASS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The debate has been diverted from the motion, and I question the relevance of the member for Hart's comments.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is aware that the member for Hart was distracted by certain interjections. The member for Hart is aware of the motion before the Chair. Therefore, I suggest that he continue to confine his remarks to that motion.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The member for Unley may say things like that, and I am quite happy for you to address it to me directly, if you so you wish.

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

Mr FOLEY: I have covered adequately the reasons why the Opposition believes the Minister should appear—even if I am unable to put some of the issues and have the full opportunity to canvass the important issues that demand the Minister's attention. I simply say to the Minister: Lynn Arnold did the decent thing; he went to a select committee—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY: He got a bit further up the Cabinet ladder than you did.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson: Where is he now?

Mr FOLEY: In happy retirement—in Spain. I have battered and bruised the Minister long enough on this.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: As I say, I have not landed a punch on him today and I suspect we will leave that until Question Time. I urge the Minister to reconsider his reluctance and his decision not to appear before the select committee and do the decent thing. What have you to hide?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development): With pride I am an elected member of the House. With pride, I am a Minister in this House and I am accountable to the public of South Australia as a Minister of the Crown through this House. In this session the House has sat for about 21 days. I have been in attendance for 20 of those 21 days. The Opposition has had the opportunity to question me for 20 hours in this session of Parliament. I will be available in this House every sitting day to the conclusion of the session. I am available at any time during Question Time for any series of questions the Opposition wants to put to me about the water contract. That is hardly resisting giving answers to questions posed by the Opposition and being accountable to the public of South Australia through the parliamentary process.

Indeed, if we look at the number of days this Parliament has sat and the days on which the Opposition has had an opportunity to question me, it has questioned me on only about seven of those 21 days. Therefore, I simply make the point as a Minister of the Crown elected to this House and accountable as Minister to this Parliament and the public of South Australia that I am available at every Question Time for a series of questions and any number of questions that the Opposition wants to put to me. I will be here every sitting day of the Parliament, accountable and responding to any questions that the Opposition puts to me.

Several points were made by the previous speaker. One point is that we are dealing with this matter at 8.30 p.m. without the glare of the cameras. I make this point to the House: I was asked last Thursday in Question Time, in the full glare of the media, whether I would be attending the committee. At that time I said that I am here and available, that I will continue to be available here for questioning as I should be as an elected member of the House. That was widely reported last Thursday and Friday, yet the Opposition has the audacity to suggest that we are dealing with this matter at this hour simply because we do not want it reported. The matter has already been reported to the South Australian public. The Opposition made the point that there has been some variation in reports of the contract.

Mr FOLEY: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I draw your attention to the relevance of the Minister's remarks. He is now debating the substance of the committee's deliberations—the very point on which I was called to order.

The Hon. J.W. Olsen: I didn't interrupt you once.

Mr FOLEY: Everyone else did.

The Hon. J.W. Olsen: But you had your say.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not need any assistance. Even after giving the rulings I gave, the Chair continued to give the member for Hart considerable latitude. If the Chair wanted to enforce Standing Orders, the member for Hart would have been restricted much more than he was.

The Minister is giving reasons why, as I understand it, he does not believe he should appear before the Legislative Council's select committee.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart will withdraw that comment or I will name him. The member for Hart said that there was one set of rules for the Minister and one for the others. That is a direct reflection on the Chair. He will withdraw forthwith—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: —and he does not need counselling.

Mr FOLEY: I withdraw, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The member for Hart indicated that there were varying reports of this contract and that I needed to appear before the committee to check the veracity of that matter. I simply remind the House that yesterday I brought in a minute from the Crown Solicitor that attests to the veracity of statements I have made in this House. The Opposition simply does not want to hear the truth: when the truth is given to members opposite they want to ignore it simply for political purposes. The Solicitor-General has said that this is an excellent contract—'an excellent contract' are the words of the Solicitor-General.

Mr CLARKE: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order, and it is the very point on which the member for Hart was pulled up: the Minister is now debating the substance of the issue—the water contract and the matters before the select committee—rather than the issue pertaining to the Minister's appearance or non-appearance before the select committee.

The SPEAKER: The Minister will confine his remarks to the motion before the Chair.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. On any occasion I have put statements before the House I have been prepared to seek and establish independently from the Crown Solicitor—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: It is relevant to the debate in the context of the argument put by the member for Hart.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The member for Hart did say it, and he said it on a number of occasions. In terms of the veracity of statements before the House, no less than the Crown Solicitor has supported the accuracy of my statements.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has pursued that argument far enough.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Thank you. We have statements made by some Opposition members in another place that they can drag this committee all the way to July.

Mr ATKINSON: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Minister is referring to debate in another place. He is quoting speeches in another place by members of the Opposition, and I ask you to rule that such debate cannot be canvassed in this place.

The SPEAKER: The Minister is aware that he is not permitted to debate matters that are currently before the other House. Therefore, I ask the Minister to confine his remarks to the matter before the Chair, which is the motion.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will adhere to your ruling.

The SPEAKER: I am sure you will.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I will summarise by making this point. I repeat the point made last Thursday in Question Time

to the gallery and the media. It was reported and I repeat it today. I am an elected member of this House, accountable to the public of South Australia through this House. I will be available at every Question Time, and the member for Hart can serve up any number of questions and fill every hour of Question Time. Indeed, I would be pleased for him to do so. I am more than willing to respond to those questions in this House, and therefore be accountable to the public of South Australia, and be pleased to do so. That is where it ought to be, because this is the House of Parliament to which I am elected, to which I am accountable, and to which I am sworn in as a Minister of the Crown and have certain responsibilities. I will discharge those responsibilities, and I will be available for any number of questions at every Question Time for however many questions you wish to ask me.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Mr Speaker—

Mr Cummins interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: Hark! The member for Norwood. Obviously times in the legal profession are thin and there are no briefs today.

Mr CUMMINS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The member for Ross Smith is now discussing the legal profession and I ask what relevance this has to the motion. It is a standard motion and he has to speak to the motion itself. He has to confine his speech to the content of the motion. I am a lawyer, by the way.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Standing Orders do not in any way take into account whether or not the member is a lawyer. The Deputy Leader has just commenced his contribution and is obviously aware of previous rulings.

Mr CLARKE: I will not take too long unless provoked my members opposite (in particular, the member for Unley). I support the resolution of the Legislative Council. I can understand the Government of the day having some qualms not about the political issue *per se* but about the principle of having a Lower House Minister appear before an Upper House committee. In fact, I almost heard the Deputy Premier quoting the Prime Minister on this matter with respect to certain appearances before the Senate that were demanded when the Prime Minister referred to the Senate as unrepresentative swill. Of course, that would not apply to the Legislative Council. It is not a question of each State electing 12 Senators; in this case 22 members are elected across the whole of the State in a very democratic fashion under a proportional representation system. Therefore, the Legislative Council cannot be unrepresentative swill.

However, when it comes to the issue of the water contract and the reasons why the select committee wishes to interview the Minister on this matter, it is very important. The Minister has made great play of the fact that he is accountable to this House and, therefore, that is all he needs to do in discharging his responsibilities. We know only too well, Sir, through your rulings from the Chair and, as I understand, from other Speakers in the past, what applies with respect to Standing Order 98 and the manner in which Ministers answer questions. If I could paraphrase you, Sir, you have said that Ministers can answer questions any way they want. So, if I ask whether the sky is blue and a Minister answers by saying that the moon is made of blue cheese, that is okay. Indeed, that is how Ministers of this Government have treated Question Time. They do not answer seriously the substance of the questions put to them.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. As you pointed out, Sir, this motion touches upon the privileges of members of this House. I ask you, Sir, whether the member for Ross Smith is not almost casting a reflection on the Chair in putting forward a line of argument which rather than canvassing the privileges of members of this House actually canvasses the quality of answers given by Ministers in this House and the rulings made by you as Speaker on the quality of the Ministers' answers.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair was listening very carefully to the Deputy Leader because he has developed some skills that are getting fairly close to reflecting on the Chair and then skirting around the issue. Perhaps the intent is fairly clear without clearly indicating any criticism. I again make the point to all members that, if they are to participate in this debate, they should confine their remarks to the matter before the Chair. The manner in which Ministers answer questions is a matter for Ministers to comply with in terms of the Standing Orders. If, at Question Time, a member is unhappy and believes that a Minister is going beyond Standing Orders, they should take a point of order at the time.

Mr CLARKE: I have certainly taken points of order, Mr Speaker, and you have reaffirmed the position with respect to rulings under Standing Order 98. I also draw the attention of the House to the report of the Auditor-General last year with respect to parliamentary scrutiny of important outsourcing privatisation contracts that this Government has entered into. The Auditor-General quite specifically said in his report that there was a danger of there not being sufficient parliamentary scrutiny of these very important contracts dealing with the public interest and with the public purse.

I refer to the few measures that Parliament has to control Executive Government, particularly given the Party political nature of this House. We do not sit here as independent members of Parliament. We are all members of our respective political Parties. The governing Party and the Cabinet have the support of the parliamentary majority, and they carry out the wishes of the Party room as decided within the Party room irrespective of what might take place within this Chamber.

The ability of the House to act as an effective check on Executive Government is very limited when there are two strong Party political affiliations in this Chamber. That is a matter of fact; it is not a matter of reflection. It would not matter whether the Labor Party were in government or whether the Liberal Party were in government. The Legislative Council is a representative body of the electorate. Its members are now democratically elected—and that has been the case since 1975. The Legislative Council is perfectly entitled to ask that a Minister appear before it to answer questions.

The Opposition has found that only through the use of the Legislative Council can we obtain answers. On a day-to-day basis, Ministers and the Premier come before this House and answer questions about important contractual arrangements involving water, EDS, hospitals and any other number of Government agencies by saying that they are all subject to commercial confidentiality and that they cannot reveal the answers to questions because—

Mr CUMMINS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The substantive motion before the House is that the Minister appear before a select committee and not that he produce documents. There is no motion before the House for the Minister to appear and produce documents, namely, the contract.

The SPEAKER: Order! As the Chair has previously ruled, we are debating a motion which is before the Chair and which deals with a request from another place that the Minister appear. Therefore, I ask the Deputy Leader to debate that issue and not to stray widely from that area of debate.

Mr CLARKE: Thank you, Sir. I will follow strictly the guidelines of the Minister in this area. The reality is that there are very good and cogent reasons why a Minister of this House ought to accept the invitation put forward by the other Chamber with respect to this matter. It is not as if this Government went to the election in 1993 and sought a mandate from the people of South Australia to flog off our water supply. The Liberal Party did not go to the people and say that it would sign a contract to flog off our water supply and sewerage system while refusing to allow members of Parliament access to those contracts to see whether or not Executive Government acted in the best interests of the public of South Australia.

The Legislative Council has acted upon the concerns expressed by the Auditor-General in trying to ensure that there is adequate parliamentary scrutiny of all such major contracts. It would be a travesty of justice if Executive Government could enter into contracts involving not only water but any other Government service and do so totally unfettered for a period of four years up to the next election without any effective parliamentary scrutiny simply by the use of its numbers in this House to prevent adequate scrutiny of its actions.

What I also pose to the Minister and the Government is this: the Minister says, day after day, as does the Premier, 'We have nothing to hide; we have nothing to be ashamed of. This contract is so good that the whole world is holding its breath at the audacity of the South Australian Government in pulling off the coup of the century in matters such as the privatisation of our water supply.' If it is so good and wonderful for the people of South Australia as the Minister and the Premier say it is, he should have no hesitation in going before a select committee of another democratically elected Chamber of this Parliament and answering the questions that are put to him and producing the documentation that is requested. We are not dealing with a group of people pulled in off the street; the members of this select committee are democratically elected members of a Chamber of Parliament which has equal powers to this Chamber in law, except that they do not form the Government and do not deal with money matters. However, under the Constitution, in all other respects they have co-equal powers and are democratically elected.

I ask the Minister, if this contract is so wonderful for the people of South Australia, why will he not appear before such a select committee to state his case and answer the questions, particularly as they can be framed in a cross-examination format? That is the best way of testing the credibility of witnesses who appear before select committees and to get to the truth of the matter. In that way we can see whether the Minister's arguments stand the test of scrutiny. It does not matter what this Minister says about appearing day after day—

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The point taken by the member for Ross Smith clearly reflects not only on every member of this Parliament but on the processes of this sovereign Chamber of Parliament. I ask you to rule accordingly.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I believe that the member for Ross Smith was arguing relatively cogently that the Minister

should appear. I did not detect the innuendo that the member for Unley put to the Chair, but I urge the member for Ross Smith to adhere to the subject matter before the House. There is in fact no mention of the contract, and the member did advert to the contract.

Mr CLARKE: I thank you for your ruling, Sir. That is why you will always have our 11 votes for the Speakership whenever you wish to have it. I will try to conclude on this matter, because I do not want to take up the time of the House unnecessarily. I suggest to all members that this is an issue concerning Executive Government. We have heard the Premier and various Ministers say that Executive Governments can sign any contract they like without reference to this Parliament on a whole range of very important matters. Backbench member's opposite are overwhelmingly kept in the dark on any matters of vital public importance. That just happens to be a feature of Executive Government: they are expected to click their heels at the appropriate time and vote in support of the executive arm of the Government.

We are confronted with the Minister saying, in theory, that he is subject to intense questioning in this House, and he has been, but the fact is that the Minister, under the rulings of the Speaker and apparently of past Speakers, can answer any questions put to him in any way that he likes without regard to the relevance or substance of the question that is asked. If that is the case, quite frankly, a good portion of Question Time is largely wasted. That is a simple fact.

Occasionally a Minister slips and actually answers the substance of a question and then realises the mistake when it is too late because we have caught him out. That is the real problem with Executive Government. In this House it is 36:11 on Party political lines. I do not complain about Party political lines. We enforce it and all the rest of it in our own Party, and that is a simple fact of life. Therefore, when another democratically elected Chamber of this Parliament with co-equal powers to this Chamber with respect to most matters, except for those to which I have already adverted, calls on a Minister to appear and answer specific questions, a Minister should not be frightened, if he believes his case is so good, to appear and answer those questions, under oath, if necessary, and through cross-examination.

I pose that as a challenge to this Minister. If the contract is so good for South Australia, why will you not put up? Basically, it is because this Government does not have the guts to do it. If it has not got the guts to release its own polling figures, which have been made a Cabinet secret and upon which it has spent scores of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money on publicity to try to reverse what those polling figures show, why should we have any faith in the Minister in this House?

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): During recent previous Parliaments it is fair to say that Labor Governments pleaded a number of causes for not being as responsible to the electorate and to Parliament as those Labor Governments should have been. Indeed, the member for Unley will recall that when he was the member for Hayward it was common for Ministers in the Bannon Government to plead commercial confidentiality when they were questioned during debate on Bills or during Question Time. Earlier in this debate the Minister for Infrastructure cited a number of examples of Labor Government Ministers who refused to appear before Upper House select committees.

Mr CUMMINS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. What the member is now saying is clearly irrelevant.

There are rulings to the effect that one cannot cite other instances in a debate like this; one has to speak to the content of the substantive motion. This is clearly irrelevant, and I refer my friend to page 973 of Erskine May.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Spence has been listening intently to the debate, on occasion has raised points of order, and is acutely aware of the narrow ambit of the debate. The member for Norwood has a point of order which I rule is correct. I ask the honourable member to advert to the subject matter, which is a motion for the Minister to appear before a select committee.

Mr ATKINSON: When we came to the election of December 1993 the Liberal Party promised a change in the relationship between Ministers and Parliament and between Ministers and the electorate.

Mr Brindal: Parliament is here.

Mr ATKINSON: There was one word in that changed relationship between the ministry and Parliament and the people that could summarise that change.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Unley to order.

Mr ATKINSON: When I came in after the December 1993 election and took my place as part of the Opposition (fewer of us then than a cricket team), this word used to be shouted from the Government benches and from this part of the Opposition benches now occupied by the Liberal Party. Indeed, when the Premier used to say it—this is in 1994—a roar went up from the Government back benches. What was that word?

Mr Brindal: Relevance.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, honourable member, for beating the Chair.

Mr ATKINSON: That word was ‘accountability’. The Premier promised Parliament and the people of South Australia that there would be greater accountability in his Government, and how soon has it been forgotten? Let us set aside for a minute the technical constitutional question of whether Assembly Ministers ought to appear before select committees in another place. Let us set aside the strictly legal question and consider this entirely—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members will come to order.

Mr ATKINSON: Let us consider it on principle. Let us consider whether, on principle, the Minister for Infrastructure ought to appear before a select committee of another place independently of the legalese. Let us do that just for a moment. It seems to me that, if you are a Liberal member of Parliament and you are doorknocking your electorate—

Ms White: They don’t doorknock.

Mr ATKINSON: Well, they do not doorknock, but let us say they did. When it comes closer to doomsday, let them explain to an ordinary South Australian, an ordinary voter for the House of Assembly, why a Minister in the Brown Government should not appear, on principle, before a parliamentary select committee. The truth is that, if this matter were explained to voters, to the punters, to the people who listen to the Bob Francis show, without knowing the constitutional position, they would certainly say, ‘Well, why shouldn’t the Minister appear before a parliamentary select committee?’ I defy members opposite to find any ordinary voter who is prepared to accept their argument. The truth is—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, the member for Unley!

Mr ATKINSON:—that this argument over whether the Minister for Infrastructure should appear before a select committee of another place has to be done in virtual secret. It has to be done in secret, at a time when the media gallery is vacant, when the television cameras are not here, because the argument from the Government benches is an anaerobic argument: it is an argument that cannot survive in the fresh air, amongst the people of South Australia. It is an argument that can work only in here. It is an argument that is understood only in here by people who are obsessed with politics.

To the voters it must seem incomprehensible that the Minister for Infrastructure cannot appear before a select committee. It is astonishing. Like the Minister for Infrastructure, I too come into the House and listen to Question Time. I have to say that the Minister for Infrastructure is one of the best Ministers, if not the best Minister, at answering questions during Question Time, and I am sure he can acquit himself well before a select committee of another place. Unless he has something to fear from the briefing he takes to that committee, in terms of ability, he has nothing to fear.

The Hon. R.B. Such interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: The Minister for Youth Affairs, or whatever he is the Minister for—I know his portfolio manages to occupy the Minister for Monday morning, but I really do not know what he does for the rest of the week—interjects and says, ‘Let’s go on the Bob Francis show and debate this.’ I issue that challenge to every member of the Government: come on Bob Francis’s Nightline show and debate this issue now.

Mr BASS: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I question the relevance of the honourable member’s remarks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Spence has adhered pretty well to a philosophical argument, having set aside the legal arguments and the actual motion itself in order to put forward his point of view, but I ask him to stick closely to the point and not be diverted by the interjections, which appear to be sidetracking him a little. I ask members to cease their interjections and there will be fewer points of order from the member for Florey.

Mr ATKINSON: I now move to the question of legalities and the constitutional position, and I want to do this only briefly. The Minister for Infrastructure mentioned a number of examples where a Labor Government Minister had been summoned to appear before a select committee of another place. What all those examples had in common is that the Liberal Party of the day supported the principle that—

Mr Evans interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: That is exactly right: the member for Davenport is exactly right. On all those occasions the Liberal Party supported the constitutional principle that it was okay for a Minister in the Assembly to appear before a Legislative Council select committee, and now the Labor Party, which at that time opposed the idea on constitutional grounds, finds itself supporting the proposition. How remarkable it is that things change when we swap positions in the Assembly. Isn’t it just remarkable! We all recall—or perhaps only some of us recall—that the Liberal Party in another place moved a motion of no confidence in one of the Bannon Government Ministers, namely the Hon. John Cornwall. It did it long before—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: No, not debates: an outcome in another Chamber. It did it long before Dr Cornwall met his final doom. That motion was passed in the other place, the Liberal Party supporting it. Of course, we did not accept that as a

Party. John Cornwall was allowed to continue. But how remarkable it is that at one time the Liberal Party could think that a Minister should resign because of a motion of no confidence in another place but this time it thinks a Minister should not even appear before a select committee of another place. How the worm has turned.

It is well known that we are in a most unbalanced House of Assembly at this time. The people of South Australia have chosen a House of Assembly in which the Opposition is smaller than at any time this century.

Mr Brindal: Whose fault is that?

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Unley asks, 'Whose fault is that?' It is undoubtedly the fault of the previous Labor Government. Is that the answer you wanted? It is a matter of conventional wisdom that the Opposition in this place finds it hard to scrutinise a Government that has a record majority. It is a difficult task which we fulfil to the best of our ability. In another place, the Government does not have a majority. Three Parties are represented in another place, and that means that the Government cannot ram through, in that other place, everything it wants to. It has to argue its case and try to win its case on the merits of the argument, on principle. So, in order to get its measures through the other place, the Government has to win the support of either the Democrats or the Parliamentary Labor Party. Sometimes it does not.

I take great pleasure in those items that pass in the other place, supported by the Liberal Party and the Labor Party with the Democrats in a minority of two. There should be more of it. It is plain to any South Australian who follows politics that accountability in the South Australian State Parliament would be well served by Ministers in this Government, though they be Assembly members, being called to give evidence and to answer questions before the other place or before the committee of another place.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Unley asks, 'Why should this House abandon its privilege?' It is not abandoning its privilege. This House can pass a resolution now that enables the Minister to appear before the select committee of another place and it can take back that privilege at any time it wants to. So later, if there was another select committee on another topic, perhaps in the next sitting week, it would be quite within the authority of this House to decide that an Assembly Minister does not appear before a select committee of another place.

The question of a Minister's appearing before a select committee of another place is within our gift, and if we want to give it we can and if we want to refuse we can. So, the member for Unley is trying to say that we are alienating our privilege for all time by allowing one Minister to appear before one select committee of another place. My argument is that we are not alienating our privilege at all. It is part of our privilege that we can say 'Yes' to a Minister in this place appearing before a select committee of another place.

My final point is that this Government is hiding behind privilege, hiding behind legalese and hiding behind an abstruse version of the Constitution to deny accountability to the people of South Australia. This House has the authority now to say that the Minister shall appear before a committee in another place. It has the authority to say 'No' on the next or another occasion. I urge the House to live up to the Premier's election slogan of accountability.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I put the motion. Those in favour say 'Aye'.

Honourable members: Aye.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Against, 'No'.

Honourable members: No.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I believe the Noes have it.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The motion was that the request be not agreed to.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry, Minister: I was construing the motion sent from the Upper House.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: No, I moved:

That the motion be not agreed to.

Members interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: On a point of order, Sir. I cast your mind back to the debate on the third reading of the Small-wheeled Vehicles Bill, wherein you put a motion and it was carried and, when I asked you to put it again, Sir, you refused to do so.

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

Mr ATKINSON: My point of order, Sir, is that the House has dealt with the motion and we will now need a motion of recision.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order, honourable member. On that occasion the member for Spence was grossly confused in that I was calling him to speak on the next issue on the Notice Paper when he realised that he had not called for a division. In this instance, the Chair has no copy of the motion before it and I am asking for a copy of it. The motion is—

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order, Sir. You put the motion, the motion was carried and there was a pause. There was no dissent. Unless there is a motion of recision of a decision of the House, it is quite clear that a firm decision of the House has been taken.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The point was that I was clarifying—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Premier to be seated. The Chair was confused as to the precise motion being put. The issue is no more complex than that. The motion that was moved was not the motion that came down from the Upper House, which the Chair read out. I read out the motion. The motion was a separate motion which the Deputy Premier moved, namely, that the motion be disagreed to. That is the motion before the Chair.

Mr ATKINSON: I rise, Sir, to dissent from your ruling.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has not ruled yet. The honourable member will have the opportunity to put the motion in writing if he wishes to. The Chair's decision is that the motion will be put again. I put the motion to members. Does the honourable member intend to move dissent, as he is entitled to do?

Mr ATKINSON: Yes, Sir.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the member for Unley that such language is quite unnecessary. The member for Spence has moved dissent from the Deputy Speaker's ruling that the motion be recommitted.

The SPEAKER: As the Chair understands it, the member for Spence has moved dissent from the Deputy Speaker's ruling that the motion be recommitted. Does the member for Spence wish to speak to the motion?

Mr ATKINSON: Certainly, Sir.

Mr EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I understood that the Deputy Speaker made a ruling that the motion had not been carried and he would take the vote again. If the

motion has not been carried, I do not understand how we can recommit it and I seek a ruling on that.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is of the view that the Deputy Speaker was of the opinion that there was some misunderstanding in relation to putting the question and he proposed to put the question again so that the matter could be beyond doubt. At that stage, the member for Spence indicated, and has now put in writing, that he wished to move a motion of dissent from the Deputy Speaker's ruling. That is currently the motion before the Chair.

Mr EVANS: If the motion of the member for Spence is not carried, has the previous item been carried or lost?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will then put the question to the House again and that matter will then be in the hands of the House. The member for Spence.

Mr ATKINSON: Before you entered the Chamber, Sir, the Deputy Speaker put a motion about the Minister's appearance before a select committee of another place, and that was voted upon on the voices. He asked first for the Ayes and then he asked for the Noes. The Deputy Speaker found that there was a preponderance of 'No' voices, and he said that the Noes had it. What that means is that the motion is lost or, as you so sweetly say, Sir, it passes in the negative—whatever that means.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: Yes, it means that it is lost, but I find it a very peculiar way of putting it, Sir.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

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

Mr ATKINSON: So, we have a situation where the motion, which I think had been quite thoroughly debated before the House if not to say overcooked, was lost on the voices. If Government members do not like that, all they have to say is: 'Divide'. It is very simple.

Mr EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker, to point out to the House that I did call 'Divide' twice at that point.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order.

Mr ATKINSON: It reminds me of an ALP national conference that I once attended when Mick Young was in the Chair. The Socialist Left did not have the numbers on a particular item and lost the vote. When Mick Young called, 'The motion is carried on the voices', all the Left delegates went, 'Oh, you cheat, you cheat', and Mick Young merely said, 'All you need to say, delegates, is "Show of hands".' The equivalent in this place when you disagree with the counting by the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker is 'Divide'. That is all you need to say.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Norwood has a point of order.

Mr CUMMINS: On a point of order, Sir, I note that the clock is not operating.

The SPEAKER: The monitor on the table of the House is operating.

Mr ATKINSON: I take the House back to the debate on the Road Traffic (Small Wheeled Vehicles) Bill.

Members interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: It is highly relevant.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I question the relevance.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's motion is that the ruling be disagreed to. I suggest that he confine his remarks to that motion.

Mr ATKINSON: If I cannot debate previous rulings from the Chair in this precise situation, I do not see that I can make my point very well. The point I am trying to make is that it was pointed out to me—correctly by the Deputy Speaker—during the third reading vote on that Bill that if you miss the call to divide and the Speaker or Deputy Speaker, or the Chairman of Committees for that matter, rules that the motion either passes in the affirmative or the negative, then that is it. If you want to come back, you come back with a recommittal motion. That is what you do; that is the proper procedure.

I put to you, Mr Speaker, and to Government members that it would be a lot easier on the Government if it had gone through that recommittal procedure, because we would be through it by now and we would all be home. It is important in a rule of law democracy in a Westminster system that we adhere to the rules. Even if you have 36 out of 47, you still ought to go by the rule book, because one day you might be back here and not have 24-plus any more. My message to Government members is: let us go through by the rule book, let us accept that the Deputy Speaker ruled that the motion had passed in the negative—that the Noes had it—which he did, and let us get on with recommitting it so that the Government can use its majority. Let us not try to cover up by saying that the Deputy Speaker was confused and made a mistake.

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Briefly, in response to the member for Spence, I make three points. First, as every member of this House understands, irrespective of the loudness or the quietness of the voices, unless it is private members' time, the Speaker will lean towards the Government, particularly if it has a majority such as this Government has. There have been many occasions in this House—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: No, I am simply saying—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: It is a convention of this House, irrespective of the loudness of the voices, and that has been the case on a number of occasions. The member for Davenport called 'Divide', and at the same time I asked for clarification so that the motion, as the Deputy Speaker understood it, could be corrected. I could have equally called 'Divide', and the matter should now be at an end.

The House divided on Mr Atkinson's motion:

AYES (9)

Atkinson, M. J. (teller)	Blevins, F. T.
Clarke, R. D.	De Laine, M. R.
Foley, K. O.	Geraghty, R. K.
Hurley, A. K.	Stevens, L.
White, P. L.	

NOES (27)

Allison, H.	Andrew, K. A.
Armitage, M. H.	Ashenden, E. S.
Baker, S. J. (teller)	Bass, R. P.
Brindal, M. K.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Brown, D. C.	Buckby, M. R.
Caudell, C. J.	Condous, S. G.
Cummins, J. G.	Evans, I. F.
Hall, J. L.	Ingerson, G. A.

NOES (cont.)

Kerin, R. G.	Lewis, I. P.
Matthew, W. A.	Meier, E. J.
Olsen, J. W.	Oswald, J. K. G.
Penfold, E. M.	Rossi, J. P.
Such, R. B.	Venning, I. H.
Wade, D. E.	

PAIRS

Quirke, J. A.	Becker, H.
Rann, M. D.	Wotton, D. C.

Majority of 18 for the Noes.

Mr Atkinson's motion thus negated.

The House divided on the Hon. S.J. Baker's motion:

AYES (27)

Allison, H.	Andrew, K. A.
Armitage, M. H.	Ashenden, E. S.
Baker, S. J. (teller)	Bass, R. P.
Brindal, M. K.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Brown, D. C.	Buckby, M. R.
Caudell, C. J.	Condous, S. G.
Cummins, J. G.	Evans, I. F.
Hall, J. L.	Ingerson, G. A.
Kerin, R. G.	Lewis, I. P.
Matthew, W. A.	Meier, E. J.
Olsen, J. W.	Oswald, J. K. G.
Penfold, E. M.	Rossi, J. P.

AYES (cont.)

Such, R. B.	Venning, I. H.
Wade, D. E.	

NOES (9)

Atkinson, M. J.	Blevins, F. T.
Clarke, R. D. (teller)	De Laine, M. R.
Foley, K. O.	Geraghty, R. K.
Hurley, A. K.	Stevens, L.
White, P. L.	

PAIRS

Becker, H.	Quirke, J. A.
Wotton, D. C.	Rann, M. D.

Majority of 18 for the Ayes.

The Hon. S.J. Baker's motion thus carried.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE AUTHORITY
(REVIEW) AMENDMENT BILL**

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendment to which the House of Assembly had disagreed, and had agreed to the alternative amendment made by the House of Assembly in lieu thereof.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.12 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 15 February at 10.30 a.m.