

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 15 February 1996

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

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: KANGAROO ISLAND HOSPITAL

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the twentieth report of the committee on the Kangaroo Island Hospital redevelopment proposal be noted.

The South Australian Health Commission proposes to redevelop the Kangaroo Island General Hospital, at an estimated cost of \$5.1 million. The hospital is a 30 bed public Acute Level 1 hospital and health service, which provides a unique service to the isolated communities on Kangaroo Island. It provides clinical services for the treatment of patients in: surgery, obstetrics, dentistry, geriatrics, diagnostic radiology, health programs, allied health and medical support services and health education programs. In addition, the hospital also provides a range of community health, promotion and domiciliary services to the island, utilising facilities in Kingscote, American River, Parndana and Penneshaw.

In recent years, minimal funds have been expended on the hospital, and it is now in a position whereby service delivery and working conditions are impractical and inappropriate. In fact, the building has deteriorated to a point where major work is required, as severe occupational health and safety risks exist. The current redevelopment proposal is extensive and requires:

- relocation of the hospital kitchen;
- provision of all acute staff and support areas on a single floor level;
- improved access and security for patients and staff;
- provision of a day surgery suite;
- upgrading of patient accommodation, particularly intensive care and labour wards;
- segregation of acute short term and secure long term patient areas; and
- expanding requirements for community health services and facilities.

The primary aim of the redevelopment is twofold. First, it will address the occupational health and safety issues that exist within the building and secondly it will ensure that facilities are upgraded to meet current minimum standards. Presently, conditions for patient care are inefficient, inappropriate and often substandard; and working conditions for staff are impractical and in some cases demoralising. The redevelopment will ensure that a comprehensive health service is provided to both residents and visitors that is in keeping with the current health care standards that we expect in South Australia.

The Kangaroo Island General Hospital also plays an important role in the attraction of general practitioners to the island. It has been quite clearly stated by these practitioners that if the hospital ceased or reduced the types of level one services currently offered on the island the retention of even one practitioner is not feasible. In addition, redevelopment of the facilities would allow the hospital to offer a broader range of services thus reducing the slippage of clientele to Adelaide. This is particularly relevant to obstetrics patients who

frequently travel to Adelaide to access the better facilities that are available on the mainland.

In summary, the committee is of the belief that the current working conditions for staff are inefficient and dangerous, given the extensive list of occupational health and safety risks that exist within the building. Furthermore, the committee is convinced that patients will receive an improved level of care following the redevelopment and a more comprehensive range of services will become available for residents and tourists on the island. Pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to Parliament that it recommends this expenditure and fully supports the proposed public works.

Mrs PENFOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: URRBRAE AGRICULTURAL CENTRE

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the twenty-first report of the committee on the Urrbrae Agricultural and Horticultural Education Centre be noted.

The Department for Employment, Training and Further Education and the Department for Education and Children's Services propose to redevelop the Urrbrae Agricultural High School at an estimated cost of \$16.7 million. Following a Government review of horticulture and rural vocational training in South Australia, it was determined that the existing Torrens Valley Institute of TAFE facilities for the School of Horticulture at Brookway Park were in need of upgrading and expansion. As there was no additional land available for redevelopment at the current Brookway Park site, alternative locations were investigated and Urrbrae Agricultural High School was selected as most suitable. The site, bounded by major roads on the north and east, is approximately 45 hectares and is adjacent to the Waite complex, which provides tertiary education in the agriculture and horticulture fields.

The current proposal involves the construction of new buildings and site facilities to allow the Torrens Valley Institute of TAFE Brookway Park School of Horticulture to operate on the site of the existing Urrbrae Agricultural High School. This proposal also provides for new and redeveloped accommodation for functions of the high school and for the Department for Primary Industries' State Tree Centre. In addition, a wetlands, to be constructed by the City of Mitcham, has also been integrated into the project. This will solve the occasional flooding problems associated with the site and will be used as a practical learning exercise for students.

The new facilities will expand and enhance the curriculum options for secondary and TAFE students by collocating the existing high school horticulture activities with the TAFE vocational training programs. Furthermore, greater efficiencies will be gained through the sharing of common resources and reducing the duplication of facilities and equipment.

Overall, the project will provide new flexible animal housing for the high school and new accommodation for DETAFE horticultural education and training programs in landscape, arboriculture, irrigation, nursery, machinery, and environmental management. Within each of these disciplines space will be provided for general teaching and learning, together with specialist facilities and resource rooms suitable for competency based training. Areas will also be provided for campus stores and maintenance, staff accommodation and

additional car parking, all of which will be integrated into the general landscaping of the site. The new facilities, to be established in the centre of the existing school complex, will be for the shared use of the TAFE school and the high school. It is currently anticipated that construction will commence early in 1996 and be completed in up to eight stages by the end of 1998.

The committee believes that the current conditions at the Brookway Park site are placing restrictions on the educational functions of the facility, which is in turn disadvantaging the students undertaking the courses offered. In particular, insufficient land area available to the college makes it difficult for students to practise the practical aspect of their courses.

Furthermore, the staff of the facility are experiencing severe office overcrowding and operate in substandard conditions. The additional space that will be made available by relocating to Urrbrae Agricultural High School would solve all of these problems. It is also evident to the committee that the Urrbrae High School facilities are in need of repair and enhancement to alleviate the operational difficulties caused by the lack of updated facilities, inefficient layout and occupational health, safety and welfare concerns.

This redevelopment will offer a solution to the problems associated with both of these sites whilst providing a valuable link between secondary and tertiary students studying agriculture and horticulture. In addition, it is a means to provide well equipped learning and study areas for students, thus enabling the efficient provision of higher education programs. Pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to Parliament that it recommends that the proposed public work proceed.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I wish to remark on the report that I have just heard from the Public Works Committee, to commend the committee for the work that it has done on behalf of the Government in analysing the proposal put to it and to point out that I have an interest in the matter in that I am an old student of Urrbrae and one of the beneficiaries of the Mortlock Scholarships which were awarded by Urrbrae under a trust fund established for the late Mr Mortlock from his estate.

That brings me to the salient point of my remarks. Urrbrae is a unique institution. It is an agricultural high school and was the first of its kind anywhere in Australia, as was Roseworthy the first agricultural college to be established anywhere in the southern hemisphere. In turn, those institutions through the generosity of Peter Waite led to the establishment of the agricultural science faculty, the first of its kind in Australia, at the Adelaide University, and that was on campus land which was part of Peter Waite's estate on the eastern side of Fullarton Road.

The real point in all those historical observations, briefly put, is my hope that the Public Works Committee and the Government have carefully examined the trust deed of Peter Waite, because it was very explicit in the way in which it sought to determine that the land should be used for no other purpose whatsoever than agricultural education at secondary and tertiary level. It is reasonable to argue that a TAFE institute is study at tertiary level, but the campus land set aside for that purpose is on the eastern side of Fullarton Road, not the west. The western side was allocated for the purpose of establishing a high school for secondary education.

Mr Atkinson: Is Unley on the same section?

Mr LEWIS: Unley High is on a piece of land which was taken from the Waite land in return for an equal area acquired on the opposite corner of the section where the high school buildings for Urrbrae were erected. The land on which the Urrbrae High School buildings are established is not part of the Waite land which was entailed in the trust deed. That is a *quid pro quo*, and everyone agreed with that at the time, including some Supreme Court judges. I make this point because of the anxiety that has been expressed in the community amongst people who, to my knowledge, quite unquestionably over the years have been Liberal supporters. They want me to do the right thing and to ensure that there is not an abuse of Peter Waite's trust deed—an abuse taken in ignorance or convenience, or both, based on recommendations from the bureaucracy to the Government which have been adopted.

I know that the proposal has bipartisan support, but notwithstanding the good intentions we should not, in any sense, abuse what was left by Peter Waite, quite lawfully and quite definitely for those explicit purposes. On very close examination of that trust deed it may transpire that there are no explicit statements in the deed which require the land on the western side of Fullarton Road to be used exclusively for secondary education, and I hope that is the case. Because, if there is not, we are all in a very embarrassing situation indeed.

Motion carried.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: RURAL POVERTY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Leggett:

That the eighth report of the committee be noted.

(Continued from 8 February. Page 940.)

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): This report was initiated when parts of Eyre Peninsula had suffered from a series of exceptional circumstances over a long period. In addition to adverse grain and wool prices on the world markets and high interest rates, many farmers had had several years of drought, coupled with frosts, unseasonal rains at Christmas and, to cap it all off, a mouse plague. Few people in the city have experienced a mouse plague and, seeing the pictures on television, although disgusting enough, give little idea of the revulsion felt when they are discovered in beds and clothing and nestling in linen cupboards, or the revulsion of the smell that pervades everything. I was born and bred on Eyre Peninsula and I do not believe that I have experienced morale in some regions being so low. However, I am pleased to report that in 1995 we experienced an excellent season over most of Eyre Peninsula with good grain prices and better wool prices.

Country people are hardy, and they bounce back quickly. There is a great feeling of optimism about. That has been buoyed by the State Government's rural arterial road program. Roads are very important in the country, and the start of the Kimba-Cleve road and, more recently, the Lock-Elliston road have given a great lift to these areas as tangible benefits of having a Liberal Government in power in the State. A Federal Liberal Government after 2 March will be an added bonus. However, the weather and the prices are fickle and the improved optimism must not be an excuse for not taking heed of this report and its recommendations, nor those of a strategic task force which focuses particularly on Upper Eyre Peninsula.

There is still a crisis in most country regions of South Australia. The prices, although better, in real terms are still not up to the prices in the past. When I married 28 years ago a bale of hay sold for about \$2; a bale of similar quality hay today would fetch only around the same price. In real terms this should now be at least \$14. As one farmer put it to me, 'We used to be considered the landed gentry and now we are more like peasant farmers.' One farm would often support two or more families with additional working men at the busy times.

Nowadays, the wife is often the labourer or is out earning additional money off the farm. Quite young children can be found driving equipment—not as we did, to help feed the sheep during the holidays, but as a serious part of the farm's survival. There are major stresses and strains on communities as football teams are reduced, as shops, schools, businesses and clubs are closed and as people move away. Also, there is the additional burden of Government workers being withdrawn as our Government copes with the huge State debt we inherited from the former Labor Government and, of course, along with the Government workers go their families. Often these people have become community leaders in sport or cultural pursuits. They have brought into these communities their knowledge and training gained from the cities. It is difficult for people who have not lived in small towns to appreciate the complexity of the social fabric and how interdependent everything is.

As illustrated by this report, urgent action is needed to address some of the disadvantages suffered by rural people before the deterioration goes any further. Country people realise that, due to the isolation and sparse population density, it is not economical to provide the same level of services, but there are alternative strategies that can be implemented: these need to be put in place.

It is obvious from the report that reducing access to Government services compounds the isolation factors for rural people considerably, and should be avoided where possible. I support the committee's recommendation that all Government departments, both State and Federal, should have toll-free telephone numbers for rural callers. It is noted that many individuals in the country have low incomes and that this is a significant deterrent to accessing Government services. Telephones will play an extremely important part in the future. I support the recommendation that telephone services for rural callers must then provide a level of service compatible with face-to-face services, and that Government personnel be multiskilled in being able to answer and respond to country issues appropriately, that is, with confidentiality, with knowledge and with empathy and understanding. There is no point in providing services if, as often happens, people are not aware of them. The updating of the *Country Book* and the promotion of the Country Link services and the *Rural Book* by the Commonwealth and primary industry departments have rightly been supported.

Many recommendations of the committee suggest that a different method of delivery of services will help, for example, in the area of education. Education is highly valued by rural people. The Eyre Peninsula has experienced a decrease in the offering of secondary school subjects over the past few years. A new model has been developed by officers of the Department for Education and Children's Services locally, and it is currently with the Minister.

The committee proposes a number of alternative ways in which more face-to-face delivery of subjects can be achieved by using state-of-the-art technology in distance education

delivery, thus providing a more equitable way for students on the Eyre Peninsula and across the rest of the State to be educated. Staffing levels need to be guaranteed for more than one year, enabling families to plan the courses for their students with the knowledge that the subjects are available over a greater period of time. Many parents, at great cost, decide to send their children to school in Adelaide to ensure they have the subjects of their choice. This is a great cost, not only to the parents but also to the community and needs to be avoided where possible. As it is, tertiary education is often available only in the city and many parents cannot afford to send their children. In both cases, parents often decide to move the whole family.

The Chairman of this inquiry comments on the lack of quantifiable data and the difficulty in defining exactly what is poverty in rural areas, or even what is 'rural' or 'country'. The job the committee took on was indeed mammoth. The primary production problems and the social problems, particularly relating to isolation and the effects on health and education services, would take years to analyse fully. I have touched on very few.

I support the proactive, differential treatment of rural communities that helps to ensure the social justice and more equitable access to services that is at the heart of many of the recommendations of the committee. Country areas are different and must be treated differently. Meanwhile, we will continue to seek increasing population and more profitability by diversifying, value adding and promoting new industries. I commend the committee on producing such an excellent report in such a short time with limited resources.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I commend the committee for this magnificent report. Although I have not read it in great detail, I am aware of its sentiments because I was involved with a lot of material that went into it, and I have taken great interest in it. As the member for Flinders said very capably, there is much poverty in our country areas—a lot that we do not know about. If any member of this House has any doubt about that, I could take them to some areas of my electorate, which I will not name here. In one particular area, members would be shocked at the conditions in which those rural people live. For example, there are often two or three families on one farm. These people do not complain for one minute. They just take it as their role in life, they are cheerful about it, but to see how they make a living and bring up a family in such conditions and on such an income is totally amazing. As I said, they do it cheerfully and without complaint.

As the member for Flinders said, there is a lot of optimism in our rural areas, particularly when they see works, particularly road building, in the district which they have not seen for many years. The member for Flinders referred to the road building works on Eyre Peninsula and, because I know how appalling those roads are, that is great to see. I am also very pleased to report that the Morgan to Burra road is under construction, and one could not put a price on the optimism and interest that that has created in the local area.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr VENNING: It is as important or more important than Barton Road. I appreciate that greatly. For 10 years there have been serious problems right across rural areas, and socialist Governments have chosen not to recognise or address those problems, but now that is happening. The political reality is that there are not any votes out there for the Labor Party: for the Liberal Party, it is a very strong blue

ribbon area. I pay this Government credit for putting its priorities where they ought to be, irrespective of politics. We do not spend money just in our marginal seats: we spend it where the need is, and that is certainly in the far flung areas of this State.

This is a very good report. It is very good reading and it will be a valuable tool for the Government in its continuing efforts to assist our rural people, our isolated people and our needy people in the outer areas. I commend the report to the Parliament.

Motion carried.

SOCCER TEAM

Mrs HALL (Coles): I move:

That this House congratulates the Australian Olympic soccer team, the Olyroos, on their outstanding performance in winning the Oceania Olympic qualifying tournament and wishes them success in their final challenge to represent Australia in the world's premier sporting event, the Olympic Games, to be held in Atlanta later this year.

In addition, I congratulate all those involved with the organisation of the recent soccer tournament and, in particular, members and commissioners of the South Australian Soccer Federation, in particular, the Chairman Charlie Caruso, and Tony Farrugia, Soccer Australia, and in particular Chairman David Hill, and the Oceania Football Confederation under the presidency of Charlie Dempsey. The Oceania olympic qualifying tournament is now completed and the magnificent Olyroos have taken another step on the road to Atlanta. To say that our Australian team towered above the competition is perhaps an understatement, although they did suffer a slight let down in the final match, losing to New Zealand.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mrs HALL: One-nil. I am pleased to be associated with soccer in this State, particularly and very proudly with my new job as soccer ambassador for South Australia. Some of my first duties included welcoming the teams and officials of Oceania to Adelaide, kicking a soccer ball in high heels and modelling a new promotional T-shirt for soccer with the slogan, 'It makes you feel good.'

Soccer certainly does make you feel good, and in particular the Olyroos make us feel good and, indeed, proud of their sporting achievements. I attended the Hindmarsh stadium on each of the 10 nights of the tournament and it was good to see the level of support given to soccer and to see the tournament itself attended by so many members of this Chamber. It was truly a celebration of soccer with the visiting teams of Fiji, New Zealand, the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu all displaying skill, courage, and sporting persistence in playing out their contests in fine spirit.

The Oceania group of nations are referred to in terms of world soccer as 'emerging'. What clearly did emerge was a demonstration of just how Australian soccer now dominates this region. Olyroo coach, Eddie Thomson, is a normally excitable chap, but it seemed that he was justifiably over the moon when describing the performance of some of our players. It is appropriate that we commend all of the Olyroo squad, as each of them did us proud. I will mention each of them by name.

The head of delegation was Peter Gray, coach Eddie Thomson, assistant coaches Les Schienflug and Raul Blanco, gear manager Nelson Delasio and physiotherapist Peter Georgilopoulos. The players include Frank Juric, Vinko

Buljubasic, captain Kevin Muscat, Mark Babic, Craig Moore, Peter Tsekinis, Joe Spiteri, Mark Viduka, Gabriel Mendez, Danny Tiatto, Goron Lozanovski, Ross Aloisi, Ante Milicic, Norman Tome, Luke Casserley, Richie Alagich, Clint Bolton, Paul Bilacopic and Joe Bacac.

In an often cynical society that at times fails to recognise success, it is appropriate to pay tribute and award accolades to the Olyroos and, as this is the South Australian Parliament, to give special attention to our own three national league stars: from Adelaide City Goran Lozanovski, with seven goals for the tournament, and three goals to the credit of Ross Aloisi and his team-mate, both from West Adelaide, who played with such distinction throughout the Oceania.

While we cannot claim both assistant coaches as being South Australian, Raul Blanco's State credentials are impeccable and Les Schienflug enjoyed his short time here in the mid-1980s and can certainly claim many old and new South Australian friends. It has long been a criticism of Australian soccer that our players cannot find the back of the net. This certainly was not the case during this qualifying tournament. The Olyroos scored 45 goals in eight matches with an average of 5.6 per game—quite an astonishing achievement. Only once were we held scoreless, and that was in the final match. Nevertheless, Australia had qualified because of its unassailable aggregate score, rendering the last match no real challenge as the game could make no difference to the outcome. The fact that the Olyroos were able to play the superior soccer they did was due, in part, to the weather bestowed upon us—it rained just once—but also because of the well-organised and fine-tuned condition of the pitch at Hindmarsh Stadium.

A well deserved accolade must go to the South Australian Soccer Federation under the leadership of Tony Farrugia for its skill and professionalism in this regard. I am sure that all of the visiting nations would be more than happy to return to Hindmarsh in their attempt to qualify for Sydney 2000. Of course, when they do they will find a stadium with a great number of new facilities, making it far more attractive for players and spectators alike. The project for a major redevelopment upgrade of the Hindmarsh Stadium to international standards is a clear demonstration of this Government's commitment to the South Australian soccer community and a recognition of the valuable contribution the sport of soccer—its players, sponsors, participants and supporters—give to this State. This carnival of soccer was set against the perfect background of Adelaide in summer time. As I said earlier, the weather gods proved that they are fans of the world game and the climate was ripe for celebration.

While the Olyroos have left town to further their Olympic aspirations, the players and officials of other nations left our city with memories that will endure. Their time in Adelaide allowed them to see what we are all about. A welcoming cocktail party, a day at the races, an afternoon watching the Test—Australia versus Sri Lanka—a cruise on *Popeye*, a visit to the zoo, an Aussie barbecue—complete with a selection of South Australian wines, a reception at Parliament House, and a Wednesday night at Heaven were all part of their itinerary—and, apart from the visit to Heaven on Wednesday night, my itinerary as well, although strictly in a working capacity.

There are many to be thanked for their support and hospitality, in particular the State Government, Premier Dean Brown, and Cuijeta Ahwan from the Department of Premier and Cabinet Protocol Branch; Tourism and Sport Minister Ingerson; Bill Spurr and Major Events for their 'Sensational Adelaide' sponsorship of the event; the Department of

Recreation and Sport; the Hindmarsh-Woodville Council; the Federal Government through the Institute of Sport; Senator Faulkner and Senator Bolkus; Barry Gibbs of the South Australian Cricket Association; the South Australian Police Academy, where four of the teams stayed; the Entertainment Centre; the many soccer volunteers and commissioners who took their holidays in order to make the event such a success; and the many sponsors of corporate Adelaide for their valuable dollars—and the list goes on.

One never really knows where these visits will lead. I refer to the goodwill all round, between players and officials: we have every right to be proud of their behaviour, which was exemplary, both on and off the pitch. No autograph hunter was turned away, no fans were cut short, and no discussion with children about the joys of soccer were refused. Australian and visitor alike made many new friends.

Some also had a keen eye for opportunity. The coach of one of the Pacific Island nations left Adelaide with suitcases filled with samples and brochures of South Australian wines. His fine palate led to him to believe that there was sales potential for him back home—and further export potential for our winemakers here.

The media performed a great service in publicising this tournament. The *Advertiser*, the *Sunday Mail*, Messenger newspapers, SBS, Channel 10 and other TV networks for their news coverage, radio stations 5AA, SAFM, 5EBI and 5RPH, in particular, did soccer and themselves proud with their promotion, support and coverage of this international event.

Soccer has yet to gain the column inches and minutes on air granted to other football codes, but there has been a genuine attempt to cater for the game's ever increasing number of supporters. As usual, the Adelaide crowds were enthusiastic and well behaved, although a little more sparse than organisers had hoped. Perhaps this was a by-product of the superiority of the Olyroos from the very first encounter; perhaps the length of the tournament was also a factor because it was conducted over a three week period.

Sports fans generally, and the fans of the international sport in particular, are no exception, having more of an appetite for a contest than they do for a one-sided outcome, and the goal margins probably kept some fans away. Those margins, let me say, masked the intriguing contests that did take place on the pitch. No individual or team ever gave up the ghost and, if anyone has ever gained the impression that this was a mere training run for the Olyroos, they are sorely mistaken. This is not to take any gloss away from the Australian team's performance. They did dominate their opponents and they were deserving of their wins.

What Now? Next they pit their skills against the second placed CONCACAF Confederation. That could be Mexico, Canada, Costa Rica or El Salvador, and our hearts go with them. These are the finest of our soccer youth. We have achieved justified success in the under-age competition around the globe, and it would be magnificent to see them fighting it out in Atlanta for Olympic gold. Make no mistake: soccer is improving every year in this nation, and we will soon be a major force in the world game.

While on the subject of the growth of Australian soccer, we must never forget where it all starts: kids at junior level—without them our youth, the Olyroos and the Socceroo squads could not exist. Therefore, it is imperative that funding for the development of the magnificent junior development programs, which prepare our young players of the future, is enhanced at a State level, so that we can continue to be proud

of the achievements on the world stage by young South Australians. I invite the House to endorse these sentiments and enthusiastically support this motion. I congratulate all those concerned with the sport of soccer.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): It is with some pleasure that I rise to second the motion put forward by the member for Coles. I will not speak very long on the matter, as she has certainly covered the subject matter amply and in great detail. On behalf of the State Opposition, I would also like to extend our congratulations to the Australian team. Our best wishes go with them with respect to what we hope will be their arrival in Atlanta and hopefully success later this year during the Olympics.

I want to spend a few moments also in praise of the organising committee with respect to the conduct of the Oceania Games at Hindmarsh. I refer to the hospitality that was extended to all teams by all South Australian citizens who came across them as well as the City of Hindmarsh and Woodville, the City of Adelaide, and, of course, the Premier, who held a reception for all the teams at Parliament House. In particular, I would like to extend our congratulations to Charlie Caruso and Tony Farrugia for the work they put in with respect to the tournament.

I would also like to pay tribute to the many hundreds of volunteers who helped in the organisation of the games. Without picking out any persons in particular, I spoke with a number of team liaison officers, football soccer supporters in South Australia, who gave up their time. In fact, a couple of them to whom I spoke at various functions are self-employed businessmen, but they took time away from their own business to accompany the teams to which they had been assigned to help them to familiarise themselves with South Australia and Adelaide in particular. That would have been at some cost to those individuals personally, both financially and in respect of time. Nonetheless, like a number of other great sporting organisations, there never seems to be an end to the supply of volunteers, who selflessly put themselves forward to assist their particular sport.

I would also like to pay tribute to the nations that competed against Australia. It would be fair to say that nobody expected Australia to lose to the teams it was competing against, but nonetheless the teams that competed against Australia—Vanuatu, Fiji, New Zealand and the Solomon Islands (and I hope I have not missed any)—all gave a solid effort, and they did their own countries very proud. We also must put the matter into context. Australia is developing a more professional approach to sport; for example, there has been the introduction of the Australian Institute of Sport, which came about only because of what was seen as a humiliation for Australia in the 1976 Olympics at Montreal. It was not really a humiliation; it was just that we were still practising the proper amateurism in this sport in the Olympics whereas we were competing against super nations such as the United States, the then Soviet Union and many of the Eastern Bloc nations where the athletes were effectively full-time professionals.

We developed our sporting prowess. We have become more professional about it, and these small countries we are competing against in Oceania do not have access to the same sorts of resources our players have. They also have to continue to try to eke out a living in their own nation, so it is very difficult for them in terms of resources. That is where Australia can play an important role, because a number of the officials to whom I spoke from those competing nations that

were in Adelaide at the time pointed out that Australia can play a very valuable role as a guiding light, as a mentor, to these nations in providing much valuable assistance not only in training and equipment but also in the training of coaches and the like so that those people will be able to develop further the professionalism and abilities of those nations, when they go back to their own country. I wish them well in that regard. It has also added considerably to the understanding of Australians for our South Pacific neighbours. It was no disgrace for those nations to have been defeated in this sport by a country such as Australia, given the sheer weight of our professionalism in this area compared to the resources available to those nations.

The Leader of the Opposition, who joins me in extending our best wishes to the Australian soccer team, has been a life-long supporter of the game. I cannot admit to being such a supporter myself. I enjoy watching sport—the World Cup, and the like—and I will be there supporting Australia if we get to the Olympics, as we all hope. I am more of an Australian rules football fan, but the Leader of the Opposition has been a life-long supporter of soccer and for many years has been a member of the Adelaide City soccer club in Adelaide and attends just about every one of its home matches in which it plays, and has done so for years. I understand the Premier is ticket holder No. 1 of Adelaide City, and he has been to one match—probably the one where he received ticket No. 1. Nonetheless, the Leader of the Opposition has been a committed Adelaide City fan for many years. He pays his ticket as Vice President of that club and attends every one of its home matches, and has done so for many years, and I am sure that is appreciated by the many thousands of ordinary supporters of Adelaide City who see him there year in, year out, rain, hail, sleet, whatever.

On behalf of the Opposition, I again extend our best wishes on Australia's performance to date. As the member for Coles has pointed out, there is a significant hurdle facing Australia yet before we get to Atlanta. I have no doubt that our players will give their very best and will do Australia proud, and I look forward, as I am sure all of us do, to seeing them compete in the Atlanta Olympics.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I support the motion. I congratulate the Australian Olympic soccer team on its outstanding performance in winning the Oceania Olympic Qualifying Tournament. I am a supporter of soccer: I believe that soccer is true football. I congratulate the member for Coles on her appointment as soccer ambassador. From her remarks, no-one can dispute her understanding of soccer, and no-one can doubt her commitment to and support for soccer in South Australia. A lot of effort went into organising the qualifying tournament that was played in Adelaide. I congratulate the Government, the Premier and the Minister for Tourism on having the foresight to promote soccer at this level. I wish the Australian Olympic soccer team well in its endeavours to get to Atlanta.

Soccer has come a long way. I remember quite clearly, when I was a teacher, taking charge of the soccer teams, and the students who played soccer were looked down upon compared to those who played Australian rules football. Happily, those days are gone, and there is now a broad range of sports from which people can choose, soccer now certainly considered as being one of the leading sports in Australia. It is no surprise, then, that this team got so far in this tournament and, hopefully, it will get even further in Atlanta.

I was fortunate enough to see some of the matches that were played and to see how strongly the Oceania group competed. As the Deputy Leader said, the soccer team should be congratulated on its efforts, particularly given the resources it has. It was an enjoyable and successful tournament. Indeed, the tournament put South Australia on the map not only in Australia but in the region, many of the matches being telecast overseas. For those reasons, the Government ought to be commended for staging the tournament. I hope that we can stage more competitions in the future, because they bring nothing but benefits for South Australia and Australia.

Motion carried.

CARNEVALE

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I move:

That this House congratulates the Coordinating Italian Committee, its President, Dr Tony Cocchiario, and all participating organisations on the success of the first Carnevale in Adelaide festival.

It gives me great pleasure to move this motion. I congratulate the Coordinating Italian Committee (CIC), its President, Dr Tony Cocchiario, and all participating organisations on the success of the first Carnevale in Adelaide festival. The Carnevale, held on 10 and 11 February at Adelaide Oval, had great significance, because it told us much about the success of multiculturalism. However, if we were to concentrate on those two days alone we would only be scratching the surface in terms of the effort, entertainment and cultural exchanges that took place in the preparations for the Carnevale festival.

The Carnevale was actually launched in Rundle Mall on 17 November, when hundreds of school children participated by singing and releasing balloons of goodwill to South Australia. It is estimated that from then to the weekend in question more than 50 000 people participated and contributed to the Carnevale atmosphere—a true celebration of multiculturalism. Multiculturalism is a two-way traffic. Indeed, it is not just a celebration of a particular group of Australians who, essentially in the early days, celebrated the fact of keeping together: we have now reached the stage where the celebrations have become an integral part of the country that has adopted these people. That is the stage that the Carnevale festival has reached, and the organisers ought to be commended for the work they have done to get it to this point. No doubt many members have seen the banners in King William Street and of course they would be aware of the contribution of the Adelaide City Council and the Lord Mayor, Henry Ninio. Many members also would be aware that on 26 January we had the Carnevale masked ball in the Adelaide Town Hall.

Indeed it is important to consider how far the Carnevale has progressed. We see the Carnevale itself as a season of mock, irreverent and joyous festivity, with its roots deep in the human psyche, taking us back to the heart and soul of many ancient civilisations, including Mayan, Hindu, Chinese, Egyptian, Greek, Roman and the many cults of pagan Europe. Over the centuries it has been incorporated into Christian traditions. Thus, the Eve of Samhain has become Halloween or All Saints Day, and similarly with pre-Lent celebrations. In Europe the ancient traditional festivals continue to take place. The Carnevale season culminates with the last day before Lent—the Mardi Gras, Martedì Grasso, Shrove Tuesday, Twelfth Night, Fasnacht and so on. Carnevale is still celebrated in Italy—in Rome, Venice, Viareggio and many other cities and towns—and we are all aware of the Carnevale in Rio, and so on. The Carnevale in Adelaide needs

people with imagination and the memory of other carnivals, who will hopefully develop a unique Carnevale.

I believe that this year has set the foundation for a unique Australian Carnevale, and it is pleasing to see that again South Australia has been one of the first. The Italian Consul, Dr Roberto Colamine, addressed the Carnevale, which was opened by the Premier and attended by dignitaries, including Federal members of Parliament. This speech by Dr Colamine is important, because it tells us much about the stage that the Carnevale has reached. He said:

I deem it right to draw your attention to this effort, and I think we all should pay a tribute to the Italian Coordinating Committee for the excellent achievement. There are also other reasons for me to be proud of being here as the representative of the Republic of Italy. If we look back on the history of this great event, we notice that it used to be called 'Italian Festival'. Now it is the 'Carnevale in Adelaide'.

The festival was conceived to show certain aspects of the Italian culture to the people of South Australia, and the Carnevale is the fulfilment of this task. I find in this change significant expression of the new feelings of those who have left Italy long ago; a new feeling toward their new country; a new feeling toward their new fellow nationals. There is not only an effort to keep alive the old tradition but the resolute will to share the most beautiful expressions of their traditional culture with all Australians.

I think that is very significant. Then he goes on to say:

Whatever your origin might be, whatever your background might be, I hope you all will appreciate such a precious gift by the Italian community.

Many members would be aware that the Carnevale started off as the Italian Festival, beginning in 1976 under the artistic direction of Ken Jamieson. As with the Fringe festival today, most of the events were self-funded and depended on community participation and support. It was a great success, and I commend the people who put that first festival together. There have been many festivals since. It was shifted to Norwood Oval, and year after year it gathered a great following, with groups from overseas coming to perform, expanding with the addition of art and craft. It has now reached the stage that it has come back to Adelaide and is held on Adelaide Oval, and that is of great significance.

As to my participation in the Carnevale festival, I was at the launch on 17 November and saw first-hand the enthusiasm by the many school children. It is important that, with community languages in the schools, we have a great opportunity to not only study the language but also the culture and to put language in perspective. Festivals like the Carnevale give us the opportunity to do that. Not everyone can afford to go overseas and practise the language and immerse themselves in the culture. In Australia, and particularly South Australia, you do not have to do that. We have it here in festivals such as the Carnevale, the Glendi and Dimitria.

I also attended the masked ball at the Adelaide Town Hall on 26 January and thoroughly enjoyed it. It was very entertaining to see all the costumes and to experience the fun atmosphere in which everyone participated. I recommend that members get into groups and have their particular costumes ready for the next one. I did not go dressed in Italian costume. I thought it would be appropriate, given that I come from that background, that I dress in another national costume, so I went as an Arab. It is an opportunity to participate in these events and to cherish and be proud of what we have achieved.

I also attended the Italian opera *La Bohème*, which was a great success, at the San Giorgio La Molar Club, Henry Street, Payneham. There were people from various backgrounds who enjoyed the opera. I also had the opportunity at the Campania Club to see Anima Mediterranea, a group from

Salerno. Anima Mediterranea means the soul of the Mediterranean. Again, that was something that I thoroughly enjoyed. In fact, my 82 year old mother who came with me also enjoyed it, as did some young people. It was a professional group which incorporated all the aspects of influences in the Mediterranean, and that is what it is all about. Italy is a multicultural country within itself. In the music one can detect Spanish, Arabic, French and other influences.

Italy is a boot. Over the centuries many people have worn that boot. We just have to look at its history. It is pleasing to see that that boot has been brought to Adelaide and is walking in King William Street and on the Adelaide Oval with all the traditions that it has gathered over the centuries. I look forward to the day when we can incorporate our uniqueness in these cultural aspects of our original inhabitants. For example, instead of having masks based on European characters, perhaps we could have some Australian symbols. Why not have masks based on the kangaroo, the koala, the wombat, and so on, which would be uniquely Australian? I think that would be a further step in incorporating in our uniqueness the success of multiculturalism and respect for our heritage and original tradition in Australia. That would please me immensely and I think it would put the Carnevale further on the map overseas, because people would say that Adelaide has a particular uniqueness.

I thoroughly enjoyed the Carnevale and it was pleasing to see so many people there. I say *grazie* and, in the original Ngaityo language, *yungandalya*—thank you. Given that the Ngaityo people of this area also used to celebrate—

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the member for Hartley's motion. I attended the Carnevale with my Deputy, the member for Ross Smith, the member for Taylor, Paolo Nocella, former member Mario Feleppa, Gail Gago, Nick Bolkus, David Abfalter and other members of the Labor Party at the weekend. In fact, I returned on the Sunday night to the Carnevale and was very impressed with the massive turnout at the Adelaide Oval. I pay a tribute to Tony Cocchiario and his organising committee members who have spent an enormous amount of time planning an outstanding festival which I think will grow and become a national event. It was a difficult decision, looking back over the years, remembering that Tony Cocchiario, Chris Sumner, Susie Roux and others started the former Italian Festival. I think the first one was held in about 1976 in Rundle Mall and eventually it moved to the Norwood Oval.

Whilst that was a very good location, there were significant problems with parking. There were also significant problems with the weather, its being held in October–November. I certainly attended one festival where it was not rained out, but they were having real problems with both the weather and the winds. At other times they had significant problems with being rained out.

They made two difficult decisions: first, to move the event to the city, and then to Adelaide Oval; and, secondly, to move it to a time of the year where at least there would be a much greater probability that the festival—later to become the Carnevale—would enjoy better weather. Unfortunately, the weather on Saturday was a bit cool. However, it picked up on Sunday and there was a massive turn out of people. One of the advantages of Adelaide Oval is that it is the best window into the city of Adelaide with excellent parking and outstanding public transport. I saw a number of people from my own

electorate in Salisbury—in fact, people originally from Calabria—who had come down by the train to attend the Carnevale. There were people from the western suburbs, southern suburbs and elsewhere.

It was an outstanding achievement. The standard of the stalls was very good. It was good to see so many Italian clubs and societies supporting the Carnevale, which made it such a success. The standard of the fashion show and the music—both classical music and rock music for the young people—was also of a very high standard. I am sure that, if the South Australian Cricket Association agrees after this trial to allow the Coordinating Italian Committee to hold the Carnevale each year at that site, it will grow and grow and become one of the great festivals of Australia.

Certainly, I was delighted to be able to go to Italy in late August and to talk with the Campanian regional government. I talked to the new Minister, Dottore Fasano, about getting the Campanian regional government to contribute to the Carnevale. I am delighted that occurred and it was very good to see such a prompt response. I particularly was delighted to see my good friend Presidente Alfonso Andria, who is the President of the Province of Salerno and who enjoys strong support in that area as a new administration. I spoke to him in late August. He is very keen to try to forge closer cultural and economic ties to make the *Gemellaggio* agreement work. I said to him, 'You would be able to show some tangible support for that if you could arrange for some cultural expression at the Carnevale by perhaps sending a group or exhibition and also a delegation.'

The day before the Carnevale, I received a letter dated 3 February—it had taken some time to get here—from the President of the Province of Salerno. The letter, which was addressed to me, said:

Our meeting in Salerno was the beginning of a number of proposed initiatives for cooperation, and today the idea formulated on that occasion to provide a presence from our province at Adelaide's Carnevale has become a reality.

Personally I am delighted that this has happened; I have always believed in the value of such initiatives right from the start, and I have involved our chamber of commerce, our tourist department and employers organisations, in order to project an image of our province as complete as possible.

Regrettably my institutional commitments and in particular the start of a delicate stage of the beginning of the year for local government organisations prevent me, as I had wished, to attend. I hope that you will accept my apology as well as my best wishes and gratitude for what you have done and what you will do in order to ensure the continuation of our promotional initiatives. I wish to convey similar feelings of gratitude to Paolo Nocella, John di Fede, Dr Cocchiario and Mr Bamonte and all those who have helped in order to assist in the success of the visit by the Salerno delegation.

Our delegation represents both the private and public sector through the presence of Mr Geraldo Padula who is the head of the delegation and represents me; Mrs Laura Cerabona from the association of hoteliers and Mr Roberto Scarano representing the association of travel agents and tour operators. All is left for me to wish every success for the Carnevale, and in the hope that this will be the first of many initiatives that can reinforce the ties of friendship and solidarity which already exist. Please accept. . . my best wishes and I look forward to seeing you soon.

The letter is signed by Alfonso Andria. I was also pleased to be able to write to the head of the regional government of Campania. I am pleased that both organisations came good with support, and I am sure that that support will grow. People were given an outstanding reception. It was also pleasing to see visitors from Emilia-Romagna. I was delighted that Salerno contributed an outstanding collection of pulcinella—essentially a cultural display of masks—which

featured in the city. That collection was a major contribution to the Carnevale and added a real historical focus.

Carnevale goes back over many hundreds of years. It was a time when masters became servants and servants became masters; it was about turning over the order of things for one day. Paolo Nocella and I attended the Carnevale masked ball, which was an outstanding success, and other cultural activities were equally outstanding. It is now important for us all, in a bipartisan way, to continue to support Tony Cocchiario, the committee, the Coordinating Italian Committee and the clubs to build on the success of this year and to look forward to next year. Carnevale certainly has my strong support. I will be writing again to the Salerno administration and to the regional government encouraging those future ties and commitments.

The people of Salerno want to see festivals of Salerno held in different cities around the world. There has been talk of conducting a festival in China, one on the southern coast of the United States (I think in the State of Georgia), and also one in Adelaide. People have some ambitious ideas. I have suggested that it would be marvellous to arrange a soccer exchange with the Salerno team—which is in series B, along with Avellino—at the time of the Carnevale to play against a team such as Adelaide City. I am sure the member for Coles would strongly support that idea. I believe there would be enormous interest in such an exchange on alternate years or every few years, and people could travel to each centre.

We have a real chance, through the Carnevale, to make a success in a whole range of areas, both in terms of tourism, trade and cultural exchanges that will benefit both regions. I congratulate Tony Cocchiario and his team on an outstanding job. It was the first Carnevale to be held in the city—the first of many to come. It deserves our total and undivided bipartisan support.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I would like to say a few brief words in strong support of this motion by the member for Hartley. I congratulate the whole Italian community, and particularly the Coordinating Italian Committee, on this wonderful festival, Carnevale, and I pay tribute to not only the people involved in the festival but the contribution made by members who have come here from Italy or whose origins are strongly linked to that exciting country. I remember as a youngster growing up in what was a fairly Anglo-Centric type environment in the Adelaide Hills and, whenever anything negative was said about people of Italian extraction, my late mother would always use the example of the Rossini family, who migrated to South Australia in the late 1800s, and she would say what a wonderful and helpful family they had been to our family.

The reason I mention that is that we often focus on people who have migrated here in recent times and overlook the fact that many people, who have inherited an Italian or Greek cultural background, have forefathers and other members of their family who migrated here many years ago, including during the last century. We have a much more enriched culture as a result of that, and Carnevale is another example of how we all benefit from what is and will continue to be a rich tradition of sharing these cultural aspects with all South Australians.

I do not want to steal the thunder of the Premier and Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs because hopefully he will get an opportunity to say a few words in Parliament about this wonderful festival, but I am sure that

he was delighted to be present and to be part of the activities. I wish the festival well and congratulate Dr Tony Cocchiario, with whom I worked on tertiary multicultural educational activities, the coordinating Italian committee and the whole Italian community in South Australia on a wonderful contribution to our society and way of life.

Mrs HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUSTUDY

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I move:

That this House condemns the Federal Government for the lack of equity in the Austudy allowance provisions for country students. Evidence from the Department of Primary Industries and Energy and DEET confirms that 4 500 students from farming families are currently excluded from gaining Austudy benefits because of the assets test. Many of these families are asset rich yet income poor. Often this is a result of servicing debt. The rural poverty inquiry report, which has been tabled by the Social Development Committee of this Parliament, confirms that fact. My own level of inquiry also confirms that many farmers have a high level of asset yet are very income deficient.

I am sure that not being eligible for Austudy contributes to the low participation and retention rate of students from rural areas in comparison with the rest of the Australian community. The decrease in population in rural areas will compound the problems of Governments providing a fair education system for rural areas, therefore many more country students will need to leave their small communities at a younger age to seek education options in bigger cities. I know from first-hand experience, having had to leave my small home town of Lock at the age of 12 to go to the Bush Church Aid Hostel at Port Lincoln to obtain my secondary education, and then on to stay with the Women's Christian Temperance Union here in Adelaide to obtain tertiary education, what a trauma this is for families and what a drain it is on finances. Freeing up the assets test for rural students will assist in addressing the disadvantages suffered by rural people, especially when compared with their metropolitan counterparts.

Let us also look at the differences between city and country students, even when the rural student has been able to access Austudy. One is a metropolitan student whose parents have a low asset base and an income under that required to qualify for assistance. This student boards at home and walks, rides a pushbike or has access to subsidised bus services from home to the education source, be it university, college or high school. The Austudy benefits can be used by this student for entertainment purposes, for clothes or for casual spending. Let us look at a similar situation for a rural student whose parents are suffering a serious decline in income and somehow have a low enough asset level to enable their student child to qualify for assistance. The rural student living away from home must find and pay for his or her own accommodation. This usually requires more than the assistance provided by the Austudy benefits, leaving the struggling rural family to pay for any entertainment, clothes and spending, such as the student coming home for holidays. Another option is for the rural student to take a part-time job, which tragically eats into study and lesson time.

These are the lucky ones who have been able to receive Austudy. There are many who just cannot fulfil their potential because they cannot afford to go at all. We then have basic

inequalities, which sadly follow these rural students all their learning years, such as limited subject choices and often a high turnover of teachers. The asset test takes into account personal, overseas, farm and/or business assets and does not include the principal family home. A 50 per cent discount applies to net business or farm assets. Austudy is not payable if total family assets are above \$369 350. Many farms are now worth in the \$1 million range. With commitments to be made for moderate borrowings, many farmers in my electorate have negative incomes. It is no wonder we are experiencing a drift from rural areas to the city as rural families make decisions to leave the land and move to larger centres. They are prepared to make these extra sacrifices for their children's future.

Education is highly valued by rural people and studies have shown that they are also prepared to put their own businesses further into debt so that they can provide a higher education for their children. Not just the student but also the money goes to the city. Hundreds of thousands of dollars drain into the city to pay for accommodation, travel, clothes, books and so on. Also the teachers and subject options go from the country as insufficient students are available to warrant certain subjects or teacher numbers. School buses stop and schools close. Droughts, low commodity prices, high interest rates and depopulation of rural areas have all been additional problems for rural families. Lifting the assets requirement is a very small price to pay to provide justice for rural young people and to assist the survival of the small towns.

It is amazing that Labor members of a Senate standing committee on rural and regional affairs, which conducted an inquiry into 'The Impact of Assets Tests on Farming Families' Access to Social Security Payments and Austudy' in March last year, found:

The original reasons for the introduction of the Austudy assets test remain valid and therefore we disagree with the committee's recommendations that the farm assets be excluded from the Austudy assets test.

It is another example of how out of touch with regional Australia is the Labor Government. The recommendation of the poverty inquiry and now the policy of the Federal Coalition is to increase the threshold of allowable assets from 50 per cent to 75 per cent—a much fairer level. I call on this House to back a call to the Federal Labor Government seeking a commitment to lift the restrictive requirements of the assets test so that rural students have fairer access to Austudy benefits.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

FORESTS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. H. Allison:

That this House is of the opinion that, with the objective of protecting the long-term socioeconomic interests of South Australia with respect to forest production and timber processing, the Government must retain control over the annual rate of cutting timber and of the age and location of timber when felled and must not sell broadacres of forestry holdings in the South-East.

(Continued from 8 February. Page 945.)

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

Leave out all the words after the word 'retain' and insert in lieu thereof the following words 'ownership, management and control of South Australia's State owned forests'.

If the amended resolution were to be carried it would read:

That this House is of the opinion that, with the objective of protecting the long-term socioeconomic interests of South Australia with respect to forest production and timber processing, the Government must retain ownership, management and control of South Australia's State owned forests'.

I move this amendment after having carefully considered the views that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, made known with respect to your own motion. The difficulty I had with the motion as printed was that it still leaves it open for the privatisation of the management and control of the State's forests because, whilst the original motion proposed that it was the opinion of the House that the Government must not sell broad acres of forestry holding in the South-East, that would not prevent the privatisation of the harvesting of the timber.

Your motion, Sir, refers only to the land on which that timber grows. The value of the forest is not the land itself, but it is the timber—the trees—that have grown for 40 years or more under State ownership. My concern with the motion that you have moved is that it allows a loophole for this Government to say, 'We are not privatising the State's forests. We will continue to own the land, but we will privatise the harvesting of the trees.' The Government could hand over to a private monopoly the sole rights to harvest the forests and to sell them if it can, to use the trees themselves exclusively for manufacturing or, in a private monopoly, to determine for themselves which of its competitors in the manufacturing stakes could have access to those trees and at what price.

Also, your motion, Sir, does not effectively ensure that the administration and management of the State's forests are retained in the hands of the State Government. As you would know only too well—as do other members of this House—we have a State Government which is exceptionally keen to privatise the management and control of a whole range of the State's assets. I quote the well-known example, of course, of the water supply and sewerage system. The Minister for Infrastructure says, 'We have not privatised it,' but the management and control of those assets are in the stewardship of a foreign owned monopoly.

The computer and information technology systems operated by the State Government have been outsourced and the management and control have been given to a private American company. Of course, we in the Labor Party have strenuously opposed the privatisation efforts of the Government.

In relation to the State's forests, many Government members outside the House—I think perhaps even you, Sir—share the same views as the Labor Party on this issue. Even if you disagree with us on water, EDS and the like, I think that you, Sir, and the member for MacKillop—because so many of the State's forests are in your electorates—would agree with the Opposition that the State's forests are too important to hand over *carte blanche* to a private monopoly.

Through questions in this House, we know that an American company has actually established an office in Adelaide and has expressed an interest in Forwood Products. I do not think any of us in this House believe that a company from overseas would specifically set up an office in South Australia simply to look at purchasing Forwood Products on its own.

The overseas companies that put in a bid for our water supply established offices here, because obviously putting together a bid for the management and control of our water supplies would be somewhat time-consuming and involve a

considerable amount of resources. I do not believe that this American company or any other company would come to Adelaide and set up an office just to buy Forwood Products. Forwood Products is not such a huge business that it would require a multi-national company to set up a purpose-built administrative block in Adelaide to negotiate the purchase of Forwood Products on its own.

Clearly, as that company has established itself in South Australia, it has its eyes set on more than Forwood Products: I suggest that it has its eyes set firmly on our State's forests. This company does not care about buying broad acres, the land itself; it is interested in having the exclusive harvesting rights of these forests, because that is where the value of the forests lies: in the trees, not in the land itself.

You, Sir, will have noted certain significant changes to the language that the Premier has used regarding this issue over the past few months. At one stage, in answer to a question by me on 13 November last year, the Premier stated quite categorically that there would be no sale of the State's forests. We now see—and it has been reported in the local print media, in your region, Sir—that the Government and the Premier use language such as 'the sale of the forest land'—not 'forests' full stop but 'sale of the forest land'. That has been stated in a number of the press releases in the various print media both here in Adelaide but more particularly in the South-East.

To say the very least, the Opposition is very suspicious of this Government when it tries to skirt around the basic issue of ownership of the State's forests. I take you back to your motion, Mr Deputy Speaker, and read out your words again. What your motion states—and I agree with much of what you have had to say on this issue—is as follows:

That this House is of the opinion that, with the objective of protecting the long-term socioeconomic interests of South Australia with respect to forest production and timber processing, the Government must retain control over the annual rate of cutting timber and of the age and location of timber when felled and must not sell broad acres of forestry holdings in the South-East.

Your motion, Sir, would still allow the private sale of the harvesting rights of our State's forests, because you refer to the fact that the Government cannot 'sell broad acres of forestry holdings'.

The Premier has already said that he will not sell the forest land, but he makes no reference to the product that is on top of it. Whilst under your motion, Sir, the Government might have control of the annual rate of cutting timber and of the age and location of timber when felled, that is more an administrative matter. It is, if you like, a bit like SA Water supposedly retaining control over pricing regulations and certain other regulatory authorities of the supply of water and sewerage. However, the fundamental principle would still allow this Government, if it could do so, to find a purchaser—and there would appear to be at least one circling Adelaide—and sell privately the harvesting rights of the timber, and it would allow that private monopoly to determine what, if any, amount of that timber should be sold to other milling operations in both the South-East and elsewhere in South Australia.

The Opposition is abundantly cautious about the Government and its motives in this area, but we believe they are well justified, given the Government's handling of privatisation in general. We also know that Executive Government is virtually unfettered in its powers to enter into contracts and is subject to very little scrutiny. One can ask as many questions as one likes this in this House, but apparently it is

okay for a Minister to choose not to answer the substance of a question. Given the Party numbers in this House, 36:11, on strict Party-political lines there is no way in which the Executive Government can effectively be held accountable for its actions, because only the Executive Government knows what is contained within the water contract, the EDS contract or any contract into which the Government enters.

There is always the cry of commercial confidentiality. Select committees of another House of this Parliament cannot obtain documentation because of the cry of commercial confidentiality. If ordinary citizens and members of this House, including the Leader of the Opposition, under the freedom of information legislation cannot even access the results of an opinion poll on the water privatisation issue carried out for SA Water at taxpayers' expense and if Cabinet can then declare it a State secret and, therefore, avoid the freedom of information legislation and the State Ombudsman, these are serious issues. It comes back to the point I was making last night. In his report last year, the Auditor-General expressed his concern that there was inadequate parliamentary scrutiny of the sale of the State's assets and that no mechanism was in place to ensure that Executive Government was properly scrutinised by Parliament. This is why the Opposition has moved its amendment. We want it made crystal clear to Executive Government that it is not to sell the management or control of our State's forests, whether it be in relation to the land or the harvesting rights of the trees.

On that basis alone and since we make it crystal clear where we stand on this issue, I would have thought that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and the member for MacKillop would be only happy to join us and support our amendment. I am very conscious that the citizens in your electorate, Sir, in the South-East support the retention of the State's forests in State Government hands for all the reasons I have pointed out. The carrying of our amendment would make crystal clear to the Executive Government what this House says it can and cannot do with our State's forests. There is no ambiguity or smart lawyer legalese so that they can somehow worm their way out and say, 'We're not selling the land but the trees that grow on top of it.' We make it clear in our amendment precisely what we mean and we urge you, Mr Deputy Speaker, to support it.

Mr BROKENSHIRE secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION RESOURCES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Clarke:

That this House condemn—

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

(Continued from 8 February. Page 949.)

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I have listened with interest over the past few months to the

debate that has taken place off and on with respect to this matter. It is regrettable that only one member of the Government spoke to this motion. I may have missed other contributions, and if I did I apologise in advance for any error. To my knowledge, only one Government member spoke to this motion, and that struck me as fairly odd. Since this Government took office, the Minister for Education and Children's Services has progressively announced cutbacks with respect to school service officers and teachers. As a result, many members, particularly those in marginal seats, would have received representations from their local branches of the Institute of Teachers and, more importantly, from a local member's point of view, from their school councils.

These groups would have pointed out the deleterious effects such cutbacks are having on the education of their children—our future. Those local members would have written to the Minister and expressed sympathy with the parents. The local members would have wrung their hands and said, 'Isn't it all dreadful; I will take it up very strongly with the Minister; I will take it up in the Party room; I will take it up in the Parliament; I want to demonstrate to you that I am a good local member supporting your interest.' What did we find? This motion is a perfect vehicle for backbenchers in marginal seats to say that they support the Opposition with respect to cutbacks in education. This is where the acid test applies, because there will be a vote and a division on this matter. All Government members who wrote to their constituents in the past and said, 'Isn't it a shocking thing; I am doing the very best I can to restore school services' will probably, under Liberal Party direction and in support of their Executive Government, cross the floor against this motion. That is not good enough.

I would have more time for the local members concerned had they said outright to their constituents, 'This is a decision of the Government and that's it. I can do no more; I will just have to cop my share of the blame.' To put themselves forward when talking to their school councils and school chairpersons and say, 'I am on your side' and then hope it will all blow away, shows how they operate. When they have an opportunity to support a resolution condemning the Government for its cut-back in education in this State, they go to water—and in silence, without even getting up in this House and explaining their position as to why, by voting against this resolution, they are prepared to support the cutbacks in education.

Many members would already know that in effect a new tax has been applied to parents in schools, by way of increased school fees in public schools to try to cover the shortfall in State Government funding in what is supposed to be a free education system in South Australia. Some schools have even applied service fees to make up the wage costs of school services officers. That is an absolute disgrace because, where more families work, those schools will have a better opportunity than other State schools to hire school services officers. That is not appropriate in what is supposed to be free education and equity of access for all students, irrespective of their background or the income of their respective families. This is about creating a two-tiered system of education in this State.

The House divided on the motion:

AYES (11)

Atkinson, M. J.	Blevins, F. T.
Clarke, R. D. (teller)	De Laine, M. R.
Foley, K. O.	Geraghty, R. K.
Hurley, A. K.	Rann, M. D.

AYES (cont.)

Rosenberg, L. Stevens, L.
White, P. L.

NOES (24)

Allison, H. Andrew, K. A.
Armitage, M. H. Ashenden, E. S.
Baker, D. S. Baker, S. J.
Bass, R. P. Brindal, M. K.
Brokenshire, R. L. Caudell, C. J.
Hall, J. L. Ingerson, G. A.
Kerin, R. G. Leggett, S. R.
Lewis, I. P. Matthew, W. A.
Meier, E. J. (teller) Oswald, J. K. G.
Penfold, E. M. Rossi, J. P.
Scalzi, G. Such, R. B.
Venning, I. H. Wotton, D. C.

PAIRS

Quirke, J. A. Becker, H.

Majority of 13 for the Noes.
Motion thus negatived.

[Sitting suspended from 12.29 to 2 p.m.]

GAMING MACHINES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTION

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*:

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OUTSOURCING

In reply to **Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens)** 28 September 1995.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The Minister for Education and Children's Services has advised that the Government has rejected a proposal by SERCO to privatise aspects of administrative support in schools. This decision was taken on the basis of advice prepared by a Department for Education and Children's Services working party which included representatives of the principals' associations.

Schools are constantly seeking ways to achieve value for money and savings so that funds within school budgets can be reallocated to other student and educational needs. Accordingly, schools purchase goods and services for such things as curriculum materials, printing and grounds maintenance, from outside parties.

Services purchased from outside parties by schools come from school funds. Schools receive funds from grants, parents contributions and various fund raising activities.

As indicated previously, schools are constantly seeking better ways to deliver education with available funds and accordingly purchase goods and services from outside parties where this is cost effective. Funding to schools through school support grants has not been reduced.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Commissioner for Equal Opportunity—Report, 1994-95.

By the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations (Hon. E.S. Ashenden)—

Corporation of West Torrens—By-laws—

- No. 1—Permits and Penalties.
- No. 2—Moveable Signs.
- No. 3—Council Land.

No. 4—Inflammable Undergrowth.

No. 5—Animals and Birds.

No. 6—Bees.

No. 7—Dogs.

No. 8—Lodging Houses.

No. 9—Garbage Disposal.

No. 10—Caravans.

District Council—By-laws—

Mallala—No. 2—Moveable Signs.

Mount Baker—

No. 2—Permits and Penalties.

No. 3—Moveable Signs.

No. 4—Taxis.

No. 5—Keeping of Dogs.

No. 6—Vehicle Movement.

No. 7—Streets.

No. 8—Parklands.

No. 9—Caravans and Camping.

No. 10—Licensing of Horse and Animal Drawn Vehicles.

No. 11—Keeping of Poultry.

No. 12—Street Traders.

No. 13—STED Scheme.

No. 14—Bees.

No. 15—Keeping of Animals.

Port MacDonnell—No. 5—Creatures.

ALDINGA TREATMENT PLANT

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Infrastructure):

I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The board of SA Water has chosen Environmental Management and Rehabilitation Services Pty Ltd as the preferred bidder to build, own and operate a new waste water treatment plant to serve the Aldinga Beach and Port Willunga area for the next 25 years. SA Water will now commence detailed negotiations with EMRS, which is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Henry Walker Group Ltd, one of Australia's largest infrastructure development companies. Construction will commence later this year, and the new plant will be commissioned in 1997. It will have the capacity to serve a population of 7 500 people.

Currently, waste water from the 1 100 residents of Aldinga Beach and Port Willunga is collected and then transported by road tankers to the Christies Beach Treatment Plant. This arrangement is costly and does not allow for any further growth in the area. The new treatment plant will save taxpayers money and protect the environment by turning waste into a productive resource. All waste water treated at Aldinga will be reused for irrigation. For the first few years of operation, EMRS has proposed an arrangement with a local vineyard development company to use all recycled water from the plant. As the population in the area increases, recycled water will be available to irrigate up to about 150 hectares of vines and other crops. As with the water filtration plants and the Bolivar-Virginia pipeline scheme, a partnership between the State Government and the private sector again gives South Australians better services sooner and more cheaply.

HEARTSMART EGGS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Minister for Primary Industries): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I seek to correct a mis-perception which may have been created in this morning's press

about HeartSmart eggs. I refer to claims that there are concerns about the labelling of HeartSmart eggs and moves by the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission to intervene. Having this morning held talks with producers, I am concerned that they and their product have been harshly treated over this issue, and that a series of responsible actions on their part have been ignored.

By way of background, the HeartSmart egg is produced under licence in Queensland, Victoria, Tasmania and South Australia by feeding hens a unique diet of natural ingredients rich in Omega 3 and vitamin E. The owner and licence holder of the HeartSmart trademark is the Agricultural Business Research Institute, based at the University of New England in New South Wales. Recent tests in the Australian Government Analytical Laboratory have shown that HeartSmart eggs have an 800 per cent enrichment in Omega 3 over normal eggs.

Australia's award winning HeartSmart egg is undergoing trials in South Africa and Europe prior to introduction into those markets. In October 1995 it won the national food award in New Zealand in the meat, poultry and fish class. Strong inquiry has been received from North America. Of greatest significance is that around 50 per cent of the Omega 3 fatty acids in HeartSmart eggs are in the form of EPA and DHA. These two fatty acids are known to help the risk of heart attack and are found mainly in oily fish. For those who do not like oily fish or who do not eat it regularly, it is claimed that HeartSmart eggs provide a delicious alternative which is rich in Omega 3.

The HeartSmart egg producers are working with Government to establish better guidelines and protocols for the infant Omega 3 egg industry. Part of this work is to establish standard laboratory protocols for testing of eggs for Omega 3 content. The inclusion of Omega 3 enriched foods in diets has become an important focus of health conscious people. However, a moderate approach to diet, including the consumption of Omega 3 rich foods, would seem to be the most prudent view. The HeartSmart producers have been in constant touch with the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission about possible breaches of sections 52 and 53 of the Trade Practices Act, and indeed claim to have initiated many of the discussions.

The producers have agreed on standards to test the Omega 3 fatty acid contents of eggs and publish only the results of tests in accordance with that standard. The testing procedure has been recommended by Professor Andrew Sinclair from the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology after being approached by HeartSmart producers to formulate testing procedures. These procedures have now been accepted by the ACCC as standard. Indeed, the Federal Attorney-General's office has given support to the testing procedures, and I quote from a letter dated 9 February 1996 sent by the Australian Government Solicitor to the producers:

We now accept in an unqualified way, the appropriateness of the sampling, analysis and interlaboratory proficiency procedures. Specifically, we now accept Professor Sinclair as the person to perform the interlaboratory procedure.

Also, as part of the negotiations with the ACCC, the HeartSmart parties have addressed a list of nine concerns about the content in promotional material and labels. The ACCC has asked the HeartSmart producers to sign an undertaking under section 87B listing a series of constraints on promotional material. The producers have negotiated at length with the ACCC and informed me this morning that they are prepared to sign the undertaking, but only after a

series of typing, grammatical errors and omissions are amended.

I have seen the copy of the ACCC document and I believe it does contain several typing and grammatical errors. For instance, it jumps from section 3 to 5. Producers rightly asked, 'What happened to section 4?' It appears that the ACCC is taking action against the producers for not signing a document which is flawed. I urge the ACCC to get back around the table and talk to the HeartSmart egg producers and solve this issue. These producers are willing to cooperate on this vital issue and are unhappy about the bad press which is being given to part of an industry and which has the well-being of consumers at heart. My investigations have given me a level of satisfaction that producers have acted in good faith and it is very unfortunate that the egg industry has received what I believe to be unfair publicity.

EDMUND WRIGHT HOUSE

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development): I table a ministerial statement made by my colleague the Minister for Transport in another place in relation to Edmund Wright House and the National Museum.

QUESTION TIME

GARIBALDI SMALLGOODS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Health advise what progress has been made in launching prosecutions against Garibaldi for the fatal HUS outbreak of more than a year ago? The Garibaldi HUS outbreak occurred over 13 months ago, and on 10 February last year the Minister for Health said that he had instructed the Health Commission to 'prepare the way for every prosecution possible'. It is now 12 months since that statement and four months since the Coroner's report was handed down. On 14 November last year the Minister for Emergency Services said that he would obtain a report for the House on this matter.

At a public function at the weekend I was confronted and abused by a former executive of Garibaldi and others connected with the Garibaldi company for pursuing this issue in Parliament and was accused of damaging their business. I reminded these people of the death of Nikki Robinson and of the continuing plight of other victims and their families and said that the Opposition would pursue the matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is aware—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition for the first time. The Chair will take other action because the Leader has defied previous rulings of the Chair. The Minister for Health.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: As the Leader of the Opposition knows quite well, the time frame for action in areas under the aegis of the Health Commission was unfortunately taken because of the Coroner's inquest. He also knows full well that the matters at present under investigation are not under the aegis of the Minister for Health. However, I shall get a report and bring it back.

HEALTH INDUSTRY DIRECTORY

Mr WADE (Elder): Will the Premier advise what initiatives the Government is taking to help companies in the health industry to develop products and, in particular, to develop products with export potential?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Government has an objective to ensure that we achieve a very substantial export industry out of our health industry here in South Australia. With the full cooperation of my colleagues—the Minister for Health and the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development—I launched this morning a major directory which lists over 100 South Australian companies that have major products to launch on the export market. These companies so far have achieved exports of about \$90 million from South Australia. The clear evidence is that over the next five years we can lift that \$90 million by at least three times that amount. In fact, the most conservative estimate is that we will take it to over \$200 million and, quite possibly, to \$300 million.

A substantial gain has already been achieved from a number of these companies—companies like Fauldings, a household name in South Australia and based in this State. It has achieved enormous recognition and product penetration into the United States and other world markets. South Australia has always had some very good medical technology. Florey, a South Australian, developed penicillin, which has now had an impact on virtually every person throughout the world. We have Basil Hetzel, our present Lieutenant-Governor, who identified the iodine deficiency which impacts on 40 million people around the world and has certainly improved their lifestyle as a result. This morning I launched this major directory. I also launched a video produced by the South Australian Development Council.

I congratulate the people who have been involved from the South Australian Centre for Manufacturing, the South Australian Development Council and the South Australian Health Commission for putting together such a substantial package so that we can achieve our objective of substantial exports of South Australian manufactured goods and technology and, in doing so, literally create hundreds of new jobs for South Australians.

UNITED WATER

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Minister for Infrastructure plan to leave for Britain and France after the Federal election for talks with water companies; and, if so, will he ask United Water's French parent company, CGE, for a report on corruption charges against the company, its subsidiaries and its Chairman, given the Minister's previous assurance that the *bona fides* of bidders for the water contract would be taken into account in the selection process and CGE's assurance to me in late August (five months ago) that the company would be happy to provide a report on charges and corruption allegations concerning its executives?

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to whoever made that comment that it is unnecessary and unwise.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Leader of the Opposition canvassed that issue with representatives of the company in his office only two weeks ago.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I will get onto that. So, I am sure that the Leader has the answer—he is simply putting another issue on the agenda for today.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I will be going to the United Kingdom in the first week of March for, I think, approximately 10 days at the invitation of the United Kingdom Government, which will pay my airfare and accommodation. The British Foreign Office has arranged my program whilst in the UK. That program will include having meetings—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wants the call at Question Time and wants to remain in the Chamber, he can take this as a first warning.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The British Foreign Office at its expense has put together a program for my visit to the United Kingdom which will, naturally, include meetings with water companies because of the contract that we have put in place. It will also include looking at the electricity market and power generators in the United Kingdom.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I don't know how many times I have to say this, but I will say it again: there is no power station for sale in South Australia and there will not be. One of the things I will look at in the United Kingdom is a power utility that is a vertically integrated structure, which is the same as ETSA has, which is able to participate in the national electricity market in order to perhaps reaffirm the view by some that there is no need for any disaggregation in ETSA in South Australia. That destroys the accusation which members opposite were trying to put on the agenda regarding my visit to the United Kingdom.

In addition, I will look at and speak with people related to the Manchester Airport regarding the operation and upgrading of airports, which we want to see. Given the agenda in Australia for private involvement in the operation of airports, we want to ensure that we put South Australia in a good position. We have already pursued with both Ansett and QANTAS the capacity to upgrade our international and domestic terminals. In addition, the Minister for Transport and the Premier have pursued vigorously the extension of the runway to ensure that we have an airport of international standard.

I will also meet with defence related companies, such as Westland Helicopters, GEC Marconi and a range of others—they do not all come to mind off the top of my head. I was pleased to receive the invitation from the British Government to visit the United Kingdom. I readily accepted that invitation, because it will provide me with the opportunity to have a range of meetings. I will also meet with the International Advisory Board (European Division) of the MFP whilst overseas. In other words, it will be a packed program of eight to 10 days involving issues related and of importance to South Australia in the future.

STATE BANK

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): My question is directed to the Premier. Does the Government share the Opposition's disappointment over yesterday's settlement of the first civil court case in the Supreme Court arising from the collapse of the former State Bank?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I read in the paper this morning the comment by the member for Spence, who said

that the outcome of the action by the State Government against the former directors of the State Bank of South Australia was disappointing. Of course, we would all agree that we would like to see a greater settlement. He went on to say that he was sure that South Australians can do their sums. What a pity that the former Labor Government could not do its sums. What a pity that those Ministers—including the now Leader of the Opposition—who sat around the Cabinet table at the time that the State Bank lost \$3 100 million of our money did not take a greater interest in what was going on in the bank. I remind the House, once again, what the present Leader of the Opposition, as a responsible member of this Parliament, had to say about Mr Marcus Clark, regarding whom we are taking action at present. He said (*Hansard*, 13 April 1989):

No-one of significance in the Australian community would not acknowledge that the success of the new bank is, in a large part, due to the brilliance of its managing director, Tim Marcus Clark.

The Leader of the Opposition—and that is why he is now in opposition—further said:

His appointment in February 1984 was a major coup that stunned the Australian banking world.

He also said about Mr Marcus Clark:

It was a major coup for this State.

That is interesting, because in his report Royal Commissioner Jacobs specifically picked up the quote by the Leader of the Opposition. He had this to say—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I remind the Leader of the Opposition what the royal commissioner had to say about his speech to this Parliament on 13 April:

The member of Parliament who proposed the motion—

the now Leader of the Opposition—

condemning the Opposition for attacking the bank spoke in glowing terms of the bank's role and performance, so praiseworthy indeed as perhaps to cause the State Bank Centre to blush to a deeper shade of pink.

Just as the Leader of the Opposition is now blushing a somewhat deeper shade of pink. Regarding the Oceania acquisition, Mr Jacobs went on to say—and this is relevant, because this is specifically what the court case is about:

Had Treasury and the Treasurer—

of course, we know that was the Labor Treasurer—

been as alert as they should have been to the inadequacies associated with the Oceanic acquisition, much more detailed consideration might have been given to further acquisitions in growth and assets, particularly in relation to the Remm-Myer Centre loan three to four months later.

Quite clearly, the then Government was negligent in its actions, as was the Premier of the day and the Ministers who sat around the Cabinet table. Through the Remm-Myer loss alone, they cost us over \$1 000 million. It is no wonder that South Australians are bitter as to what went on under that Labor Government and that they have to pay the price in this State for the \$3 100 million directly lost through the State Bank and the further \$1 000 million we have had to pay on that loss through having to borrow as a State. It is the mess that this Government has worked hard to climb out of, and we are succeeding. We have written down that debt substantially. We have been able to reduce substantially the interest payments made each year on that debt.

Members should realise that the financial problems inflicted on this State by the former Labor Government could have cost every household in South Australia about \$800 a

year more directly as a result of the State Bank crash and the deficit that that Labor Government inflicted on this State as a result of that.

Through our actions in reducing debt, we have reduced the potential impact on every household in South Australia by \$300 million a year and a further \$500 to \$600 a year on every household in South Australia in terms of the deficit that we have reduced the former Government's over-spending by. It is the Labor Party of this State and members such as the present Leader of the Opposition (the former Minister) and the member for Spence who should hang their heads in shame as once again we see the stark reminder of what the State Bank has cost South Australia. Damnation be on their heads.

EDS CONTRACT

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Why did the Premier tell this House on 8 February that 'all outstanding issues between the State of Florida and EDS have been concluded', and who advised the Premier that 'the State of Florida has now advised that it has waived its rights to further appeal the case'? The Opposition has a letter from the State of Florida's Attorney-General's office dated 11 February—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir. I will repeat the explanation. The Opposition has a letter from the State of Florida's Attorney-General's office dated 11 February which says that legal action is still pending and states:

... no judgment has been entered in the contractual dispute case to date.

The letter also states:

It is apparent from statements made in your Parliament last week the Premier has been provided misinformation about our litigation and matters still pending in Florida courts.

The letter goes on to say that an appeal has been filed by the State of Florida on a second suit for damages under the guarantee provided to the State by EDS.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, the member for Hart refuses to accept that a determination has been handed down and now an order based on the State of Florida to pay \$US53 million or \$US54 million in terms of the settlement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I understand it is out of order to make displays in the Chamber, especially if you are not addressing the Chamber. How is it that the member for Hart can hold up a piece of paper, presumably a letter?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ridley is correct. I realise that the member for Hart wishes to make a point, but there are ways and means of achieving that objective.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The member for Hart cannot accept that he stood in this House and asked all those questions day after day and, in fact, the State of Florida got banged on each of the issues raised.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It has been. The judgment is down in black and white. If you like, I will bring into the Parliament the actual judgment showing that the State of Florida had to pay EDS \$54 million.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations is out of order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I pointed out that the State of Florida was thrashing around trying to make every potential claim it could because it knows darn well it has to pay over \$US53 million to EDS. I will get the details for the honourable member and I will embarrass him in this House.

Mr Foley: Just get your facts right.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart has embarked on a course of action over the past week. He obviously wants a conflict with the Chair. He is now warned, and I am taking him off the list for any further questions because of his conduct.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. There have been enormous amounts of abuse from the other side of the House, particularly from the Deputy Premier—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Last week, Sir, you ruled that it was not unparliamentary for the Premier to say 'untruths'.

The SPEAKER: The Chair did not rule that the member for Hart transgressed in respect of the words he used, but he continues to interject and has no regard for the authority of the Chair.

POLICE RECRUITS

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): Will the Minister for Police—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Why aren't you interjecting on him?

The SPEAKER: Order! If the House is to become disruptive—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Giles will come to order. I am aware that this is the last sitting day before an election. If members want to cause a fracas with the Chair, the Chair is quite happy to accommodate them. However, they need to remember that they are members of Parliament and should conduct themselves as responsible people. I do not believe that the citizens of South Australia expect their members of Parliament to behave in this irresponsible manner.

Mr LEGGETT: Will the Minister for Police inform the House of plans to recruit new members to the South Australian Police Force? An article in today's *Advertiser* claims that an urgent recruiting drive is under way because there is a critical shortage of police officers.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I saw the headline and read the newspaper article this morning. While I will not comment on the headline, except for its indicating a claim being made by the Police Association which does not have the substance that may otherwise have been attributed to it, the issue of importance is the recruitment of new officers to the Police Force. As everyone in this House would be aware, the recruitment of officers to the Police Force was suspended for a period because of enterprise bargaining and other negotiations. It was always the purpose of the Police Department to raise the issue of recruitment programs once we had been through that period and once the wage issue had been settled. To the credit of the Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner, the matter was raised with me very early in our discussions on issues facing the Police Force.

There had been discussions on the issues of recruitment, training, types of training, how they should fit in and whether there would be sufficient people coming through the system to make sure that there were no shortages in the future. Certainly, there is no critical shortage at the moment. As everyone would recognise, a number of people are being moved from non-policing duties onto policing duties. I instance the speed camera issue, relating to which a number of officers will be freed up for policing purposes: not for sitting behind speed cameras.

A lot of work is being done to deploy resources to the areas of need. There may be one or two instances where the resources are overstretched because of particularly high levels of activity, but I believe that all South Australians can feel confident that we will not have a particularly serious situation either now or in the near future. However, the issue of ongoing recruits is a matter of importance. It is a matter of keeping new, highly trained people coming into the system. I appreciated the representations made to me on this issue, and we are looking at the whole recruiting issue. We will go into a recruitment course, and the size of that course will depend on the activity and changes being undertaken over the next six months.

Everybody should be aware that the lead times mean that we cannot suddenly turn on police officers: they have to be trained properly and go through a selection and recruitment process, and that takes time. We do not want gaps to appear. The Government is acting very responsibly. I appreciate that the Police Association has raised the issue with me, as has the Police Commissioner, and it had little to do with the story. We are simply saying that we have to use our resources in the best and most efficient fashion. This House can be assured that that will be the case.

EDS CONTRACT

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier, when he ceases talking to his mentor.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. Rann: He's in the Gallery. This is supposed to be Question Time.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my right will cease interjecting forthwith. I want the House to understand that it is at the discretion of the Chair to call on the Business of the Day if members do not want to ask any more questions or if they behave in an irresponsible fashion. If there are any further disruptions, I will call on the Business of the Day. The Deputy Leader knows that he is not to refer to the Gallery, or he might get the same treatment as the member for Hart.

Mr CLARKE: Why did the Premier tell this House that he was fully satisfied that the legal action between EDS and the State of Florida would not affect this State's computer outsourcing contract because he had read an independent review of the judge's decision? On 15 November last year the Premier told this House:

I cannot think of a better independent assessment to get than a report prepared quite independently of either the State of Florida or EDS, and that is who prepared it.

The following day the Premier said that the Government's American legal adviser, Shaw Pitman, had provided advice to the Government on specific bad contracts involving EDS.

However, an Opposition FOI request for the independent assessment resulted in a letter from the Premier's office which revealed that the assessment came from an 'information technology industry publication' and that 'the Premier did not retain a copy of this magazine'.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Mickey Mouse.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Leader of the Opposition says 'Mickey Mouse'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. Rann: It's as though it was a new idea or something.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In fact, it was a verbatim account of the summary of the formal judgment that was handed down.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Which magazine?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It was the one in America. There was a formal detailed account point by point for every aspect of the judgment that was handed down.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I should have thought that that direct summary of the judgment was a very accurate summary of what the judge put in his fuller summary. It was the formal summary. If the honourable member wishes, I will get a copy of the formal—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Of the magazine?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No; of the formal judgment which was written up verbatim in the magazine.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I give the Opposition and other members one last chance. They are clearly indicating that they do not want to ask questions by continuing to interject. If it continues, I will call on the Business of the Day.

UNITED WATER

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure. Can he advise the House of the first of the economic and industrial developments announced today by United Water to meet its commitment to earn \$628 million worth of exports for South Australia over the next 10 years?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am pleased to advise the House that Pica Activated Carbon (Australia) Pty Ltd will be establishing its Asia-Pacific headquarters, as well as a processing and packaging plant for activated carbon, in Adelaide. The company expects to generate \$20 million in export earnings from this contract with the annual turnover for Pica (Australia) expected to be about \$5.7 million. The plant represents an investment of \$2 million, and it will begin operations early next year. Locating this company in Adelaide is a direct result of the water industry contract with United Water. It shows that United Water is honouring its commitments and that the contract delivers economic growth and jobs in South Australia.

Pica is a world leader in the manufacture of high quality activated carbon, the dominant supplier in the Asia-Pacific region, and has an annual turnover of approximately \$40 million, of which 10 per cent goes into research and development. It will be sponsoring—and we are pleased that it is—the Ian Wark Institute for Mineral and Material Science, Technology and Engineering at the University of South Australia.

The company will use Adelaide as the base from which to develop the Asia-Pacific markets for the use of carbon in water treatment and food processing. It recently sent 300 tonnes of SA coal to Germany for testing to see whether it can be turned into granulated activated carbon for use in water treatment. If that test is successful, there is the potential for a production facility in South Australia which could generate employment for more than 100 people and require a further investment of \$30 million. The water industry contract is a good deal for South Australia and it is working. Here is a practical indication of economic development being put in place as the contract requires.

HOSPITAL BOARDS

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Are plans proceeding to amalgamate the boards of the Flinders Medical Centre, the Noarlunga Hospital, the Daws Road Hospital and Southern Domiciliary Care, and would amalgamation of the boards assist the introduction of the Healthplus initiative? The Opposition has been informed that the Minister cancelled a meeting scheduled for yesterday to discuss these amalgamations.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: It is almost laughable. As the Leader of the Opposition would acknowledge, having been a Minister some long time ago, and probably never in future, there are time constraints on meetings and things change. A number of months ago—I guess it would be six, seven or eight or something like that—the potential amalgamation of those boards was raised with me by a member of the board who acknowledged that the directions of the Government, which were clearly attempting to decrease administrative bureaucratic overload and to focus on service provision, were the way to go for the future and that the members of the boards wished to put to me, as the Minister in the Government who was pushing for increased service efficiencies, that they had a plan, and I enthusiastically supported it. I am told that there have been very productive discussions led by the board, not dominated by the Government. I believe that that will be the outcome of these productive discussions.

HOSPITAL WAITING LISTS

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): Does the Minister for Health consider that waiting lists in South Australian public hospitals will be affected by the Federal Government's action following the 2 March Federal election?

The SPEAKER: Before calling the Minister for Health, I point out that he can answer questions only as they relate to his responsibility, not the responsibility of the Federal Government.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am only too happy to address the question from the member for Mitchell, recognising that unfortunately it is my job to cope with the disastrous waiting lists with which we were left after the most recent State election. The 2 March Federal election is very important for all South Australians and particularly for South Australians on waiting lists. Despite the protestations of the Australian Democrats, only two Parties are seriously contending to form Federal Government: the Coalition and the Australian Labor Party. As I mentioned, after 11 years of Labor Government federally and in this State, we inherited waiting lists of over 9 000 people and, over the past two years, by the sorts of efficiencies illustrated by the member

for Elizabeth's most recent question, we have managed to reduce those waiting lists by over 16 per cent, which is a great credit, but we need the support of the Federal Government to continue the challenge.

I have looked at what the Federal Parties are offering: Federal Labor has offered \$150 million over two years, specifically to reduce waiting times. On a population basis, South Australia's share of that funding would be about \$12.4 million or \$6 million a year. That sounds like a very generous offer but, unfortunately, experience has taught me, as the Minister for Health, that that is nothing more and nothing less than a Labor campaign promise. Indeed, as far as Labor Party campaign promises go, it is not even as generous as the now famous, or perhaps infamous, L-A-W, law, tax cuts, where the law was changed after the election.

I want to draw the attention of the House to this alleged \$150 million and how it compares with previous Federal Labor Party promises. At the 1993 election, Federal Labor promised \$100 million. This program was to reduce waiting lists, and I am quite sure that all Ministers for Health around Australia thought that that was a good idea. At first glance, one might be prompted to observe that the 1996 promise has increased by 50 per cent, but the 1993 promise, unfortunately, was broken. Ministers for Health around Australia were concerned about this. Members opposite would say that the Federal Labor Party's health rebate would encourage private health insurers, and hence help to reduce waiting lists. I quote a letter from this morning's *Australian* where Mr Clive Ashenden, the Managing Director of one of Australia's largest funds—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: No relation. The letter states:

Once stripped of its election veneer, it is apparent that this scheme actually provides no additional incentive for families who do not currently have private insurance to obtain it. Why would such a family be encouraged to spend \$1 800 a year or more for private cover in order to obtain a \$350 rebate which is available to all eligible families whether they are insured or not? Nor is there any incentive for families which currently have private cover and for whom the 'price' of using the rebate for their contributions is to forgo any entitlement to Medicare rebates for the nominated ancillary health services. In addition, there has been no attempt to address the two main health funding problems in Australia today. They are, of course, the plight of the elderly—

and I know the member for Giles is interested in the elderly— for whom health insurance is becoming increasingly unaffordable, and the public hospital system which is becoming less capable day by day of coping with the additional demands being placed upon it. That is what Mr Ashenden said, not me.

The SPEAKER: I think the Minister has adequately answered the question, and I ask him to round off his answer because he is straying somewhat from the original question.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I shall round off by identifying that, in contrast to this illusion which will disappear if the Federal Labor Party is re-elected, under the Coalition policies, even if half the people took up private health insurance, public hospitals in South Australia would benefit by \$40 million.

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The Minister is straying into the hypothetical concerning a Coalition victory and particularly in respect of the maintenance of its promises given this Government's own record.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Deputy Leader had raised a point of order in relation to the relevance of the answer, the

Chair would have upheld it. Unfortunately, the honourable member strayed somewhat in raising the point of order. I ask the Minister to complete his remarks or the Chair will withdraw leave.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I intend to by merely reiterating that South Australian public hospitals would benefit under the Coalition plans to the tune of \$40 million per year, and another 120 000 South Australians would be covered by private health insurance.

McDONALD, PROFESSOR PETER

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Is Professor Peter McDonald, the South Australian Health Commission officer responsible for the Healthplus initiative, currently visiting the US health care giant Kaiser Permanente in the United States?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The answer to that question, is 'Yes.' The reason for the visit is that, as I have maintained on countless occasions publicly, we believe we have the best possible information technology-based way of providing community health care in Australia. However, we are not xenophobic. I repeat: we are not xenophobic, as is the member for Elizabeth, and we are prepared to acknowledge that there may be things we can learn from the way other people do things. Professor McDonald is in the United States assessing the claims of Kaiser and to see whether we can improve our already excellent system.

EDS CONTRACT

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Will the Premier provide any further information to this House on the outcome of the court case between the State of Florida and EDS?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I can, because I have the very information, a copy of which the member for Hart should have himself obtained. I can give the honourable member a copy of it; in fact, I can give the whole House a copy of it because, after I have used it, I am willing to table the document. This is a court order handed down on 29 January this year from William Gary, Circuit Court Judge, ordering that a total amount of \$38 271 735 plus interest be paid to EDS immediately—

The Hon. M.H. Armitage: In US dollars?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In US dollars. In fact, the interest takes that figure up to about \$US53 million. The judgment states:

In view of the foregoing, the court orders that—

this is against the State of Florida—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will come to the Attorney-General of Florida in a moment. The judgment continues:

1. All exceptions are denied except as to EDS's exception in reference to a mathematical error already corrected by the Special Master in his . . . recommended order. No basis was otherwise shown for any of the exceptions in view of the record support for the Special Master's recommendations.

2. The Special Master's recommended order as amended . . . dated 5 September 1995 is approved and incorporated by reference as part of this order as that EDS shall recover \$38 271 735, plus interest. Further the court reserves jurisdiction solely to determine questions related to additional interest, attorneys fees, and costs.

In other words, there is no right of appeal. The only area where the court will allow any additional information is on additional interest, attorneys' fees and costs. This judgment

was handed down in the State of Florida on 29 January this year. What amazes me is that the member for Hart continues to quote from the Attorney-General of Florida. Last year I sent a letter to the Attorney-General of Florida asking him for all the evidence of judgments against both the State of Florida and EDS. Do you know what the Attorney-General of Florida sent me? He sent me a very small part of the total judgment, and only that part in favour of the State of Florida.

If one had read the material sent by the Attorney-General of the State of Florida, one would have assumed that the State of Florida had won on every point when, in fact, EDS won the vast majority of the case and, in net terms, won something like \$US53 million or \$US54 million, including interest payments.

Here is the proof because the State of Florida refused to pay the money. Here is a court action in the State of Florida itself. I table the document so that the House can see it: it clearly shows that the only grounds on which there can be any further argument in relation to this matter is the additional costs, attorneys' fees and other associated costs. Quite clearly the State of Florida missed out badly. I would go with my document—the order from the court—any day compared with any document that the member for Hart would want to table in this place.

UNITED WATER

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Given the answer by the Minister for Infrastructure to my previous question, has he been briefed by his department, SA Water, or by United Water on reports from France about the latest fines against subsidiaries of CGE involved in corruption, including price fixing for public works contracts, and can he assure the House that no executive with responsibilities for the Adelaide water operations through the CGE subsidiary, United Water, was involved? In January this year—so I am sure the Minister is aware of this—the French Antimonopolies Commission fined 47 companies, including subsidiaries of CGE, more than 400 million francs or more than \$A100 million. These are the largest fines ever levied by the French Antimonopolies Commission and were the culmination of a five year investigation into corruption over public works contracts. In one case—

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The remarks being made by the member are not attributed to any document, as I recall, referred to in the course of his explanation but are merely an expression of opinion arising from himself, which means that they are comment. I ask you to rule on that.

The SPEAKER: There is a tradition in the House that members, having asked a question, have a reasonable opportunity to briefly explain it. In recent times members have taken more latitude than the Chair believes is necessary. If the House wants me to bring down rulings which virtually prohibit explanations, I do not think that would be in the interests of the House.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: According to French reports, in one case a director of a CGE subsidiary revealed that before tenders were placed for a large bridge in Normandy the company and its competitor colluded and both submitted exactly the same price of 630 million French francs or more than \$A150 million. That price was 40 per cent greater than the price expected by the authority commissioning the bridge and again contributes to continuing speculation about the *bona fides* of CGE.

The SPEAKER: Comment. I call the Minister for Infrastructure.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No.

LAND CONTAMINATION

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources advise what role South Australia is playing in the development of new technology for treatment and prevention of contaminated lands? With land contamination a growing concern in Australia and overseas, I understand that a major international conference is under way in Adelaide in which South Australian expertise is being showcased to the rest of the world.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am delighted to be able to answer the question raised by the member for Mawson. Certainly the issue of contamination is one about which we have heard much in recent times and about which we will continue to hear a lot as our understanding of environmental issues grows. I am very pleased to advise that this week we have representatives from something like 24 countries in Adelaide as part of the Council of North Atlantic Treaty Organisation Conference on the treatment of contaminated land and groundwater. Each of the countries represented at NATO is presenting four projects at the conference. Projects relating to the clean-up of aquifers and clean-up of petroleum contaminated soils in Adelaide are being showcased to audiences which include representatives from the United States EPA.

The decision to hold the conference in Adelaide is a major coup for South Australia, particularly for the Environment Protection Authority. With South Australia's proximity to the Pacific rim and Asia, this State is positioning itself not only to remediate our own lands but also to develop ourselves as a regional environmental centre by exporting technology and expertise to developing countries.

South Australia is making major progress with exciting environmental technologies. Not only will this bring benefits to South Australia through improvements to our quality of life and environment in this State but it will reinforce the fact that looking after the environment can create jobs and economic potential. Certainly environmental jobs will play a major role in future. Members should also be aware that the NATO conference will be followed immediately by another international conference, again with representatives from about 24 countries around the world, and it will look at contamination in the soil environment in the Australasian-Pacific region. I am pleased to be able to advise the member for Mawson that South Australia is playing a major role in the development of new technologies to deal with the treatment and prevention of contaminated lands, both in Australia and internationally.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Will the Minister for Health give an undertaking that his promise that a new private hospital wing to be built at Modbury will be fulfilled? I have been contacted by a constituent—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: On a point of order, Sir, perhaps you could explain to the Government the rules about interjections.

The SPEAKER: I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that he knows full well that that comment borders on

provoking the Chair. The Chair has been very tolerant. I am very happy to enforce those Standing Orders rigidly, and the Leader of the Opposition would be the first one to run foul of them.

Mrs GERAGHTY: I have been contacted by a constituent who is concerned about the situation at Modbury Hospital. Healthscope, the company running Modbury Hospital—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs GERAGHTY:—has now said that it will operate a new private wing at Modbury Hospital within the existing facility. Health Commission statistics show that since Healthscope took over the surgical booking list for Modbury Hospital has increased to 1 076 patients—an increase of 12.2 per cent—and since the Liberal Government was elected the list has increased by 21 per cent.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Saul on the road to Damascus! I cannot believe this. I have stood up in this Parliament day after day defending what the Government has been trying to do to make the public hospital system more efficient by getting the private sector involved, and I recall that I have been sledged routinely from the other side. Now I am being asked to ensure that a private hospital is built.

It does indicate that water dripping on a stone eventually has its end point in that the stone gives way. Clearly we have over here the stone—the rock upon which this member is built, Peter Duncan—finally agreeing that the private sector has a role to play in the public provision of health services, and I am delighted. The question that the member asks clearly acknowledges the benefit of having a private hospital involved in the public sector provision of health services. That is wonderful because, of course, there are enormous benefits to the public sector. Some of those benefits include the fact that we are able to get better infrastructure, better technology, more expensive and up-to-date technological advances and so on. There are enormous advantages to public patients.

It is great that at last the Labor Party has been brought kicking and screaming to the acknowledgment that all the plans of this Government for the public provision of health care are worth supporting. That, at least, is an advantage. Where the private hospital is built and where any private individual or company chooses to spend their money—not my money—is their decision, not the Government's. If Healthscope, in this instance, or any other private company chooses to spend its money in a particular way, so be it, particularly if I as Minister for Health can get better public services out of that.

It is factual that the private company is looking at other ways of maximising its advantage. One of those ways would be to situate the private hospital within the confines of the public hospital. Of course, we would benefit from that because there would be not only all the benefits of the infrastructure and the services and so on but a rental component. So, we would gain even more. The interesting thing about this private hospital, which started admitting patients on 1 February, I think—and it has been very successful, I am told—is that an application for a provider number is on the desk of the Federal Minister for Health. We have seen a copy of the letter from her bureaucrats, who advise that the Federal Minister for Health ought to write and acknowledge that that private company has a provider number so that it can provide services in a private hospital. Indeed, the letter goes on to say

that these are often granted in retrospect, so they are confident that that is the advice that will be provided.

The Federal Labor Minister for Health, under a sham of a Federal Labor Party policy, forgetting the fact that for the past 15 years the Federal Labor Party has been saying that it hates the private sector, recognising that 80 or 90 per cent of people want private health insurance, has put out a sop like an L-A-W tax cut—in this case it is an L-A-W hoax—to try to get people into the private sector. The Federal Minister has the capacity with one signature to grant the private sector at Modbury its provider number—and all will be sweet. I wonder whether she has not done that because it would make her look stupid during the election campaign or is it because, once again, her well publicised memory has failed her and she has forgotten to do it?

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, WORKCOVER SAFETY AWARD

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): Will the Minister for Correctional Services provide information on how the Department for Correctional Services became the first South Australian Government department to be awarded a WorkCover safety award at the annual safety achiever bonus scheme awards presentation?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I thank the member for Kaurna for her question and her ongoing interest in Correctional Services matters. It is pleasing to be able to advise the Parliament of more good news concerning the Department for Correctional Services. The department was awarded the most improved award in the exempt employer category at the WorkCover awards late last year. Indeed, it is the first ever State Government department to win such an award. This Government cannot take all the credit for that award being made. In fairness, I must give some of the credit to the previous Government for, were it not for its dismal record in occupational health and safety, the Department for Correctional Services could not have achieved its worst ever scenario and made such a dramatic turnaround possible. Of course, part of the credit must go to the member for Giles during his appalling time as Minister for Correctional Services in this State.

The department is responsible for the management of seven prisons and 16 community correctional centres. I am sure that all members would acknowledge that the department by its very nature is one in which its employees are often subject to difficult situations where injury is possible. Under the previous Government, workers' compensation claims in the department reached record high levels: a total of 442 claims were made in 1992-93 for a total cost of \$6 million. At that time, 33.8 per cent of employees—almost one in three—put in WorkCover claims. This sad state of affairs has now been turned round. Indeed, during the last financial year there was a claims reduction of 25 per cent, which resulted in cost savings of \$1.6 million.

I will highlight the actual cost savings that have been achieved. In 1993-94, there were 360 claims for \$4.81 million, a period that covered part of this Government's term in office. In 1994-95, there were 275 claims for \$3.09 million. To date in 1995-96, there have been 148 claims for a cost of \$1.46 million, which relates back to \$1.81 million for the same time last year. So, despite a dramatic reduction in the last financial year and despite the award, the department continues to reduce its costs.

The way in which this has occurred is by sensibly focusing on occupational health and safety issues. Some of the moneys thereby saved have been turned back into the department to ensure that further concentration on these issues is possible. They have included such things as driver training for high risk staff; the purchasing and placing of industrial matting in industrial areas within the prison; the purchase of ergonomic computer tables and other equipment; hazard management training for Correctional Services staff; the appointment of a staff counsellor and safety consultant for the department; and, most importantly, the centralisation of occupational health and safety budgets to the local areas so that local decisions rather than central decisions can be made to improve occupational health and safety issues. These changes have come about by seriously focusing on the problems and empowering local managers to make their own decisions.

I am pleased to say that things are already faring better during this financial year. The figure that I gave was for ongoing as well as new claims. I am also pleased to be able to advise the House that in the first quarter of this financial year new claims for the Department for Correctional Services have cost \$224 000 compared with \$991 000 for the same time last year—a considerable improvement indeed, one which my departmental employees and managers deserve credit for for embracing occupational health and safety and driving down claims occurrence and therefore the overall cost to the taxpayer.

SOUTH ADELAIDE CRECHE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): My question is directed to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The front bench is very disorderly.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Following the decision of the State Heritage Authority in February 1995 to retain the facade of the former South Adelaide creche on the waiting list, did the Minister write to the authority requesting it to reconsider its decision?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I did that. On a number of occasions, I meet with the Chair of the Heritage Authority. I have discussions with him. As members of this House would know, there is no opportunity through the heritage legislation for the Minister to intervene in any way whatsoever. I have always supported that that should be the case and I continue to do so. That does not mean that representation should not be made. If I receive representation from constituents or other people in this State, it is totally appropriate that I should pass that representation on. I have no concerns about that at all.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AMALGAMATIONS

Ms HURLEY (Napier): What is the view of the Minister for Local Government Relations on the desirable number of local government councils in South Australia? To date the policy of the Government, as stated by the previous Minister, has been for a 50 per cent reduction in the number of councils.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: It is well known by everybody who is interested in local government that the voluntary process this Government has set in place is working extremely well. As Minister, I am absolutely delighted with the way in which the negotiations are occurring. At the

moment, 100 of 118 councils have already indicated that they wish to discuss amalgamation, and they are speaking in 31 groups. I have had discussions with the Chair of the board and with the Chief Executive, and it is quite obvious that discussions are going extremely well.

The voluntary process will probably provide us with more amalgamations than the 50 per cent to which the honourable member referred. I am perfectly happy to allow the natural process to proceed, because we are seeing extreme cooperation from local government: councils are really talking to each other, councils that six to 12 months ago were indicating they were just not interested in amalgamation. Those councils are not only talking about amalgamation but have applied to the board for assistance in undertaking amalgamation discussions. To answer the honourable member's question, I have no doubt that the process will work extremely well.

TRAC PROGRAM

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education outline a new scheme that starts high school students on a career path while they are still at school?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I thank the member for Lee for his question. Rather than respond directly to him, because he is sitting behind, I will tell everyone the good news. TRAC is a program which used to focus specifically on training in the retail industry people in years 11 and 12—not simply work experience but accredited training. Last year, my department supported a pilot program involving approximately 30 young people in the Tea Tree Gully area and this year, in conjunction with the Australian Student Traineeship Foundation, we are supporting a program involving 500 young people from 60 high schools throughout the whole of the State. As I indicated earlier, this program is now focused on areas in addition to the retail industry, including the commercial, hospitality and automotive fields.

The young people are trained at industry level standards. They are involved in a mentor scheme: they are assigned to people in the workplace who can keep an eye on them, assist them and provide them with day-to-day support and encouragement. In that way, they link their school activities to real work in the workplace. This is a major step forward, because these young people get credit for the training they have done when they progress into a TAFE or private provider training system after they leave school.

I was at the launch at the Festival Centre and, unfortunately, there was no representation from the Labor Party. The Hon. Carolyn Pickles could not attend apparently because of a family sickness, but no other honourable member felt compelled to attend, and that is rather unfortunate. However, we did have the Federal member for Kingston there. I will not mention his name because he is relatively well known. He paid tribute to the innovative schemes under this State Government and said that we were the most innovative and creative in terms of training and employment programs throughout Australia. I conclude on that very positive note. TRAC, which now encompasses a wider range of areas, involves 500 young people getting a real start on a career path and links school and the workplace.

LIVESTOCK HEALTH

Mr VENNING (Custance): My question is directed to the Minister for Primary Industries—my first to that Minister,

and I congratulate him on his appointment. Will the Minister provide details of plans to review legislation relating to livestock health, animal identification and compensation?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thank the member for Custance for the question, so ably supported by the Deputy Leader. I would like to inform the member for Custance and the Deputy Leader that Primary Industries South Australia has now released a green paper entitled 'Review and Consolidation of Legislation Relating to Livestock Health, Animal Identification and Compensation'. The green paper reviews 10 Acts of Parliament which concern livestock and seeks public comment on the proposed consolidation of those Acts into a single livestock Act. The review of the 10 Acts was initiated because each was developed independently, resulting in duplication, which causes confusion for producers. Some have remained virtually unchanged since they were developed in the 1930s and 1940s, and they tend to regulate areas of activity which are no longer relevant. International trading requirements are tending to be more fluid and, in order to deal effectively with this, relevant legislation needs to be flexible.

To create national uniformity, agreed responses to trading issues such as controls over the use of hormonal growth promotants, chemical residues and vendor liability for misdescribed stock need to be reflected in legislation. The style of most of the current Acts makes them difficult to understand and interpret, and it is especially difficult for users to determine their responsibilities. Discussions have been held with representatives of various South Australian livestock and fishing industries. Several options and issues are considered in this green paper, and it is hoped that the paper will promote further industry and public comment in the process of developing the livestock Act. I hope that the new livestock Act will be tabled in the spring session this year. Responses on the issues and options canvassed in this paper are sought before 1 May 1996, and I look forward to many constructive responses, including a detailed one from the member for Custance.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I refer to the Collex Waste treatment plant which, it is proposed, is to be established at the former British Tube Mills site at Churchill Road, Kilburn. The interesting thing about that company is that it is owned by CGE, which also runs our water supply in South Australia. It wants to set up a waste treatment plant, with the potential for quite a number of noxious odours throughout the residential area. I have been reliably informed that Collex has been in contact with the Environment Protection Authority and is seeking the release, under FOI legislation, of a letter sent to the Environment Protection Authority by Johanna McLuskey, who is a councillor on the Enfield City Council. She complained about an incident which she believes took place, with the spillage of waste in a transport by Collex from Elizabeth to Clean Away's site at Wingfield.

However, what is interesting is that Collex wants to initiate defamation proceedings against the Enfield council. As I have informed this House before, the Enfield City Council is fighting that application vigorously. It is seeking that letter from the Environment Protection Authority, sent by Johanna McLuskey, with a view to joining her in that defamation action.

I find it quite appalling that an ordinary citizen, albeit an elected representative on the Enfield council, is being threatened somewhat by a very large multi-national company because she is standing up for the residents in her area, opposing the establishment of the waste treatment plant. Yet we have this company, through legal advice, wanting to sue Johanna McLuskey, a mother of two or three young children and an Enfield councillor to boot. I find this appalling, because I also know that work is proceeding apace at the waste treatment plant, even though Supreme Court action has been initiated by the Enfield council against Collex. Why is it so smug? Why is it still proceeding with its work at the Churchill Road site, even though there is action before the Supreme Court. Quite clearly, in my view—

The SPEAKER: Order! By way of clarification for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, if the matter is before the Supreme Court, it is *sub judice* and the honourable member cannot refer to it.

Mr CLARKE: I will not be referring to it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has and, if he continues to refer to it, he is out of order, because he drew the matter to my attention.

Mr CLARKE: Thank you, Sir. The issue at hand is the question I put to the Minister for Urban Development last week in this House, and that is, 'Will you give a guarantee that you will not exercise your rights under section 24 of the Development Act to override the Enfield council's wishes in this area and allow the Collex waste treatment plant to operate, despite the opposition of the council and the residents?'

It is quite clear that this State Liberal Government will allow it to happen. It is just waiting for the Federal election on 2 March before helping out its Federal Liberal colleague the member for Adelaide, Trish Worth, who has been pleading with her State colleagues saying, 'I don't mind you setting up a waste treatment plant in Kilburn. I don't really care about it but I do care if you do it before 2 March, because my election may hang on it.' That is what I find offensive about the whole exercise: this Government has deliberately told me and Enfield council on a number of occasions in the past 12 months, 'We are a pro business and pro development Government and we do not care if it creates only six jobs in Kilburn and causes noxious fumes to float across the residents of Kilburn, but we will push ahead and we will make sure that we only push it ahead after the Federal election so that we do not embarrass our Federal colleague, Trish Worth, who is running for the Federal seat of Adelaide.'

That is an appalling indictment of this Government, because cynically it is trying to play this matter out so that immediately after 2 March the Government will override Enfield council and Collex will issue defamation proceedings against Johanna McLuskey and Enfield council, trying to muzzle local representatives while they go about their business of setting up a stinking and smelling waste treatment plant right next to a nursing home, a primary school and residential development in Kilburn. I find that absolutely outrageous.

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

Mr WADE (Elder): I want to talk today about the reality of Labor's 13 years of Government and how it has been reflected in our declining standard of living. Under Federal Labor the gap between the rich and the poor has become a chasm. The rich have become richer, and the chardonnay socialists must be indebted to the Labor pseudo socialists who have worked hard to make their mates more comfortable. What about Labor's true believers, those on low and fixed incomes who put their faith in Labor to look after their interests? People on low incomes and the poor have actually seen their incomes fall. Indeed, we have 1.9 million Australians remaining trapped by poverty. Federal Labor's policies are the major cause of this problem. Paul Keating openly admits that Federal Labor deliberately pushed up interest rates that induced the 1990 recession.

The recession worsened Australia's unemployment, and those who could least afford it suffered the most. In 13 years—a number unlucky for some and certainly unlucky for Federal Labor—of Labor we are a nation of high costs, low wages and high unemployment; and, over the last 13 years under Labor, Australia has fallen behind the rest of the world in our standard of living. The World Bank indicates that between 1983 and 1993 Australia's per capita income dropped from tenth to twenty-second position. In 1983 we were ahead of Denmark, Germany, Finland, France—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr WADE:—it was 1983, if the member for Spence had been listening—Japan, the Netherlands, Austria, the United Kingdom, Belgium, Italy, Singapore and Hong Kong. Now, 13 sorry years later under Federal Labor and its policies, all these nations are ahead of Australia in per capita income. Under Labor, Australia's position in the world is declining and we are slipping backwards continually. Research by the Economic Planning Advisory Commission, commissioned by the Federal Labor Government, found that real earnings of the lowest 10 per cent of earners actually fell between 1983 and 1994 and, under the ACTU Accord Mark 8, Australians on low award rates will be \$8.25 a week worse off in real terms by 1999, and that is a fact. Thank you, Mr Keating, and the ACTU, who will no doubt be happy to learn that their armchair chardonnay socialist mates are 17 per cent richer in real terms since 1983.

In real terms, the bottom 20 per cent of households suffered over 23 per cent loss in their incomes. Unemployment from that group has jumped from 6.4 to 28.1 per cent. The poor suffered the most under Labor and are suffering still. Only the rich—the top 20 per cent—recorded a real increase in income over the past 10 years. The middle income group—that middle 20 per cent—saw real household income fall by \$58 a week over the past 10 years, nearly a 9 per cent loss in real income. The rich are getting richer and the poor and middle incomes are being pushed down. Labor has deserted its traditional supporters in order to sip champagne on Sydney's north shore in housing costing a mere \$2.4 million. Keating has lost the plot and Labor has lost the heart of the people. When I read these statistics and see Australia's plight under the Federal Labor Government it reminds me of the words of Oliver Cromwell in dismissing the Long Parliament:

You have sat too long here for any good you have been doing. Depart, I say, and let us have done with you. In the name of God, go.

So, we say to Keating, 'Go, in the name of God; go and leave Australians alone.

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

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Yesterday I was speaking about some of the hardships that this Government is inflicting on people in our community. Some of the decisions that the Government makes also cause hardship to the environment. I believe the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources has a genuine interest in the environment, but when he takes decisions to Cabinet I do not believe his concern is reflected by the decisions that Cabinet makes. Policy in this area affects everyone and, to pander to the desires of business solely, can arguably be a most devastating outcome for us all. Since it impacts far into the future and crosses generational bounds, I suggest that the Government needs to look at some of the decisions it makes.

The member for Napier has spoken about the Highbury dump saga and I will not reiterate the mess made of that matter, but it has created a burdensome impact on the local community. If members opposite genuinely care about the environment, I ask them to speak out against the proposal by Howard to sell one-third of Telstra to support an environmental policy that is merely a gimmick to catch votes.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: Will members opposite show the people of South Australia that they genuinely care about the environment? Will they stand up and say that the environment is important to us all and confirm that by telling Howard—if it is that important—that the environment should be funded in its own right and be given a proper place? I do not think they will. It is obvious that is not going to happen. The truth is that on the Liberal agenda—both State and Federal—it is private ownership or management of our services and basically the environment can fend for itself.

I wish to pick up on an issue alluded to yesterday by the member for Price, who spoke about a past Premier. I have read extensively the comments of that former Premier and I will quote his words to the House. It was a time well before we came into the House but the comments are well worth heeding. The former Premier's comments were made in reference to a royal commission, not of the disastrous and divisive type that we have recently dealt with, because I suspect in those days such divisive activities would not have occurred. The past Premier stated:

The State Government presented a case to the effect that the company was a public utility and a monopoly, and that it was in the public interest that certain control should be established over its operations.

Further, he said:

It has been said that this legislation is opposed to the policy and plank of the platform of the Party to which I have the honour to belong. It has been said, too, that the legislation is socialistic.

I believe it may have sounded that way, but those words were uttered in relation to the making of the Electricity Trust Bill of 1946 and the very wise and visionary words of the honourable Sir Thomas Playford. This man took the Adelaide Electric Supply Company from private ownership into the bosom of public domain. Why? He did this because, as he said:

I do not regard it as socialism for any Government to try to provide social amenities at places where such amenities cannot be provided unless the State as a whole comes in and takes some active steps.

The honourable gentleman spoke of providing service to people—service before economic rationalism. In that context, not only do I believe that he was referring to rural South Australia (which no doubt he was) but that he was in reality protecting a vital service for all South Australians. The question is: is the sale of vital and daily required public utilities really in the best interests of the public? Let me mention this very elusive woman whom everyone seems to have met all over the place. I refer to the Torrens by-election which this Government lost during its honeymoon period—a most devastating result. Let me quote from a letter that was distributed throughout the electorate, as follows:

A mother from Windsor Gardens stopped me—

this was signed by the Premier; so, the Premier met this woman—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr BASS (Florey): Before I begin I will comment on the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's comments about the member for Adelaide. As usual, the Deputy Leader uttered absolute rubbish and made allegations which cannot be substantiated. In South Australia, there are some 300 000 to 400 000 workers employed under the Federal industrial relations system. These workers have been labouring—and I use that word quite deliberately—under a Federal industrial relations system which has delivered no practical value to the work force and which has been discredited under its own weight of legalism and complexity. If ever there was a need to reform the Federal industrial relations system it was illustrated by an interview with the Federal Minister for Industrial Affairs, Laurie Brereton, on the ABC program *PM* two days ago. In that interview, Mr Brereton was forced to concede that the award safety net increases under the Federal Labor Government amounted to a wage increase of only 2.6 per cent, and this was well below the annual inflation on the Federal Government's own figures of more than 3 per cent.

In other words, this was an admission that the living standards of ordinary working Australians are being eroded by the Federal Labor Government. What is even more amazing is that Brereton then claimed that the Federal Labor Government, if re-elected, did not intend to make any changes whatsoever to the Federal Industrial Relations Act. He claimed that the Federal Government's laws were working as well as he wanted them to. What an incredible statement! On the one hand, Brereton admits that the Federal Government's laws are delivering reduced living standards for Australian workers yet, on the other hand, he says that he will do nothing about it. If ever there was a statement which proved that the Federal Labor Government has run out of ideas and is not worthy to govern Australia for a further three years, it is that statement by Mr Brereton. No objective commentators, let alone ordinary workers or employers, on Federal industrial relations believe that the Federal industrial relations system is as good as it gets.

That is what Laurie Brereton was saying, and he was saying that in the same arrogant fashion that Prime Minister Keating last year told the small business community in Australia that business conditions were as good as it gets. These admissions that Labor has no plans, no ideas and no industrial relations reform policies give a very hollow ring to the Prime Minister's circus act policy speech yesterday when

he claimed that he was a man of vision for Australia. What a vision! A vision to change nothing in industrial relations as far as Laurie Brereton is concerned; a vision to change nothing for small businesses as far as Keating is concerned. The Federal Labor Government has run out of steam when it comes to improving the lot of the ordinary Australian worker. In fact, even with the massive resources of the Federal bureaucracy, professional speech writers and strategists, including the recalled US Ambassador Don Russell, around Keating's and Brereton's side, the Federal Labor Government has been forced in its Federal industrial relations election propaganda to copy the industrial relations theme 'flexibility with fairness' of the South Australian Brown Liberal Government.

Not only did Prime Minister Keating use the theme in his so-called major speech on industrial relations when he returned to Australia from another overseas trip but he copied this theme in his national TV election broadcast. During Wednesday night's *PM* interview, Laurie Brereton again claimed that the Federal system was all about flexibility and fairness. What a load of rot! I am proud of the industrial relations achievements for workers under the Brown Liberal Government. I want these benefits—true flexibility and fairness, higher wages outcomes, improved productivity, fairer dismissal laws, empowerment of workers over trade union officials and the right to choose union membership—to be allowed to 200 000 to 300 000 South Australian workers still labouring under Federal laws.

In the interests of South Australian workers, we need a change in the Federal industrial system. South Australian workers cannot afford another three years of a Federal Labor Government which admits that it does not want to make a change to improve their living standards and which arrogantly claims that this is as good as gets. It is an absolute disgrace.

Ms HURLEY (Napier): I will briefly continue remarks I started yesterday in respect of urban development and rumours that this Government proposes to bring in legislation that seeks to give the Minister wide powers to approve development proposals. In the face of vehement local opposition, the current legislation has allowed the Minister to pass through proposals such as the Worrina development and the Woolworths building at Gepps Cross. So, it would seem that the Minister already has sufficient powers to push through whatever developments he considers of important social and economic significance. I am also concerned with the way the hills face zone is being treated by the Government. There is a small part of the hills face zone abutting the northern plains of my electorate. That indicates how wide the hills face zone stretches around Adelaide, how it touches closely on most people and how it affects them a great deal.

People in Adelaide are used to and enjoy having the hills surrounding them. The hills are important to the beauty, amenity and recreation of the people who live in Adelaide. The hills face zone is being nibbled away by the Government, because it appears content and is even encouraging this in its quest to sell off the State's assets. A number of groups have complained vigorously about selling off the small parcels of land around the hills face zone. There have been instances where developers have gone in and changed the use of the hills face zone without any action whatsoever by the State Government. At the same time, it seems that this Government might look at gradually withdrawing the policies and structures built up by the former Labor Government which

protected the natural environment around Adelaide and, indeed, South Australia generally.

This Government should concentrate on improving planning and design in existing urban development rather than allowing the sprawl into the hills face zone. Not enough is being done by the Government in this regard. The MFP has a very welcome project at The Levels that is examining innovative urban design, but it is a very small and probably long-term project. There is also a small housing development at North Haven being run in conjunction with the South Australian Housing Trust.

The Government has yet to take an active interest in creating a secure and interesting urban environment in South Australia. We must remember that in modern Australia most people live in an urban environment, but this Government has not paid enough attention to that fact. This State has the potential to become a model of good design, because underpinned by the work already done by the Housing Trust and what was formerly the South Australian Urban Land Trust (now the South Australian Urban Projects Authority), we have the ability to build on what we have already done and create an urban design that reflects egalitarian and social justice principles. However, this Government has shown none of the vision required to do this.

The Government is seemingly planning to undermine the role of its community advisers on the Development Assessment Commission and remove the provisions requiring public comment on development proposals, thereby paving the way for the design policies, planning and principles in this State to be undermined by short-term expediency in its quest for asset sales. This vision is not good enough for South Australia. It indicates a sort of shopkeeper mentality of buying, selling and trading commodities. It does not take into account the important principles which people throughout Australia have absorbed on environmental considerations.

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

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): It is interesting but expected that we should have witnessed the episode involving the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, one of the key fabricators on the Opposition benches—probably the second best fabricator to the Leader of the Opposition. It is also interesting to note that the cameras waited for that fabrication. It will be pretty sad if they run that sort of fabrication tonight. However, I still have a great deal of faith in Australians as a whole. I believe that at the end of the day, in about 2½ weeks, we will see the true Australians making sure that they look after what we have all fought for in the past.

I should like to highlight the facts regarding what Labor is currently doing. Not only do we see stories being made up by the Deputy Leader but we also see pieces of paper coming into our electorates making claims about health which are not true. I want to put on the record, and trust that we may be able to get a run on this by people who care about putting both sides of a factual argument, the claim by the Federal member, Gordon Bilney, in my electorate that Federal Labor put \$13.4 million extra into the health system in South Australia last year and that we took out \$35 million.

The facts are that since 1989 the Federal Labor Government has put only \$41 million of extra money into public health in this State. We have put \$129 million of extra services into the public health hospital system in this State in that period. We had no choice but to do that if we were to maintain the good standards that we still have today, because

we had to offset in real terms what the Federal Government had not provided for. It has not provided for it, because it has lost about three million people out of private health in a period not much greater than six years.

I wish to highlight what Dr Carmen Lawrence is doing to people in South Australia who cannot afford to be knocked around in the way that they are and who do not have the opportunity of being highlighted on television to address what the Federal Labor Government is not doing for health. Tertroxin is one example. In July last year I raised in the media the fact that Carmen Lawrence had decided to pull the plug on the pharmaceutical benefits scheme with regard to Tertroxin. Tertroxin is important for thyroid sufferers and for sufferers from cancer, and it is the only satisfactory drug for helping people who have weight problems, particularly young people. Dr Lawrence pulled that from the pharmaceutical benefits scheme. Not only did she pull it but she did not address the fact that this drug is in very short supply in Australia, and she procrastinated instead of assisting in obtaining urgently a supply from England.

I have constituents who have finally been able to get continuity of that supply, but it costs \$60 a bottle. That is money that they cannot recoup in any way other than to send the wife or husband out to work as well as the spouse who is already working, and it is \$60 that they cannot spend in the best interests of their family.

Another issue that I raised, on which I received an inappropriate response from Carmen Lawrence, was the rotting of overservicing by locum services. I have clear evidence that overservicing has occurred, and through WorkCover we are following that up in South Australia. We have much further to go on that matter, but at least we are following it up. I highlighted to the Federal Labor Minister, Carmen Lawrence, that rotting was going on in this area. I shall table the letter that I got back, and I trust the media will run with it, because millions of dollars could be saved nationally and put into better health care, but Carmen Lawrence was not interested in doing it.

Carmen Lawrence is like Paul Keating, the Prime Minister, and his love affair with his flights. Paul Keating is about to spend money as though it is going out of fashion if he gets another chance in Government. He has ordered some new accessories for his planes and is spending \$500 000 on upgrading Canberra's RAAF Fairbairn VIP facilities so that his Ministers can wait for planes in even more comfort. When he went to New Guinea last year, he sent his plane over with his mattress so that he could sleep on a mattress on which he is used to sleeping in Australia. Many people in Australia do not even have a mattress. They should vote against Paul Keating on 2 March.

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

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): 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 Bill seeks to make a number of miscellaneous amendments to the *Legal Practitioners Act 1981* ("the Act"). While a number of the proposed amendments are for the purposes of "tidying up" the Act, the Bill has certain important provisions which recognise the separation of the body currently known as the Legal Practitioners Complaints Committee from the Law Society and widen the powers of the existing disciplinary mechanisms which deal with legal practitioners in South Australia. This Bill is the first part of a wider review of the existing disciplinary processes to ensure that complaints against legal practitioners are dealt with expeditiously and fairly.

As previously stated, the Bill recognises the separation of the Legal Practitioners Complaints Committee from the South Australian Law Society. To prevent any misconception that the Legal Practitioners Complaints Committee is a committee of the Law Society, the Bill changes the name of the Committee to the Legal Practitioners Complaints Board ("the Board"). Clause 15 of the Bill establishes the Board as a body corporate, with perpetual succession, a common seal and the powers of a natural person. This amendment will allow the Board to sue and be sued in its own name and acquire and incur rights and liabilities so far as may be necessary to carry out its functions and duties under the Act (i.e., enter into contracts for the purchase of equipment and services, enter into a lease for its premises, sue to recover costs and receive money, establish its own bank account and receive monies into that account). Section 7 of the Act is amended to provide the Law Society with powers in the same terms. Further, the Bill amends section 72 of the Act to provide that there will be a Director of the Board and that the Director be appointed by the Board with the approval of the Attorney-General. These amendments provide a greater level of independence of the Board from the Law Society, a change which will reinforce impartiality in the disciplinary process.

Section 37 of the Act, which deals with confidentiality, is amended to ensure that the Board has access to information from the Law Society in relation to any matter it is investigating.

The amendment to section 42 of the Act removes the power of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs to institute proceedings for taxation of legal costs and gives that power to the Board.

Section 77(3) of the Act currently provides that where the Committee has attempted to resolve the subject matter of a complaint by conciliation, but the attempt has been unsuccessful, the Committee must report to Attorney-General and the Law Society. The Committee has requested that this provision be removed as it is intended that the conciliation process will be used far more frequently and would result in some 200-300 reports being required per year, which is onerous and may be a positive disincentive to conciliate. This provision is therefore to be removed.

Section 77(4) of the Act currently provides that if, in the course of an investigation, the Committee is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to suspect that a legal practitioner has committed an offence, then the Committee must immediately report the matter to the Attorney-General. Under this provision as amended the Board will also be required to immediately upon satisfying itself that there are reasonable grounds to suspect a practitioner of criminal activity, report this matter to the police and prosecution authorities in order that they may begin investigations as soon as possible. In fact, the Committee has already recognised that matters need to be referred to the appropriate authorities more expeditiously and is currently sending information to the Director of Public Prosecutions and the police at the same time as material is referred to the Attorney-General pursuant to section 77(4). This amendment will merely formalise a process which is occurring in any event.

The previous Solicitor-General (now Chief Justice) provided advice in relation to various provisions concerning the Committee. Currently, the Committee may only make an investigation after receiving a complaint. On the advice of the former Solicitor-General, the Act has been amended to provide as follows:

- (a) the Board may make an investigation into the conduct of a legal practitioner whether or not a complaint has been received;
- (b) the Board must investigate when a complaint has been received, unless it decides that the complaint is frivolous or vexatious;
- (c) the Board must investigate at the direction of the Attorney-General or the Law Society.

In relation to paragraph (b) above, it has also been noted that some complaints relate to minor matters and can be resolved quickly without a formal investigation. The Bill therefore provides that the

Board may refuse to commence or continue an investigation where the subject matter of a complaint has already been resolved.

Another matter on which the former Solicitor-General provided advice concerns whether the Committee has power to inspect documents over which legal professional privilege has not been waived. Whilst the Bill does not currently contain any provision relating to waiver of legal professional privilege, the issue is being considered further and may be the subject of an amendment in this House.

The Committee has also expressed concern that the current wording of the Act may not allow the inspection (or request for a copy) of records or documents which are kept exclusively by electronic means. With the increase in information stored by electronic means, this is clearly a real problem. This Bill amends the Act to provide a power to inspect or require production of a document that is accessible only through the use of a computer or other device.

The Bill also provides the Board with additional powers in relation to the production and seizure of documents, and provides for sanctions to enforce those powers. In addition the Board may require a report from a legal practitioner in relation to a complaint. A penalty may be imposed if the practitioner fails to provide the report within the time required. This parallels the current power contained in section 77A to require reports in relation to complaints of overcharging.

This Bill also makes a number of amendments to the provisions relating to the Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal ("the Tribunal") which have been recommended by the Tribunal in its Annual Report. These include an express power for the Tribunal to receive undertakings from defaulting practitioners that he or she will, during a period specified in the undertaking, practise law according to certain conditions. There needs also to be a power for the undertaking to be varied or withdrawn from time to time upon application to the Tribunal. Any breach of the terms of the undertaking will be considered to be unprofessional conduct. The Tribunal has also requested power to direct a periodic audit of the files of a defaulting practitioner with a requirement that the practitioner bear the cost of this procedure.

At present, upon finding that a legal practitioner is guilty of unprofessional conduct, the Tribunal is empowered to order that the practitioner not practise law for a maximum period of six months otherwise than in accordance with conditions stipulated in the order. The Tribunal reports that, while this is a useful power, the period of six months is not sufficient to complete an effective professional rehabilitation program. The Tribunal notes that the alternative procedure of referring the matter to the Supreme Court for disciplinary action may not be appropriate. This Bill increases the period to twelve months.

The Bill amends the Act to allow for a member of the Tribunal who has completed the term of his or her appointment to continue as a panel member for the limited purpose of completing unfinished business assigned to the panel. The Tribunal reports that the course of disciplinary proceedings is often unpredictable and that the Tribunal has experienced difficulty in completing particular matters before the retirement of a panel member.

The Bill also provides for two of the three members of a panel to continue to hear a matter if one of the members dies or is incapacitated due to illness. This should not occur unless the consent of the practitioner has been obtained. In the event that this occurs, the panel will only be able to make a decision if both members agree (and if the members cannot agree, the charge against the practitioner may be relaid). This amendment was originally made to address the matter of a panel member who was suffering from a serious illness and not expected to return to sit on the panel. Thankfully, the member is now in good health but the amendment is still necessary to allow the Tribunal to continue to hear a matter with only two members if a member of the Tribunal falls ill or for some other reason becomes unavailable.

The amendment to section 84A of the Act makes it clear that the Tribunal may conduct an inquiry (or part of an inquiry) in private if satisfied that this necessary to protect the confidentiality of clients of the practitioner who is the subject of the inquiry.

Finally, the Bill provides that the Tribunal may require any person appearing before it to prepare a document, including a bill of costs in taxable form, which may reasonably be required for the purposes of the Tribunal's inquiries and that the Tribunal may require any person appearing before it to obey any reasonable direction of the Tribunal in order to further its inquiries.

As previously stated, the Bill includes a number of miscellaneous amendments which have been requested to "tidy up" the existing provisions of the Act. These include an amendment to ensure that individual practitioners and directors of incorporated practices must both apply to the Supreme Court for the granting of an authority to continue to practise in the event of a personal or corporate insolvency. The Council of the Law Society is in agreement with these proposals.

Section 16 of the Act is amended to make it clear that recent changes to the Corporations Law which allow a proprietary company to have only one director apply to legal practitioner companies also, and to expand the definition of "prescribed relative" to include brothers and sisters of a practitioner.

The miscellaneous amendments to the Act also include a requirement that a legal practitioner who receives trust money in the course of acting in a matter must provide the person who instructed him or her in the matter with trust account statements.

I commend this Bill to Honourable Members.

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 5—Interpretation

This clause amends section 5 of the principal Act as follows:

- the definition of "approved auditor" is amended to make it clear that the approval may be granted by the Registrar of the Supreme Court;
- a definition of "Board" is inserted and the definition of "Committee" is struck out;
- a definition of "document" is inserted to make it clear that term includes any type of document, including information stored electronically;
- the definition of "Secretary" (which is now obsolete) is struck out.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 7—Incorporation and powers of Society

This clause does not substantively amend section 7 of the principal Act but merely substitutes wording that is more consistent with recent incorporation provisions in other Acts.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 16—Issue of practising certificates

This clause amends section 16 of the principal Act to reflect changes to the *Corporations Law* that allow a proprietary company to have only one director, and to expand the definition of "prescribed relative" to include brothers and sisters of a practitioner.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 31—Disposition of trust money

This clause amends section 31 of the principal Act to require legal practitioners to provide their clients with trust account statements in accordance with regulations.

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 34—Appointment of inspector

This clause consequentially amends section 34 so that it refers merely to "documents".

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 35—Obtaining information for purposes of audit or examination

This clause consequentially amends section 35 so that it refers merely to "documents".

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 37—Confidentiality

This clause amends section 37(4) of the principal Act so that it includes matters reported to law enforcement or prosecution authorities by the Board as well as matters referred to such authorities by the Attorney-General. This is consequential to the amendment to section 77(4) of the Act. The amendment also makes it clear that information may be disclosed to the Board.

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 39—Delivery up of legal papers

This clause consequentially amends section 39 so that it refers merely to "documents".

Clause 11: Amendment of s. 42—Costs

This clause amends section 42 of the principal Act by removing the power of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs to institute proceedings for the taxation of legal costs and giving this power to the Board.

Clause 12: Amendment of s. 45—Appointment of manager

This clause consequentially amends section 45 so that it refers merely to "documents".

Clause 13: Amendment of s. 49—Supreme Court may grant authority permitting insolvent persons to practise

- This clause provides that a legal practitioner—
- who has become bankrupt or has applied to take the benefit of a law for the relief of bankrupt or insolvent debtors; or
 - who is or has been a director of an incorporated legal practitioner during the winding up of the company for the benefit of creditors,

must not practise law without the Supreme Court's authorisation. Breach of the section is punishable by a maximum fine of \$10 000.

Clause 14: Amendment of s. 57—Guarantee fund

This clause removes an incorrect reference to Part 5 in section 57 of the principal Act and provides for any fee paid to the Board to be included in the guarantee fund.

Clause 15: Amendment of s. 60—Claims

This clause amends section 60 of the principal Act to allow a successful claimant to be reimbursed for reasonable costs incurred in making the claim.

Clause 16: Amendment of s. 68—Establishment of the Legal Practitioners Complaints Board

This clause amends section 68 of the principal Act to continue the Legal Practitioners Complaints Committee as the *Legal Practitioners Complaints Board* and to constitute the Board as a body corporate with the usual powers.

Clause 17: Substitution of s. 72

This clause substitutes a new section 72 in the principal Act dealing with the Director and other staff of the Board. The new provision reflects the fact that the secretary of the Committee is now called the Director, and allows the Board to appoint the Director, with the consent of the Attorney-General. The proposed provision also incorporates the power to appoint other staff, which is currently contained in section 74(2).

Clause 18: Amendment of s. 73—Confidentiality

This clause amends section 73(2) of the principal Act so that it includes matters reported to law enforcement or prosecution authorities by the Board as well as matters referred to such authorities by the Attorney-General. This is consequential to the amendment to section 77(4) of the Act.

Clause 19: Amendment of s. 74—Functions of Board

This clause amends section 74 of the principal Act—

- to allow the Board to investigate matters of its own motion or at the direction of the Attorney-General or the Society;
- to allow the Board to prescribe fees with the consent of the Attorney-General.

The provision relating to staff currently contained in this section is removed as it is proposed to be incorporated in new section 72.

Clause 20: Amendment of heading

This clause amends the heading above sections 76 and 77 of the principal Act so that it more accurately reflects the contents of those sections.

Clause 21: Amendment of s. 76—Investigations by Board

This clause makes a number of amendments to section 76 of the principal Act as follows:

- Subsection (1) is replaced with three new subsections. New subsections (1) and (1a) are not significantly different from the current subsection (1) but are expressed in clearer terms. New subsection (1b) provides the Board with the power to decline to investigate or discontinue an investigation into a complaint that is frivolous or vexatious or where the complaint has been resolved.
- Subsections (3) and (4) are replaced to provide additional powers as follows:
 - (a) the Board may, by notice, require the production of documents at a time and place specified in a notice;
 - (b) the Board may seize documents;
 - (c) the Board may, by notice, require a report from a legal practitioner, within a time specified in notice.

The sanction for failure to comply with a requirement under the new subsections is \$10 000 or imprisonment for one year.

- the definition of "prescribed person" is amended to include a person instructing a legal practitioner.

Clause 22: Amendment of s. 77—Report on investigation

This clause repeals subsection (3) and also makes a number of minor changes to section 77 of the principal Act. Subsection (3) is removed so that reports on unsuccessful attempts to conciliate a complaint will no longer need to be made to the Attorney-General and the Society.

Secondly, the clause makes a number of consequential amendments—the wording of the section currently assumes that the Board would only be investigating a matter following receipt of a complaint, however, under the proposed amendments to section 74 the Board will be able to investigate matters even if no complaint is received.

Finally, the clause provides for the Board to report to all relevant law enforcement and prosecution authorities as well as the Attorney-General.

Clause 23: Amendment of s. 77A—Investigation of allegation of overcharging

This clause amends section 77A so that it is consistent with the amendments to section 76.

Clause 24: Amendment of s. 79—Conditions of membership
This clause amends section 79 of the principal Act to provide that a retiring member of the Tribunal may complete any part-heard matters.

Clause 25: Amendment of s. 80—Constitution and proceedings of the Tribunal

This clause amends section 80 of the principal Act to provide for the continuation of proceedings in the Tribunal where a member of the Tribunal dies or is otherwise unable to continue acting as a member. Proceedings may only be continued if the practitioner that has been charged consents to the continuation, and the Tribunal's decision in such a case must be unanimous.

Clause 26: Amendment of s. 82—Inquiries

This clause amends section 82 of the principal Act to allow the Tribunal power to accept an undertaking from a practitioner or to require some form of on-going examination of the practitioner's files and records.

Clause 27: Amendment of s. 84—Powers of Tribunal

This clause makes a number of amendments to section 84 of the principal Act. Firstly, the section is consequentially amended so that it refers only to "documents". A new paragraph is inserted in subsection (1) giving the Tribunal power to require the preparation of any document (including a bill of costs). Failure to comply with a reasonable request of the Tribunal is made an offence. Subsection (6) is deleted as its contents will be covered by proposed new section 95C, discussed below.

Clause 28: Amendment of s. 84A—Proceedings to be generally in public

This clause makes it clear that the Tribunal may conduct an inquiry in private if that is thought necessary to protect client confidentiality.

Clause 29: Amendment of s. 95—Application of certain revenues
This clause amends section 95 of the principal Act to allow the Society to be paid an amount approved by the Attorney-General, out of the money paid for practising certificates. This clause reflects the fact that the Society currently provides administrative services in relation to the provision of practising certificates and would allow the Society to be reimbursed for its associated costs.

Clause 30: Insertion of ss. 95A, 95B and 95C

This clause inserts new provisions in the principal Act as follows:

95A. Inspection of documents

This provision provides for access to documents stored electronically.

95B. False or misleading information

This provision creates a general offence of knowingly making a false or misleading statement in information provided, or a record kept, under the Act. The maximum penalty for breach of the section is a fine of \$10 000.

95C. Self-incrimination

This provision removes the privilege against self-incrimination for the purposes of obtaining information or documents under the Act. However, information or documents that would otherwise be subject to this privilege will not be admissible in evidence against the person in proceedings (other than proceedings in respect of the making of a false or misleading statement or perjury) in which the person might be found guilty of an offence or liable to a penalty.

Clause 31: Consequential amendments

This clause provides for amendment of the Act in accordance with schedule 1.

Clause 32: Revision of penalties

This clause provides for amendment of the penalties contained in the Act in accordance with schedule 2.

SCHEDULE 1

Further Amendments of Principal Act

The schedule removes all references to the "Committee" in the principal Act and replaces them with references to the "Board".

SCHEDULE 2

Revision of Penalties

The schedule amends all penalties in the principal Act and removes the references to Divisional penalties.

Mr ATKINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

WITNESS PROTECTION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 November. Page 832.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): The Opposition has carefully studied the Bill, which codifies existing police methods of protecting witnesses. The Bill is necessitated by a Commonwealth Bill codifying the same matter and warning that the Commonwealth would no longer provide State witnesses with Commonwealth documents to help them to change their identity until State witness protection legislation was passed. The Commonwealth has given the States until 18 April this year to pass such legislation.

The clauses appear to be sensible, especially those which require full disclosure by a witness of matters such as his legal obligations, financial position, immigration status and the provisions for ending protection. We also think it is reasonable for participating witnesses to sign a memorandum of understanding—something like a contract—in relation to the conditions, rights and obligations of the witness protection to be offered to such persons.

The Commissioner of Police is in charge of witness protection. The Bill allows him to arrange a change in identity for a witness and his family, broadly defined, but it does not allow the Commissioner to give the witness credentials that he does not possess. I query clause 5, which provides:

The inclusion of a witness in the program must not be done as a reward or as a means of persuading or encouraging the witness to give evidence or make a statement.

Perhaps the Minister could explain how that clause would operate.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Minister for Police): I thank the honourable member for his contribution to the debate. As the honourable member outlined, the witness protection program has operated for many years in Australia. The Commonwealth felt it appropriate to codify the program. I am not sure that everyone was as eager as the Commonwealth to do this but, having done it, we now have this issue of reciprocity and the extent to which our laws should reflect the Commonwealth legislation. To a large degree, this measure does reflect the Federal legislation.

There is still some argument about the issue raised by the honourable member in respect of whether the witness protection program involves reward, because that could be perceived as corruption of a witness, as the honourable member quite readily would recognise, and I am sure that concern was behind his question. The law provides that no person shall be paid for appearing as a witness for the prosecution or the defence, and that has been a long-honoured tradition in the legal framework handed down to us from the United Kingdom.

There is a dilemma with respect to the witness protection program. As soon as we codify the program we will have this innate difficulty. The matter is still under discussion. I advise the honourable member that a satisfactory result has not been reached as to how we can have a witness protection program that, in part, benefits witnesses. Quite often witnesses are set up under new circumstances and given some security, which they may not previously have had. They are certainly given some security in terms of being removed from the area of risk, but it goes further than that: some witnesses are given a new identity, a new home and perhaps a new job opportuni-

ty, all of which may be a great improvement on their previous circumstances.

We have a dilemma in law, and the matter is still under discussion. I am asking for the legislation to be passed, and I mention the issue raised by the very astute member for Spence: how do we manage this dilemma once we make it law, because we are doing something the law does not allow? It has been a matter of some discussion and certainly some interesting debate between the Attorney-General, the Director of Public Prosecutions and the police. I assure the honourable member that the Bill will be re-examined in another place in light of those deliberations, and there may well be some amendments that encompass the conflict and how it can be resolved if there is reward in the system.

I thank the member for Spence. He has asked a very good question. The matter is still under discussion. I am assured that, by the time the Bill gets to another place for debate, everyone will be happy with the final outcome, especially the

police, because they are the administrators of the Bill. Of course, as members would recognise, the task of the police is not always easy. Everyone would also understand that quite often the witnesses being protected are not necessarily innocent victims but may have been part and parcel of the original crime. Those dilemmas must be sorted out, and the police, the DPP, and the chief law-maker of the State, the Attorney-General, must be satisfied with the outcome. I assure the House that we will reach that level of accommodation by the time the Bill is debated in another place. I thank the member for Spence.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 4 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 19 March at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 13 February 1996

QUESTION ON NOTICE

LONSDALE INVESTMENT

41. **Ms GREIG:** What encouragement is given to potential investors to look at establishing their business in the Lonsdale area?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Investors considering the establishment of a business, whether it be in the Lonsdale area or any other area of South Australia, should consider the range of incentives and assistance which are provided through the Department of Manufacturing Industry, Small Business and Regional Development. This assistance may include advice from The Business Centre or The South Australian Centre for Manufacturing, which are business units of the Department of Manufacturing Industry, Small Business and Regional Development.

Assistance and incentive packages are tailored to meet the specific needs of individual businesses. Requests for assistance from potential investors are evaluated on a case by case basis in terms of the level of investment in South Australia and the number of jobs and potential to generate export dollars.

Recent examples of investment in the Lonsdale area include Sola Optical which has invested \$3.5 million in a new state-of-the-art research and development facility and Transitions Optical, a US based optical manufacturer which has established operations adjacent to Sola.

In addition investors considering the Lonsdale area should contact the Southern Development Board Adelaide for advice and assistance from that organisation.

A list of programs administered by the Department of Manufacturing Industry, Small Business and Regional Development includes:

- Industry Investment Fund
- AusIndustry
- Enterprise Improvement Program
- The Jobs Package
- New Exporters Challenge Scheme
- Consultancy Grant Scheme
- Business Information