HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 3 July 1996

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Bank Merger (BankSA and Advance Bank),
Competition Policy Reform (South Australia),
Country Fires (Audit Requirements) Amendment,
Electricity Corporations (Schedule 4) Amendment,
National Electricity (South Australia),
Public Finance and Audit (Powers of Enquiry) Amendment,
Statutes Amendment (Mediation, Arbitration and Referral),
Wills (Effect of Termination of Marriage) Amendment.

SHOOTING BANS

A petition signed by 1 983 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to ban the recreational shooting of ducks and quails was presented by the Hon. D.C. Wotton.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 68, 72, 73, 76, 85, 90, 92 to 98, 100 and 104.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I bring up the twenty-seventh report of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Has the Premier expressed his concern to the Prime Minister about the Howard Government's decision to cut resources to the NCA office in Adelaide and, if not, will he raise this issue with the Prime Minister during his visit to Adelaide this week? The Premier will be aware that the number of NCA staff has been cut in South Australia from 33 to 10. I am informed that this is the biggest cut of any NCA office in the nation, even though the Adelaide office was bombed two years ago, killing Detective Sergeant Bowen.

Last week, evidence before the New Zealand parliamentary inquiry into links between organised crime and motorcycle gangs revealed strong connections between New Zealand and Sydney based gangs with franchised motorcycle crime gangs in Adelaide and Mount Gambier. I am told that one gang established its headquarters in a house in Adelaide's inner southern suburbs, and that in Mount Gambier gangs are involved in running a brothel and a nightclub. Police evidence in New Zealand—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN:—this is a very serious issue—revealed that motorcycle gangs in that country and in Australia were involved in the manufacture and distribution of amphetamines and other drugs as well as other crimes including homicide, extortion and the intimidation of witnesses. I have provided a copy of the New Zealand police report to the South Australian Police Commissioner, David Hunt. Last year, the NCA launched an investigation into the criminal activities of gangs in all States, including South Australia, as a vital back-up to South Australia's own Operation Titan.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, I assure the Leader of the Opposition that this issue is being considered by both the Attorney-General and the Minister for Police. The Minister for Police is actually with the Federal Attorney-General today discussing guns, and I understand that the Minister for Police and the Attorney-General are following the matter through with the Federal Government. I understand that this is a matter that the Minister for Police will raise with the Federal Attorney-General today. Therefore, it is being taken up with the Federal Government. The impact of that on overall NCA inquiries in South Australia is a matter for those discussions.

The SPEAKER: Order! Questions which would normally be taken by the Deputy Premier should be referred to the Premier; questions which would be taken by the Minister for Health and by the Minister for Emergency Services should be referred to the Minister for Tourism; and questions which would be directed to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources should be referred to the Minister for Infrastructure.

PARKS HIGH SCHOOL

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Will the Premier inform the House of the Government's response to criticism of lack of consultation over the closure of The Parks High School and of the steps taken by the Government to engage in consultation on this issue?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The member for Price, who I see is not in the House today, has raised—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, if the member for Price is coming into the House shortly, that is fine, but I wanted to raise the matter while he was here.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. I suggest to members that they not continue to engage in talk across the Chamber. It does not help Question Time, and if members do not want to ask questions but want to engage in that sort of behaviour, I will call on the business of the day. The Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The member for Price raised this issue in the Parliament yesterday afternoon—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—and specifically criticised the Government for lack of consultation concerning the

closure of The Parks High School. He has also raised this question by way of Question Time and debate in the House previously. I think it is about time that the House understood the extent to which the member for Price and, it appears, the Labor Party are trying to play politics with this issue. I am delighted that the member for Price is now here, because as I have just said he raised the matter in the House yesterday.

On 5 June, my appointments secretary wrote to the member for Price advising him that the Minister for Education was willing to give him a briefing, and setting down a time and a place for that briefing to discuss with him the closure of The Parks High School. On 25 June, which is the date on which the briefing was supposed to take place, the member for Price failed to make any contact at all. He did not appear—in other words, he did not attend—and he did not apologise. There was no call from his electorate office to cancel the meeting, and there was no call after the appointment.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes, the honourable member sent a fax on 19 June indicating that he wanted to see me, but the appointment had been set up with the Minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows the rules

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I acknowledge the fact that the member for Price sent back a political letter in which he stated that he had no confidence in the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Only yesterday the honourable member told the House that there had been no consultation whatsoever yet, when he asked to consult the Minister and the Minister set down a time to see him, the honourable member did not turn up. The honourable member did not apologise for not turning up, nor did he get his secretary to ring through some form of apology. That clearly highlights the extent to which the member for Price is apparently more interested in playing politics on the closure of The Parks school than keeping an appointment with the Minister for Education and Children's Services to discuss any of the facts or put his own case to the Minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Giles has had more than a fair go, and the Minister for Tourism is included in that.

GALLANTRY

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier ask the Minister for Police to apologise to a police sergeant and a senior firefighter for suggesting that they were drinking on duty? Yesterday in this House I asked the Minister for Emergency Services why the m.v. *Gallantry* was not used in search and rescue operations to find two men missing at sea. A tape of an official communications log between the police and the fire brigade emergency response rooms reveals that operational officers believed the m.v. *Gallantry* could not be used because of orders from the Emergency Services Minister. The Minister for Emergency Services has denied any such order, but the Minister for Police suggested outside this House that the officers concerned had been drinking, which has caused offence to the professionalism of both the police and our fire service. The Minister for Police said:

> Well, they might have been having a drink at the time, they might have been thinking of other things, who knows, I mean you can always, it's always when you stand around and you think of all the possible reasons some of them can be quite bizarre.

Firefighters today have called for an immediate apology from you, Premier, and your Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! The last part of the question is comment.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, the question as put by the Leader of the Opposition is entirely false with respect to what the Minister for Police said yesterday.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is entirely false. The question was that the Police Minister had specifically accused these particular people of being drunk at the time. He did not claim that at all, and the Leader of the Opposition knows that. It is just like the other questions put up yesterday. Day after day, Opposition members stand in this House and make claims that are not true at all; just as we heard yesterday the shadow Treasurer asserting that the Deputy Premier had accused all teachers of being maniacs. That is not what the Treasurer said at all: he said that the union leadership was acting like maniacs. There is a big difference between the union leadership and all teachers in terms of any accusation being made. Equally, the Leader of the Opposition has taken a claim and put forward—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: That is the exact quote.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader today for the second time in very close succession.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I invite the Leader of the Opposition to look at the question because, although he might have quoted from part of the tape, the question puts an entirely different slant on it. The answer is: there is no need for an apology.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is off the question list today.

ETSA LAND

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Will the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development advise the House of any plans that ETSA might have for the area of vacant land at Chandlers Hill near the Happy Valley reservoir? Yesterday, on the front page of the Hills Messenger Press, it was reported that ETSA plans to build a new substation at Chandlers Hill on vacant land near the Happy Valley reservoir. I understand that many service organisations and a school are interested in this land.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Following a review by SA Water of its water management practices at Happy Valley reservoir, a decision has been made to sell off one or two hectares of land south of Chandlers Hill Road. The proceeds from the sale of the land will be used by SA Water to upgrade other stormwater and drainage in that area. Therefore, under its commercial charter, which I tabled in the Parliament yesterday, SA Water is seeking to maximise the full potential from the sale of the land while consulting with the community on its needs and priorities. The first stage of this proposed sale of land has been to engage Bone & Tonkin Planners to look at the options. In conjunction with the City of Happy Valley, a concept plan has been developed which sets out the current needs of the community.

Over considerable time representations have been made to me by community groups and certainly the local members in relation to the following: an appropriate emergency

services site for the CFS and ambulance as required; traffic safety for the corner of Education Road and Chandlers Hill Road; the longer term need to earmark a substation near the existing power lanes for future ETSA expansion within the area; a commercial site; and demand for local land for community services.

I think only this week I received a request from one of the church based school groups in the area for land to be made available for expansion of that school in that locality. Following talks with the council, a concept plan has been developed by the planners in conjunction with SA Water. Of course, that is the necessary first step in any rezoning. A plan amendment report is to be developed and will be submitted, as is the normal process, to the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. That will then involve extensive community consultation as part of the assessment of the proposal.

I wish to correct the comments contained in the Messenger Press. An agreement has been reached to transfer an emergency services site to the council. No other agreements have been made and, despite the unchecked—as the Messenger Press puts it—resident rumour that a licence has been issued for a petrol station, we checked with the Retail Outlets Board and it has no record of any application for a petroleum products licence in the vicinity, let alone having approved one.

In summary, the community concerns that have been heightened as a result of inaccurate reporting by the Messenger Press are premature. The proper planning and consultation process is being used. SA Water's prime objectives are protection of the quality of water in the reservoir and the community's water supply. Any final decision in relation to the disposal of land will be made only after full community consultation. That is happening now and will continue to happen in the process.

PARALOWIE HOUSE

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education explain why he told the Estimates Committee that he had never been asked to fund the youth training and support centre, Paralowie House, when in fact he received a letter dated 4 March 1996 asking about funding and to which he personally replied on 19 March? The Minister told the Estimates Committee:

> To my knowledge we have never been asked to fund it. I cannot recall ever having seen a specific request relating to funding Paralowie House.

On 4 March Paralowie House wrote to the Minister asking about funding from the Cash Grants for Youth Enterprises program. On 19 March the Minister wrote back saying that he had referred the matter to his department. In the Minister's handwriting the letter begins, 'Dear Jim.' On 26 April the Minister's department wrote to Paralowie House advising that its request for funding under another program had been rejected.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I guess you are referring to Alexander the Great. I take that as a compliment.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: We need to distinguish two aspects. Regarding the accommodation side of Paralowie House, my department does not fund accommodation but labour market programs, so there is some confusion in terms of what the honourable member alleged. As I discovered, the department did get a letter requesting funding for a labour market program, not to fund the house as an entity. It is quite a different thing to fund an entity that is involved in a range of services to young people as opposed to a request relating to an employment program. The answer was provided by Cathy Tuncks, who is the manager of the employment division: she indicated that the request could not be met at that stage. I have been asked by the Paralowie House people to visit it. I have agreed to do that, and we are in the process of finalising a time. I repeat: the confusion in the honourable member's mind comes from the distinction between the aggregate of a house that does a whole range of things that we do not intend to fund and a labour market program for which I have responsibility.

TOURISM STATISTICS

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): Will the Minister for Tourism inform the House of latest Australian Bureau of Statistics figures on demand for accommodation across South Australia, and what picture can be drawn from this information?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The member for Norwood is always interested in improving figures, particularly in tourism—and I am quite sure in improving figures in his own electorate. The latest figures from the ABS show that South Australian hotels and motels continue to enjoy a high level of demand amongst tourists and visitors. The March quarter figure shows a record number of hotel and motel room sales, indicating an increase of 6 per cent in demand when compared with the same period last year. The increases were recorded in the following sectors: nights occupied in holiday flats, units and houses rose some 15 per cent, and visitor hostel guest nights rose by 10 per cent in the Adelaide area.

The regions to record increases during the March quarter include the Lower North, Whyalla, Port Pirie, the Barossa, the Flinders, Kangaroo Island, the Murray-Mallee, the Riverland and the Fleurieu Peninsula. For the State as a whole, four and five star establishments recorded the highest occupancy rate for the quarter—73 per cent altogether. Takings for accommodation increased by 10.7 per cent to $41.9 million for the quarter compared with the same period last year. ABS results also show that employment rose in all accommodation sectors.

Results highlight the positive impact of the Special Events March Festival of Arts and the State tourism sector, and also point to a steady performance within the accommodation sector, consolidating gains of the previous quarter. The other area which is not included in the statistics and which has shown significant growth is the bed and breakfast area. This morning, I again had the privilege of releasing the bed and breakfast group's brochure for 1996-97. This group has done an absolutely magnificent job. Some two to three years ago it had 30 members; today it has 160 members, with everybody having a four or four and a half star rating, most of them in heritage buildings or luxury units. The bed and breakfast group, involved with accommodation in the State, has been one of the superstars of the tourism industry.

TAFE SALARIES

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Has the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education been pressured to cease his direct involvement in the current TAFE dispute, and does he still believe that TAFE teaching staff deserve a salary

increase of up to 13 per cent? Almost two weeks ago, the Minister is reported as saying:

> At the moment, I am authorised by Cabinet to offer them up to 12 per cent. I believe they deserve a pay rise, and I am keen that they be offered up to 13 per cent.

A newspaper report today claims that the Minister has now been pressured to keep out of negotiations.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I have not been pressured to keep out of anything. The appropriate Minister is the Minister for Industrial Affairs. I do not know where the 13 per cent in the *Advertiser* came from, because I did not mention that figure. The statement was made in the presence of my media officer, so it came completely out of left field. I have always said that TAFE staff deserve a pay rise, we have offered up to 12 per cent and for the last 2 per cent we are looking for trade-offs. I am keen that the TAFE staff should get their pay rise: they deserve one.

CANE TOADS

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): Will the Minister for Primary Industries tell the House what the Government has undertaken to keep the feral cane toad from Queensland out of South Australia? At least two cane toads have been discovered in South Australia in past weeks. Expert scientists, such as Professor Tyler of the University of Adelaide, have commented on the danger that they represent to our State if we allow them to get established. They are known to adapt rapidly to new ecosystems, and they are omnivorous, eating both dead and living organisms. They are widely regarded by these experts as being potentially more damaging and devastating than carp, fruit fly, cutworms and feral cats all rolled into one. It is just as well that they do not have wings or they might give it to us from both ends.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thank the member for Ridley for his question and healthy contribution to the answer. It has become apparent that some people in South Australia may be keeping cane toads as pets. Therefore, appropriate action is warranted and necessary. Through the Animal and Pest Plant Control Commission, we have asked people with cane toads to hand them in, and we have declared a one month amnesty. This follows the weekend discovery of a cane toad near the Paradise O-Bahn interchange. Experts tell us that, because of the size of the cane toad, it is highly likely that it has been kept as a pet. It is the second cane toad to have been found in the past few weeks. The other was a smaller one, which was found at Victor Harbor. Officers there believe that it probably came as a stowaway in a shipment of goods from Queensland. The commission has implemented an action plan to inform the public and seek cooperation in keeping a lookout for other cane toads. A search has also been started by officers of the commission and of local councils.

If cane toads became established in South Australia, they could have a significant impact on local fauna, hence on the environment. People discovered keeping cane toads face a maximum penalty of six months' imprisonment or a $2 000 fine. However, as I said, people will not be penalised if cane toads are turned in by the end of July. I encourage members of the public to report any knowledge of cane toads, as the keeping of these pests is not acceptable.

NATIONAL COMMISSION OF AUDIT

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Given that the Premier hailed the report of the National Commission of Audit, can he confirm that he supports the recommendations of the report on aged care, family services, post-secondary education and the regional development program? A press report of 21 June states:

> The Premier. . . hailed the audit report, saying billions of dollars would be saved by adopting its recommendations. . .

The Audit Commission report recommends means tested entry fees for aged care accommodation; a 10 per cent cut to family services; the abolition of the regional development program; and much larger contributions from students and their families towards the funding of the post-secondary education system.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, let me put in context what I said. I hailed the report in terms of the opportunity to bring about a fundamental restructuring of Commonwealth-State relations—the biggest such opportunity probably in 95 years under the system of Federation that we have. What I also said, and what the Leader of the Opposition did not read, was that we did not necessarily agree with all the recommendations.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In particular, I indicated that the Government would now be examining the National Audit Commission Report and, as a result, finally putting down its position, and that would cover the sort of issues raised. I have already said that the Government does not have a position on those specific areas and that we are looking at them: there are parts of the report that we disagree with.

I highlight the fact that the National Audit Commission Report creates an opportunity for a fundamental restructuring of Commonwealth-State relations as regards cutting out much of the duplication that developed over the past 12 years under the national Labor Government. Also, it highlights the areas where taxpayers' money is being wasted. It has been suggested that up to $500 million is being wasted through duplication throughout the whole of Australia, and as a State Government we are keen to cut out that duplication as, I am sure, are the taxpayers of Australia. Therefore, through the National Audit Commission Report, we will be looking for ways to do that.

We also would welcome the opportunity to take on the responsibility in a number of areas, as highlighted by the report. In terms of the specifics of the issues raised, the Government is yet to formulate a position.

POWERLINES, UNDERGROUNDING

Mr EVANS (Davenport): Last week a public meeting was held in the Mitcham council area to discuss proposed Optus broadband or overhead cabling. Can the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development advise the House what options ETSA faces in planning for the undergrounding of powerlines in South Australia?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The member for Davenport and the member for Colton have raised with me some residents' concerns about the broadband cable that Optus is proposing to erect, as well as concerns about the portable telephone towers being erected on infrastructure such as ETSA substations and the like within the Adelaide metropolitan

area. In this State, as opposed to other States of Australia, ETSA has set a benchmark in undergrounding powerlines.

We have about 8 300 kilometres undergrounded at the moment—about 10 per cent of the network of the electricity system and well ahead of New South Wales and Victoria, which has about 4 per cent undergrounded. ETSA's current annual contribution is set to revenue, and we are contributing some $2.9 million this year for the further undergrounding of powerlines in South Australia. In addition, we have earmarked any net rent from the Optus string-out of cables to be added to the undergrounding program to accelerate that program in South Australia.

It ought to be understood that to underground all powerlines in South Australia, on an independent consultant's assessment, would cost $10 billion. The Federal member, Senator Schacht, keeps calling on the Government of South Australia to underground. I consistently replied to Senator Schacht that we would be pleased to go to a broad undergrounding program if the then Commonwealth Government was prepared to underwrite part of the $10 billion cost.

Other than the constant public statements, there was never any dollar commitment from the then Federal Government to assist in that undergrounding program. Senator Schacht's answer to that was simply to bump up the power prices in South Australia to undertake the undergrounding program. That is totally inconsistent with the objective of this Government to reduce business and residential costs—consumer costs—in South Australia for power. We are reducing those costs: we have consistently done so over the past few years and will continue to do so through the increased productivity and efficiency gains of ETSA being passed on for the benefit of all consumers and businesses in South Australia.

In relation to Telstra and Optus, it needs to be understood by the House that under the Federal Government's Telecommunications Act, which was passed by the former Labor Government and which stays in place until July 1997, the State of South Australia has no rights in either the stringing of Optus cables on telephone poles or the infrastructure that it wants to put in place for its mobile telephones, whether it be at Fulham or in streets in other suburbs within the metropolitan area of Adelaide.

The Federal Act totally overrides any South Australian Act or any initiative we in South Australia may want to take. In fact, the Federal Act is so prescriptive that, if we do not agree, they can simply go ahead, and any costs associated with that will be referred to arbitration in due course. Let it be clearly understood that the State Government and ETSA have no rights in relation to refusing Optus stringing out its cable. Faced with that fundamental fact, we have sought to get a good deal for South Australia. We sought to get the rent per pole increased to the higher level of those agreed to around Australia. We have taken the next step and said that any revenue flow from the rent of our power poles to Optus or Telstra will be dedicated funds that will go to the powerline environment committee for further undergrounding, accelerating the undergrounding program in South Australia.

For example, if the revenue from Optus stringing out its cables in Norwood is $100 000, those funds will be dedicated to the undergrounding of further powerlines in Norwood. In other words, where the rent is collected it will go back to that same locality for an accelerated undergrounding program in consultation with the local council. We have brokered a deal that tries to meet the needs of local government and residents in South Australia. We recognise that under the former Federal Government's legislation we have, at the end of the day, simply no rights in the matter. The same applies in the western suburbs where mobile telephone infrastructure is being erected on some ETSA installations: once again, ETSA has no rights. It needs to be clearly understood that the Federal Government, Optus and Telstra can proceed to install that equipment with or without the agreement of the Government of South Australia and with or without the agreement of ETSA in the use of its infrastructure.

We are working to minimise the impact on our environment from the cable string-out. We have been making representations to the current and former Federal Governments as to what ought to flow from that, and we have also been constantly communicating to them residents' concern about this infrastructure being put in place in South Australia. We will pursue the option of getting the best deal under these circumstances for South Australia.

HEALTH, FEDERAL FUNDING

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Following the Premier's statement yesterday in relation to Commonwealth funding that 'the cut in health will be less than 3 per cent and will be relatively small', is the Premier aware that a cut of only 2 per cent would total $27.8 million? The health budget is predicated on an increase in specific purpose payments of $15 million. As total specific purpose payments for health are estimated to be $640 million, a cut of 2 per cent would be another $12.8 million. Added together, this would mean a hole of $27.8 million in the health budget, and this is equivalent to the total budget for the Yorke, Lower North and Barossa region, which incorporates 10 hospitals, four domiciliary care services, the Lower North Community Health Centre and the Southern and Northern Yorke Peninsula health services. That is what you call a small cut.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has been here long enough to know that she is out of order. I warn the member for Elizabeth that she has continually made that sort of comment at the end of her question. If she keeps it up, she knows what the result will be. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, I highlight to the honourable member that here is another classic example of the Opposition's trying to take entirely out of context statements made to the House. If the honourable member will listen, she will be embarrassed by the extent to which she has just done that. First, I indicated that the total effect of the cuts to South Australia in special purpose payments would be $33 million right across the board for the $1.1 billion special purpose payments that the State Government receives. Therefore, how can the honourable member possibly turn around and try to claim that $27 million of the $33 million will be cut out of the health area? That is clearly not the case whatsoever, because the cut in health will be small in percentage terms compared with the cuts to other areas. When one looks at the facts I put down, the honourable member's claim that this would cost $27 million in health areas is entirely false.

We have been told that the total cut to special purpose payments will be up to but no more than 3 per cent right across the $1 100 million that the State Government receives. As I outlined to the House yesterday, that equates to $33 million. Some of the areas where that will be cut have not yet been identified and will not be identified until the budget is brought down on 20 August. I suggest that the honourable member stop trying to fantasise and stop trying to fabricate

a story. I ask the honourable member to wait for the facts and then look at those facts after the budget. But, in the meantime, the member for Elizabeth should not go out and fabricate, which she has a great propensity to do.

TRADE, GULF STATES

Mr BUCKBY (Light): Will the Minister for Primary Industries tell the House what opportunities he believes exist for South Australian companies to export to the United Arab Emirates? I believe that this morning the Minister addressed a group of business people from the Gulf States with a view to export potential.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: It was actually yesterday morning that I addressed a group of business people from the United Arab Emirates who are visiting Australia as part of a new transport link between the two regions. Indeed, it was good to see 90 local business people join them for the seminar. The first Emirates airline flight to Australia brought some highly influential business people from the Gulf States to Adelaide and, indeed, to the other States as well. Recently, I made a brief visit to Dubai and was impressed by the opportunities which exist for bilateral trade between South Australia and the Emirates. There are a number of similarities between the two regions, not the least being the fact that we both see ourselves as important hubs for major export markets. Certainly, in Australia we believe that we are an excellent launching pad into the South-East Asian market and, likewise, Dubai sees itself as a major hub to re-export goods into the Middle East and Europe.

A massive amount of development is under way in the UAE. In 1995, Australian exports to the UAE totalled about $430 million, of which agriculture accounted for about $150 million, and one-third of that actually came out of South Australia. The Gulf States are therefore a very important market for our produce. In particular, livestock, meat products, wheat, barley, pulses, fruit and vegetables are probably the major items at the moment, but there are also enormous opportunities in respect of dairy and seafood industries, as well as cut and dried flowers.

There are now emerging transport links to the Gulf States. Yesterday's visit was coordinated by Austrade and is an excellent example of the important connections starting to emerge between Australia and the Middle East. With direct flights, transport time is cut, and this opens up markets for more produce than previously. Dubai can certainly be a staging place for opening up some lucrative markets into the Middle East and, as I mentioned before, also Europe. Exporters need to look at the ultra modern port and storage facilities at the Jebel Ali free zone near Dubai, because it presents Australian companies with an excellent chance of getting their goods into the region.

AUSTRALIS MEDIA

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Is the Premier confident that Australis Media will meet the employment target of 750 jobs by 1998-99 as announced by the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development at the time the reported $28 million incentive deal was struck with the Government?

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson is also off the question list.

Mr FOLEY: Last week, further voluntary redundancy letters were handed out to workers by the management of Australis Media. When I asked the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development about employment numbers at Australis Media during the Estimates Committee last week, he said that I should put this question to the Premier and not to him as Minister.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I will repeat the answer that I gave the member for Hart during the Estimates Committee last week.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked his question. It is entirely up to the Government to determine which Minister will respond. The Minister for Infrastructure has the call.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the Deputy Leader for the second time.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The attraction of Australis to South Australia was an important first step after the election of the Brown Liberal Government to establish credibility in back office operations and customer service centres within South Australia, and it was an important step in attracting other companies, such as Westpac, Link Communications and BT, to South Australia. In relation to the support and incentives that have been given to Australis, the simple fact is that the largest part of that incentive and support is a purpose-built building at Technology Park.

The member for Hart knows full well that there is a dearth of accommodation at Technology Park to meet the needs and requirements of companies that want to establish there. In the unfortunate event that Australis should not continue—and I know that the member for Hart would not wish that to occur, because we want to keep those jobs in South Australia for South Australians—the fact is that the Government owns the building and would have replacement tenants in that building within a short space of time.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Well, I invite the member for Hart to take up with the MFP Corporation—all he need do is make a phone call—the list of companies that are interested in going into accommodation at Technology Park.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart has been in this Chamber long enough to know that his behaviour is out of order. I do not know whether certain members want to be named, but if that is the case the Chair will accommodate them. The Chair will name the next member who performs.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: There is protection for South Australian taxpayers in respect of the buildings at Technology Park: let that be well and truly understood. With respect to Australis, clearly its financial difficulties over the past 12 or 18 months have been well reported. Attempts are being made to put in place new financing arrangements. Those financing arrangements are currently subject to ACCC consideration. I hope that ACCC will sign off in terms of the new financing arrangements with Australis, because if it does there will be a continuation of that facility in South Australia. Importantly, Mr Rod Price, the Chairman, has given me a personal commitment that that facility will remain in South Australia. So, I hope the financing arrangements are agreed to, and I hope ACCC ticks that off.

I hope, therefore, to retain that core structure in South Australia. It is an employer of people in South Australia. It has been important in the repositioning of South Australia in

the market as a back office location. The announcement of the Government's telecommunications contract with AAPT from 1 July removes call disadvantage to the Eastern seaboard of Australia where 85 per cent of the population reside. So, a disadvantage that might have been there yesterday is not there as at 1 July this year, and that will be a basis upon which we will re-market South Australia—the Department of Information and Industry is now taking over that role—as a back office location by removing the call disadvantage. It is an important outcome of the outsourcing contract for telecommunications for Government that will position South Australia as the 'low cost of operation' State—a reason to put back office operations in the State of South Australia and build on the examples of Westpac, Australis, BT and Link Communications. I know the Opposition does not like it, but the simple fact is that jobs, jobs, jobs are being created as a result of our policy.

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Will the Premier put into context the headline in this morning's newspaper that 900 jobs may be lost from Australian National and state what circumstances have led to any potential job loss?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: When I saw that headline this morning, I thought the first question the Labor Party would ask in the House today would be about that potential for 900 job losses. Here we are almost through Question Time and there has been no question from the Labor Party on this subject. I suggest to the House that there are some very good reasons for that, and I would like to highlight to the House why the Labor Party has been silent on this issue. First, I point out that this so-called loss of 900 jobs is being potentially looked at by the Australian National Board. No decision has yet been made by the board, and those jobs are reflected across the whole of Australia not necessarily just South Australia. However, some of those job losses, and perhaps even the majority of them, could be here in South Australia.

This is the result of what Labor Governments (both Federal and State) put in place, beginning in 1991 and culminating in decisions by Federal Labor Government Minister Laurie Brereton last year. A mistake was made by the Federal Labor Government in deciding to set up a National Rail Corporation in 1991 and not making that corporation Australian National. What the Federal Labor Government did was to set a die which would automatically have a huge impact on the future of Australian National, the head office of which was based in Adelaide together with the majority of its work force. Secondly—and we all know that this is the truth and that it is highly embarrassing for the Labor Party—in 1991 the Labor Government, under the leadership of John Bannon, decided not to participate—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I inform the Deputy Leader that, if he thinks he can continue to defy the Chair, he will be suspended for four days. If he interjects again, I will name him without further warning. He knows the consequences. No-one can say that the honourable member has not been warned.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In 1991, the Bannon Labor Government in South Australia took a conscious decision not to participate in the National Rail Corporation or to be a shareholder or to take a board position. We know that the Leader of the Opposition sat around the Cabinet table and was part of that decision-making process. Therefore, the then Labor Government automatically locked itself out of any future decisions concerning the National Rail Corporation.

In September 1995 and again in January 1996, Laurie Brereton allowed the National Rail Corporation to buy 120 new locomotives, which were to be manufactured in Queensland and Western Australia and serviced in Victoria. There was no mention whatsoever of South Australia. So, here we had a Federal Labor Government without consultation with the State of South Australia, which had the most to lose, deciding to go ahead and manufacture 120 locomotives in other States of Australia and have them serviced in Victoria.

Clearly, the State Labor Government was negligent for, first, failing to make sure that South Australia had a shareholding or a formal seat on the board reporting back to the State and, secondly, failing to make sure that any National Rail Corporation was based around Australian National in this State. Laurie Brereton also specifically asked Australian National to put down a business plan, but he then failed to approve of or table any business plan prior to the Federal election. In other words, Laurie Brereton knew all along that he was setting in place something that would have a very damaging effect on South Australia.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It would appear that the former Labor Government in South Australia did roll over—absolutely rolled over. It took no interest in the future of Australian National and took no interest in protecting our rights. It was up to our Minister to write to Laurie Brereton, pointing out the conditions under the Railway Agreement 1977. Of course, that agreement was put in place by the State Labor Government, led by Don Dunstan (the mentor of the Leader of the Opposition). The agreement appeared to include some protection for South Australia because it required the South Australian Minister for Transport to be consulted about any redundancies but, if no agreement could be reached, the matter was to go to arbitration. Therefore, it no longer gave South Australia absolute protection.

We are faced today with an agreement put in place by two Labor Governments back in 1977, with a more recent plan put in place in 1991 by the then Federal Labor Government under Paul Keating and the then South Australian Labor Government under Bannon, whereby South Australia, through Australian National, is likely to miss out on literally hundreds of jobs simply because the Labor Government of South Australia failed to once again stand up and fight for this State. I can assure all members that we will exercise our rights under the Railway Agreement, even though those rights and powers are less than we would have liked because they do not give us absolute protection.

I stress that the Leader of the Opposition has not asked a question on this issue in the House today, despite the headline in the newspaper this morning, because he knows that it was the Federal Labor Government, under Laurie Brereton as Minister for Transport, that set in place this loss of jobs in South Australia. The Leader knows darn well that Laurie Brereton let a contract that went to Queensland, Western Australia and Victoria, and the Leader was not prepared to stand up and criticise Laurie Brereton.

INDUSTRIAL LEGISLATION, FEDERAL

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Why is the Premier supporting the Howard Government's industrial legislation when the

State Employee Ombudsman, who has statutory responsibility to look after the interests of all employees in matters involving enterprise agreements, disagrees with each of the principal tenets of the Howard legislation? Yesterday, the Premier supported the whole of the Howard Government's industrial legislation, which does not provide a role for the Industrial Relations Commission to scrutinise enterprise agreements or subject them to a no-disadvantages test.

On 27 June this year, the Employee Ombudsman wrote to the Senate committee inquiry into the legislation, describing the continuing role of the Industrial Commission in scrutinising all enterprise agreements as 'essential to the success of the whole enterprise bargaining process'. The Employee Ombudsman argued that the 'employers are prevented from negotiating agreements that are detrimental to the interests of their business and their employees'.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The legislation to which the honourable member refers has passed the Lower House of the Federal Parliament and is currently before the Senate committee. It is my understanding that, some time in October this year, the Senate committee will release a report recommending changes to the Bill. The Senate committee is headed by a Labor Senator. A request was made last week for all State Governments to submit a report, which we did, as did all other State Governments, recommending the direction the Senate ought to take on this Bill.

The whole issue of the Bill is before the Parliament for debate, and any comment that this Government or the Premier might make is quite irrelevant relative to the passage of that Bill in the Federal Parliament. I would have thought that the honourable member would clearly know that any statement made by me, the Premier, or anyone in this State about legislation that is still progressing through a Parliament in another jurisdiction is quite superfluous. The fact is that the legislation is there and it will be debated. The Premier said yesterday that he supported in principle the legislation before the Parliament, and the legislation before the Parliament was part of Federal Liberal Party policy at the last election.

That legislation has many similar attributes to the State legislation. It is based fundamentally on arguments put forward by this State in an effort to achieve good, harmonious legislation right across Australia. I would expect the Premier to support that harmonious legislation as it picks up fundamentally what we have in this State. I thank the honourable member for the question, and I note that it was the sort of industrial question that normally gets passed along the line. It is a very good question, but it is too early for an answer to be given.

TAFE-RESTAURANT PARTNERSHIP

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education provide information about a new program that will see TAFE and a leading Australian restaurant chain form a new training partnership?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I thank the member for Chaffey, who has been very successful recently in ensuring that bridges are built in his electorate, and we congratulate him on that. The news I am releasing today again confirms the fact that TAFE South Australia is highly regarded throughout Australia. The Sizzler chain of restaurants has entered into a contract with TAFE South Australia to train people, and today 42 people (mainly unemployed people) are being interviewed for possible traineeships with the Sizzler chain of restaurants throughout Australia. All indications are that the curriculum and other materials developed by TAFE South Australia, in its excellent training system, will be available throughout Australia.

That good announcement builds on the recent announcement that EDS has established its Asia Pacific Education Centre at the Adelaide Institute of TAFE, and that the Cordon Bleu Cooking School and the Swiss Hotels Association have an ongoing relationship at the Regency centre. For the benefit of members, I should like to highlight the extent of the hospitality training that is provided within the TAFE system in South Australia. Members would know that I am a very modest person, but I now have more restaurants in South Australia than Kentucky Fried Chicken, McDonald's or Hungry Jacks. Regency has two excellent restaurants, Latham's Scholars and the Graduates restaurants; the Adelaide campus has Martinhas and the recently refurbished Rosinas; the Torrens Valley campus has Celias; and there is a new restaurant at the Noarlunga Campus of Onkaparinga, John Reynell.

In addition, we have training restaurants all through country areas. In fact, last week I visited the Barossa Valley and attended a gala dinner at the Nuriootpa campus under the guidance of the training chef, Daniel Coad. It was a fantastic night and further testimony to the excellence of hospitality training in South Australia. It is important to pay credit to the restaurant and hotel industry in South Australia for the way in which they have worked with TAFE to ensure that our restaurants and hotels have not only the best quality meals but the best value meals in Australia. Restaurants and hotels have taken a positive view that training is essential and, rather than viewing TAFE restaurants as competition, they understand that TAFE is developing a high standard hospitality service in this country.

To conclude, I invite members who have not visited any of those restaurants to make sure they do so, and that they invite members of the public to go along and enjoy the excellent service and value which has obviously been a factor in attracting Sizzler to sign a deal with TAFE and which will result in more people being trained—with the work and benefits of TAFE being distributed throughout Australia.

ETSA SEPARATION PACKAGES

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Will the Minister for Infrastructure confirm that ETSA is offering power line workers modified voluntary separation packages to allow these workers to work for a private company contracted to ETSA and, if so, does this contradict the Premier's commitment that, once workers have accepted a separation package, they are not able to accept Government work for a further three years? The Opposition is in possession of ETSA documents seeking variations to separation packages that would discount the value of the package by 25 per cent in return for the possibility of undertaking work for ETSA as a contractor for up to 25 per cent of their time during the first three years after leaving. In the 1994 Estimates the Premier stated that persons accepting a package were not eligible for Government work for a period of three years.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, it does not cut across the Premier's instruction. In fact, the Premier approved the arrangements for the ETSA workers. It has also received endorsement from the Office of Public Sector Management as an appropriate and practical response to a requirement in the community.

WOOL INDUSTRY

Mr VENNING (Custance): Will the Minister for Primary Industries update the House on moves by some sections of the wool industry to change the selling system for the wool stockpile? A series of grower meetings were held in the State last week. I understand that the Minister was represented at a meeting in Port Lincoln and that he attended a similar meeting in Burra.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thank the member for Custance for his question. Like you, Mr Speaker, and all members, he is taking much interest in the current debate in the wool industry. As the honourable member said, meetings were held last week, including one on Kangaroo Island which attracted over 300 wool growers. I addressed the Burra meeting of more than 130 people and it was obvious there was dissatisfaction with the current low prices and the future of the wool stockpile. That continues to be a major issue not only in South Australia but right around the country. The roll-up at meetings Australia-wide in the last couple of weeks has emphasised how important that issue is and that there is a strong desire for change within the wool industry. Obviously, the South Australian Government is genuinely concerned about the impact of a sustained weakness in the market and the effect that is having on the return to growers in the State's wool industry.

We cannot lose sight of the fact that sheep and sheep products still comprise 12.5 per cent of the State's total export income. In the wool industry, times are indeed very tough. The major contributing factor in the wool market uncertainty is the stockpile and the fixed release schedule. Wool International, the Commonwealth Government's agency managing the selling schedule, has been required to sell about 185 000 bales of wool per quarter since 1 July 1994. That current arrangement does not terminate until June next year. Commonwealth Primary Industries Minister, John Anderson, has been working with the industry to try to get on top of these problems, and that will include an industry round table conference on 30 August, which will include not only growers but brokers, exporters and processors.

The Wool Council of Australia has developed a discussion paper which is being widely read within the industry and which puts up six options as to where we go from here. It was initially based on where we go from July next year. The industry needs to look seriously at what happens here. It needs to come up with a uniform voice about what it wants the Commonwealth Government to do. It is important that whatever the industry formulates and agrees to is an alternative which is viable and which addresses not only the current problem but also the issue of stockpile debt in the short and long term. Certainly, as a result of the Burra meeting I have a clear idea of the desires of growers in South Australia and on Thursday night I relayed those feelings to the Federal Minister, John Anderson, who obviously will listen to the industry over the next couple of weeks and make his decision.

ETSA SEPARATION PACKAGES

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Given the confirmation of the Minister for Infrastructure that ETSA is seeking to offer reduced separation packages in return for the possibility of work for ETSA with a private contractor, will the Minister advise the House whether workers accepting the reduced package will be guaranteed the additional 25 per cent work with the private contractor and, if not, will ETSA pay the difference to these workers? Documents in the Opposition's possession state that the ETSA proposal is only that the person may be re-engaged by ETSA through a third party contractor for up to 450 hours per year for three years. Given that the work offered at this time is not ETSA work but Optus work, which is non-government, workers may be accepting a 25 per cent reduction unnecessarily.

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Appropriately, the agreement removes the preclusion from an ETSA worker taking up this option. The member for Torrens talks about the word 'may'. It creates an option for the work force and takes the prescription out. You cannot have it both ways. We are attempting to put some flexibility into the scheme for the work force concerned. I know that the honourable member has an interest in ETSA matters and, rightly, closely monitors that—indeed, I welcome that interest. In the interests of the work force, it is an agreement that the work force wanted, as I understand it. We are meeting their requirements by putting 'may' in and giving some flexibility that is not enjoyed by anyone else accessing a TVSP.

URBAN PLANNING

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley does not need the assistance of other members.

Mr BRINDAL: Sir, you have always been very helpful in the past. Will the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations outline to the House an initiative that has been introduced to improve the contribution of urban planning and development to the living environment of our towns and cities?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I thank the member for Unley for his question, because I am delighted to announce that the State Government, through the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Urban Projects Authority, will fund an annual scholarship in urban planning and I will be seeking registrations of interest shortly. Funds of $46 000 are available from profits obtained from the Portraits of Planning Conference, which was held last year. It is anticipated that a total of $15 000 will be made available each year for three years and the prize money can be awarded to either one or a number of applicants, depending on merit, as judged by a selection panel. The panel, which will select the winners of these scholarships, will be comprised of the Chief Executive of my own department, the General Manager of the Urban Projects Authority, a training consultant from the Training and Development Branch of the department, and an external adviser, Donna Ferreti, Senior Lecturer in Urban and Regional Planning at the University of South Australia.

The purpose of the scholarship is to further the aims of the Portraits of Planning Conference, which are to enhance the contribution of urban planning and development to individual and community well-being and the creation of desirable living environments. The scholarship is to be used for study, research, training, working in another organisation, travel or accommodation. The choice will be that of the winner of the scholarship. This scholarship is yet another example of the State Government's embracing and advancing best practice procedures in the public sector, and the area of planning and urban development is one which is of great significance to the State.

The Adelaide 21 Project, which will be launched by the Premier on Friday this week, and the increased funding for the Planning Division announced in the State budget are other examples of this, as are the changes to the Development Act, which is currently before the House and which will be debated shortly.

TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD

Mr BASS (Florey): Will the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing inform the House of the TAB's latest promotional activities? In the restructuring of the TAB board earlier this year, the Minister said that one of the priorities of a corporatised TAB was to take a new approach on marketing and promotion of the State's racing industry. What has been achieved, and will more promotions follow?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I am pleased to announce that the first of the marketing processes that will be announced by the TAB were announced last week. A brief newsletter went out to all telephone betters. One of the major areas that has not been looked after in the past two to three years is that of telephone betting. It was excellent to see a brand new program to encourage that right across Australia and internationally. The new number, 132620, is a simple telephone betting system, and it will encourage all telephone betting to increase in our State.

Unfortunately, there was a 12 per cent decline last year, and it was mainly because of the lack of promotion of this area by the TAB over the past two to three years. The information has been sent to some 12 000 accounts. A significant increase is expected in the telephone betting account over the next few years, and we expect that the only way you can do that is to make sure that the product is marketed properly. It is the first time that any dollars have been spent on marketing or telephone betting in the past few years, and hopefully we will see a significant increase over the next two years.

PREMIER'S REMARKS

Mr De LAINE (Price): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr De LAINE: In answer to a question from the member for Lee today, the Premier made several assertions about me which are quite inaccurate. In response to a question by the Leader of the Opposition several weeks ago requesting that the Premier meet with representatives of The Parks High School community at the school, the Premier replied that he would not do so at the request of the Leader; however, if the school council, through its local member (that is me, the member for Price) sought such a meeting, he would consider it. Several weeks later, on 5 June, the Premier replied in writing to me, saying that he was unable to meet with the school community but that he had arranged for a school delegation led by me to meet with the Minister for Education in the Minister's office on 25 June 1996.

After consultation with The Parks High School Council, on 19 June I wrote to the Premier, with a copy going to the Minister for Education, informing the Premier that, because both the school community and I had no confidence in the Minister, the Premier's offer was unacceptable. In the same letter, on behalf of The Parks High School community, I formally invited the Premier and the Minister for Education to visit the school and meet with representatives of the school community. This letter was sent six days before the scheduled meeting, and still no written response has been received by me. I thought that this letter would have plainly indicated to both the Premier and the Minister that the delegation would not be attending the meeting in the Minister's office on 25 June 1996.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: Order! The proposal before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

Ms GREIG (Reynell): It is not very often you find someone who is not prepared to accept something for nothing—let alone their pension. Today, I want to pay tribute to a lady who was a tireless community worker within my local area, Christie Downs, a lady who worked very hard and who, for anything she was given, gave something back in return—Mrs Ivy McCallum. Mrs McCallum passed away on 22 March this year, aged 67 years. She spent her days clearing local streets of litter. Part of her pension was spent on shrubs and flowers to plant along roadsides and reserves. Mrs McCallum was not much of a talker; she always had work to do. Mrs McCallum believed it was her civic duty to help keep the area clean in exchange for her pension. Armed with plastic bags to fill with rubbish, Mrs McCallum was often seen on the local streets of Christie Downs during all types of weather: whether it was raining, freezing cold or very hot, nothing kept her away from the job she had to do. Keeping the area clean was her way of giving something back to the community.

I had known Mrs McCallum for about 10 years—I should say that I had known her as much as she wanted me to know her. Locally, Mrs McCallum was affectionately known as 'the womble'. I guess that was because of her quiet, peaceful and carefree way of going about things and making sure they were done. The last time we spoke was late February. Mrs McCallum was busy weeding a vacant block of land on McKinna Road at Christie Downs. It was a warm day, and I had just visited the local shopping centre. I thought I would offer to buy Ivy a drink. I could see she was busy, so I assumed that she would be thirsty. However, when I offered her a cool drink, she looked at me and said that she had work to do and that there was not time to stop if she intended finishing the job she had started.

Age had taken its toll on Ivy; she looked tired and worn out. Her hands were rough but strong. Her clothes had seen better days but, despite all this, there was something magical about her. Her eyes were still shiny and meaningful, and beyond them you could see her pride and independence and a special zest for life and being part of the community. On Sunday 7 July the Christie Downs community will come together in a service of dedication to the late Ivy McCallum—a local resident, a tireless worker, a lady described as the epitome of what makes a community.

I would also like to acknowledge the work of the Noarlunga council, and in particular Councillor Artie Ferguson, for organising the service, which I will be hosting on Sunday afternoon, because as a community we pay respect to those people whose tireless efforts make sure that our

community is a better place to live and that we all have a part to play in keeping it that way.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I refer to the effects in my electorate of impending Federal Government cuts to the Department of Education, Employment, and Training (DEET). I noted with interest the comments of my colleague the member for Torrens yesterday when she talked about the loss of Skillshare and Skillshare training programs in her area. The same also applies in my area. I am on the board of Para Work Links, and I know first hand of the enormous range of training programs that emanate from that group in the Elizabeth Munno Para area. I also know of the importance of the programs for the long-term unemployed, of which there are significant numbers. I fear greatly for them when the cuts are made. It is something that we as a community need to acknowledge, particularly if we are interested in looking after all the people and recognise the need for getting all the people back to work. For those people who have been out of work for a long time, this process is more complex and difficult, and we need the continuation of the sorts of programs available through our local Skillshare.

Another program to which I refer and which is of particular interest to me and people in my electorate is a special intervention program run in the Elizabeth Munno Para region out of the Davoren Park Community Centre. It is a literacy program which is run jointly through a contract signed by DEET and the Para Institute of TAFE and which is then recontracted to the Daveron Community Centre to deliver. The training comprises a certificate in preparatory education, focusing on the development of language, literacy and numeracy competencies for adult students so that they can participate more effectively in employment training and community life.

The certificate has been designed in two stages to provide maximum flexibility for students. The flexible and modular design of the course allows for multiple entry and exit points and individual student progression. It is a successful program, and a large number of clients has passed through it. I have had about 30 letters from students protesting about the fact that the literacy program is to cease. This is a problem. Without literacy, one cannot get off the dole queue and become financially independent and able to forge one's life. These people will be cut back.

I shall mention some of the concerns raised with me and other community leaders at a meeting. There are to be no more commencements until after June. That means that clients who have been assessed cannot be placed in training and that ongoing students who have completed stage 1 cannot go any further. They have been told that they can place only the minimum number of part-time clients in July. They say that many clients will not be placed. Using the 1995-96 figure, it could be as many as 100 clients. That means that there will have to be extremely hard decisions as to who, out of that very deserving group, will manage to get into this course.

We need to ask: who in our community has to pay the price for the so-called debts that Governments use to justify savage cuts to the public sector? I say that these people in community literacy courses should not have to pay that price. These courses are the only chance that these people have to make a difference in their lives.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Yesterday, as parliamentary secretary to the Department of Environment and Natural Resources and as the member for Mawson, I was privileged to be invited to a magnificent function at the University of Adelaide. It was the twenty-first anniversary of the Centre for Environmental Studies at the university. Of particular interest and pleasure to me, and I am sure to all members, is the centre's change in name, which is now to be the Mawson Graduate Centre for Environmental Studies. When we think of the magnificent work that Sir Douglas Mawson did over a number of years, not only for South Australia but for the whole country and internationally, with his expeditions and the environmental directions that he helped to broaden, this is very fitting.

It is also fitting that three new degree courses are being put in place at the Mawson Graduate Centre for Environmental Studies: Bachelor of Environmental Management with Honours, Bachelor of Environmental Science with Honours and Bachelor of Environmental Studies with Honours. They are three very good degree courses, which I recommend young people looking at job opportunities in the future to consider, because with the problems that we shall have around the globe there will have to be more emphasis on environmental issues: being able to manage them, having the science studies to address them through research and to come up with good lateral thinking on environmental policy. I am delighted that the University of Adelaide now has a brochure and policy statement on environmental policy. It was also great to hear that that was driven not by the Chancellor or the Vice-Chancellors but by a student initiative.

I should like to congratulate the Associate Professor and Director of Environmental Studies, Nick Harvey, who is clearly committed to the environmental faculties of the university. I also congratulate Professor Ian Falconer, who is the Deputy Vice-Chancellor academic at the University of Adelaide. It was also a great pleasure to see a well-known and highly respected South Australian who, together with his family, has been a major contributor for generations—Chancellor Bill Scammell. We all know of Bill Scammell's commitment to this State in terms of education, job creation and sustainability. It is a pity that we do not have more national company headquarters in South Australia like the Faulding company. We know that many national company headquarters were lost to South Australia at the same time as 33 000 jobs were lost under the 10 or 12 years of Labor debacle in this State.

Again, I wish to put on the record my congratulations to the university and to those people whom I have just mentioned. Also, I congratulate Brett Bryan, Beth Clouston and Megan McCarthy, who tied with the highest marks for an environmental studies thesis in 1995. Of particular interest to me, which I shall be asking to peruse, as I am sure will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, was the thesis by Brett Bryan on the ecological impact and management of koalas in the Southern Mount Lofty Ranges. We all know about the problems with koalas. Hugh Possingham and his team, including Julie Greig, the member for Reynell, are doing a good job on the task force, but I am sure that Brett Bryan's thesis would have some very good information to add to this issue.

This initiative by the university ties in with the State Government's initiative, led by the Premier, Minister Wotton and the Government team, and addresses on a day-to-day basis ecologically sustainable development, protection, enhancement and clean-up of our waterways and the environmental degradation on which very little direction and money had been spent until this Government was elected 2½ years

ago. I know that when we get the books balanced again, although it will be a difficult job, we shall see more money put into this important area.

Mr EVANS (Davenport): I wish to place on record some of my experiences over the past two weeks as the Australian leader of a delegation to China on behalf of the Australian Political Exchange Council. My only regret about going to China was that I missed the two weeks of Estimates Committees. I am sure that members realise how disappointed I was being in China and not enjoying the experience of spending time asking Ministers questions during those Committees.

The Australian Political Exchange Council is a federally funded body which promotes young political leaders for overseas exchanges. I was fortunate to go to China and experience cultural, economic and political structures which are so different from ours. We had representatives from five different States and three different political Parties. It was an interesting experience to live with those people for two weeks and appreciate not only the differences in the Chinese culture and thinking but the structure, thinking and interests of the other political Parties.

We were briefed not only by the Australian Embassy both here and in China but also by the Chinese Embassy. We had doors opened for us for meetings with high officials and Ministers in the Chinese Parliament. We covered a variety of topics from foreign affairs to the one-China policy, which is quite interesting with Hong Kong coming back into China next year. We also met organisations, such as steel mills in Shanghai, which buy 40 per cent of their ore from Australia and are looking to invest further in Australia in that industry. We met representatives of the wool industry, which also buys a lot of Australian product. One member of the delegation was a Western Australian farmer, and it was interesting to hear about the problems that Australian farmers are having in supplying China and the problems that the Chinese are having in getting the kind of supply they want.

We were also fortunate to speak to the Chinese media at one of the television stations. Interestingly, as most things are in China, it was Government owned. The Chinese Government recently decided to set up a second television station in Shanghai to provide competition, but as both stations are Government owned I am not sure where the competition would come in. Certainly that was the philosophy behind setting up a second station. Finding out about the amount of trade that Australia does with China was quite an education. Australia now has about $A4.5 billion invested in China, and that is growing at the rate of approximately 10 or 12 per cent a year, which is encouraging. We also have annual trade between the two countries worth about $A8 billion, and that is growing at the rate of approximately 20 per cent a year, which is a very encouraging growth rate between the two countries.

If there was one single message to Australian business that you could bring back from China it was that the Chinese economy is opening up, which has been its policy since the early 1970s, so that businesses can enter what is being called a 'socialist market economy'. There are some very good opportunities for Australian businesses to go into China.

China is particularly interested in the environmental field. I have already put the MFP on to some contacts in the provinces which we visited as regards China's stormwater and sewage treatment programs, which created great interest when we spoke to the Chinese. I am aware that the MFP has already gone to China on other occasions, but there are great opportunities for environmental programs in China, which will have to face the long-term problem of how to feed 1.2 billion people. That is an enormous problem, something which most Australians would find very difficult to comprehend, especially those living in Adelaide with a population of only 1 million. Trying to feed, educate and house 1.2 billion people has created problems for China. I feel privileged to have had the opportunity to visit China and now have a greater understanding of some of the problems it faces and the reasons why it makes certain decisions.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I rise to speak about the Collex waste treatment plant at Kilburn, a matter to which I referred in a speech I made yesterday. This afternoon I want to devote my attention to the deafening silence on this issue from the Federal Liberal member for Adelaide, Trish Worth. Prior to the last Federal election, in March, Ms Worth was everywhere around my electorate of Ross Smith, in particular in Kilburn, cosying up to the residents and pretending that she cared about them. Now, when the residents need her help to lobby her Liberal colleagues in the State Government to put an end to this proposed waste treatment plant, which is near primary schools, resident's homes and nursing homes, she has miraculously disappeared. She has abandoned those from whom, only a few months ago, she sought votes. Her loyalty to her electorate takes second preference to her unwillingness to stand up to Dean Brown, and that is both cowardly and disloyal behaviour on her part.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The Deputy Leader is maligning a member in another House. The word that he used was 'cowardly'.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister has no point of order. Unfortunately, members outside this Parliament do not have the protection those here have.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Even when the word 'cowardly' is used?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: They do not have the protection, I am afraid.

Mr Cummins interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: It is very interesting to hear from the member for Norwood on this issue. When the Federal Liberal member for Adelaide was approached on the Collex issue by the Messenger Press newspaper, the *Standard*, only a few weeks ago and was asked what her views were she said that her file on this issue had closed essentially in 1993. Of course, that is a very important year: in December 1993 her State Liberal colleagues were elected to State Government. She closed her ears and mind to the needs of the residents of Kilburn from the day her State Liberal colleagues were elected to Government and when they decided to foist this unwanted, obnoxious waste disposal plant slap bang in a residential area.

When the *Standard* asked her, 'What is your stance on it?' she said, 'I don't have one. I am neither for it nor against it.' Quite frankly, her role as a Federal member of Parliament, representing a large slab of citizens and taxpayers in this State, has been found sorely wanting. She has abrogated her responsibility; she has not picked up her file on this issue since the election of the State Liberal Government and has constantly turned a deaf ear to the needs of the residents. I know that, about two weeks prior to the 1996 Federal election, she hurriedly arranged a meeting with the Minister for Infrastructure, and that he held her hand and said, 'We'll

hold off on our decisions in this matter and won't put you on the spot until after the Federal election.' She has shown her gratitude to the State Liberal Government by not opposing this proposal or coming out publicly in support of her constituents in Kilburn who do not want this plant.

Mr Atkinson: Does she live anywhere near Kilburn?

Mr CLARKE: No, she does not live in Kilburn. I suggest that she go down to Kilburn and talk to the residents who do not want that plant; that she go down there on a summer's day when there was no wind and cop a whiff of the stench from existing industries, let alone what will be produced via this waste treatment plant. It is vastly different from the leafy suburbs of Netherby. It is about time that she lived up to the promises she touted about the town prior to the Federal election on 2 March and stood up for her residents, got hold of the State Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations and told him that it is not on. If necessary, I will stand in front of the bulldozers with the residents who oppose the establishment of this plant.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I would like to comment on a contribution to a grievance debate by the member for Taylor yesterday concerning the closure of the Salisbury campus of the University of South Australia. Members would be aware that the Leader of the Opposition and I are members of the university's council, so I am aware of the problem. I take this opportunity to publicly congratulate next year's new Vice Chancellor, Professor Denise Bradley, who was appointed at the last council meeting; and I also congratulate the present Vice Chancellor, David Robinson, on his contribution to the University of South Australia over the past five years.

I commend the member for Taylor for her quick response to voice the concerns of her constituents and the university students at the Salisbury campus. However, I believe that her comments are short-sighted. I also believe that political point scoring by referring to the Federal Government and the Howard budget is not looking at the issue at hand in South Australia. I, like her, support access and equity, as do many members in this place, and we are very much concerned about broadening the base and giving all South Australians access to tertiary education, in particular those who are socially disadvantaged.

However, the approach of members opposite in being territorial and saying, 'This area is disadvantaged so we should keep this institution here', is going about it the wrong way. In a sense, they are promoting the labelling that takes place of the northern suburbs. I speak from experience, because I spent most of my teaching life in the northern suburbs. To label someone is to ultimately subtract from their total human worth; and to talk about the continual disadvantage of an area is wrong. A policy should be in place which ensures that they are not disadvantaged. To maintain a particular institution in a certain geographic location with particular courses is contrary to what is trying to be achieved. We need to promote access and equity in all areas of tertiary life at the university.

I refer to some statistics. Of those students who live in the northern suburbs of Adelaide and who attended the University of South Australia in 1996, 13 percent attended the Salisbury campus and 20 per cent The Levels. Of those living in the Salisbury area, 16 per cent attended the Salisbury campus and 23 per cent The Levels. So, it is not the case that all students who live in Salisbury attend the Salisbury campus. In respect of students from lower socio-economic backgrounds, certain patterns are relevant. Australia-wide, there has been no increase in the percentage of low socio-economic students attending Australian universities since 1991. The participation rate at the University of South Australia increased from 19.8 per cent in 1991 to 23.6 per cent in 1995. Those statistics are relevant. As a whole, the university is giving access and equity to students who are regarded as disadvantaged. The transfer of the Faculty of Nursing to the city campus is only an intermediate step, because in the long term the faculty will return to The Levels. It is counterproductive to attack the university's decisions, because in the long run there will be benefits to students—

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

PLAYFORD, SIR THOMAS

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Premier): I move:

That this House, on the occasion of the centenary of the birth of Sir Thomas Playford, endorses the display of the portrait of Sir Thomas Playford by Sir Ivor Hele as a permanent feature of this Chamber in recognition of his enduring contribution to the economic, industrial, social and political welfare of South Australia.

First, I draw the House's attention—even though it may be against Standing Orders—to the presence of Sir Thomas Playford's son, Pastor Tom Playford; Jennifer Cashmore, Chair of the Playford Trust; the Hon. Don Laidlaw, a former Chair of the Playford Trust; and Stewart Cockburn, author of a book on Sir Thomas Playford. This superb book is by far the most definitive outline of the life, times and impact on South Australia of Sir Thomas Playford. As I walked into Parliament this afternoon I could not help but notice the portrait of Sir Thomas Playford in this Chamber. It immediately took me back to a—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, he needs to. In fact, I am sure that all members of the House suddenly felt that they had a new patron looking upon them this afternoon. Some members of the backbench told me that they will not be able to misbehave as they have in the past. I suggest that Sir Thomas Playford is probably sitting there and passing on a few fundamental lessons about how to run the Parliament and how to focus on the important things as far as South Australia is concerned. Sir Thomas Playford was without question the greatest Premier this State has seen. He was a Premier who gave enormous direction to South Australia. He was the longest serving Premier of any Westminster Parliament in the western world. He served this State as Premier for almost 27 years but, most importantly, he steered a new direction for South Australia.

South Australia was still in the height of the depression when Thomas Playford was elected to this Parliament in 1933. When he became Premier in 1938, the State was still racked by the effects of the Great Depression. There were high levels of unemployment; the State's economy was very narrowly based on primary production; and the bulk of the population lived outside of Adelaide and was directly employed in primary industries. Here we had a man who picked that there were fundamental changes through mechanisation starting to occur in agriculture and that that had to bring about a fundamental new direction in terms of the State

and in terms of creating employment opportunities for younger people within the State. It was Sir Thomas Playford who in 1938 as a young Premier of this State picked that there were emerging new industries which would expand very quickly indeed. The motor industry was one of those key industries.

Here was a person who had seen scattered throughout the whole of South Australia a number of quite significant regional centres but who recognised that those centres were not effectively being tied together with the provision of adequate services. Here was a man with a vision that we should provide reticulated water from the Murray River to outlying communities and, as a result of providing that water, see the very rapid industrialisation of regions such as Whyalla and the development of the rest of the State. Here was a person who saw the essential need to ensure that power was provided as a basic service throughout the State and who was prepared to put his political career right on the line to bring that about. Most importantly, here was a person who cared about people and who wanted to ensure that the people of South Australia had a long-term future by prospering from the new industrialisation he was going to bring to the State.

Sir Thomas Playford took over as Premier of the State towards the end of the depression, but within just over a year he saw his State, as part of Australia, plunged into the Second World War. Again, here is a person who understood the impact of war. For those who do not know, Sir Thomas Playford was very badly injured in France during the First World War. In fact, he was left for dead with very serious injuries. He was a man who throughout his working life worked tremendous hours and tremendously hard while displaying in public very few signs of those injuries ever having an impact upon him. When I was a young member of Parliament in this place I was fortunate when Sir Thomas Playford on Friday afternoons in his retirement would enter the dining room, sit down and start to relate to members of Parliament just a little of the history of the development of South Australia from 1938 to 1965.

Here was a person who enjoyed passing on to younger members of Parliament some of his experiences and, in doing so and relating those stories, passed on to all of us a very fundamental message which I took as a message to me and which I acknowledge had a profound impact on me as a young member of Parliament. In fact, there would be no person who I would put down as my mentor above Sir Thomas Playford. Sir Thomas would relate stories about how he attracted companies such as General Motors- Holden's to stay in South Australia and develop; how he attracted Uniroyal to the State of South Australia; and how he captured Philips. Philips was about to establish a very substantial factory in New South Wales but, due to an unfortunate port strike, the company had to unload at Port Adelaide all of its equipment destined for New South Wales. Sir Thomas Playford immediately ensured that the equipment was put into a secure location. He then travelled to Sydney and spoke to the senior management of Philips who, in fact, had already purchased land for the development of the Philips factory in Sydney. Sir Thomas Playford turned around and offered them a ready-made factory in South Australia, the old munitions factory at Hendon, and that immediately turned Philips into one of the largest employers in South Australia—a company employing 3 000 people.

Sir Thomas Playford realised that Adelaide and South Australia had to become part of the industrial revolution. He realised that the automobile would create literally thousands of jobs but that he had to attract the component industries here if he was to keep companies such as Chrysler and General Motors-Holden's with their assembly operations in this State. He realised that he had to attract a tyre manufacturer and a rubber component manufacturer to South Australia. Hence, he set out to attract Uniroyal. That is perhaps a story for another day. However, it is a very successful story because, of course, after many years, Uniroyal became Bridgestone, which still has a substantial tyre manufacturing facility and a rubber manufacturing industry in this State. He attracted or encouraged other companies, such as Rainsfords, to develop in the automotive industry.

I recall an occasion when Sir Thomas Playford, having seen Australia plunged into war in 1939, answered a specific request from Canberra about who would be the best purchaser of war supplies in Australia and whether he could make anyone available. He made available the person who was in charge of purchasing in South Australia, but in doing so he made it a condition that that person must return to South Australia within a matter of weeks of the end of the war. He did that for a particular reason: who would have a better idea of the location of all the industrial supplies in Australia that were used as part of the war effort, and who would have a better idea of where machinery such as boilers would be located in Australia than the purchaser of supplies for the Australian war effort?

So, in typical Sir Thomas Playford manner, very quickly after the war was over, he secured through that person a whole range of equipment, such as boilers for ETSA, to make sure that we were part of that very rapid development of manufacturing industries that took place throughout Australia immediately following the war. He was so successful that he built South Australia into the State with the biggest percentage of manufacturing industries of any State of Australia—and we retain that honour today.

He also recognised that South Australia needed to populate quickly after the war, that if we were to have manufacturing industries we would need to attract the people who could work in those industries. So, he set out with the specific objective of attracting a large percentage of migrants to South Australia. In fact, South Australia was well above the national average in terms of its number of migrants. There are many South Australians today who, as part of that vision of Sir Thomas Playford immediately after the war, owe the fact that they reside here to him. He pursued development for this State with a determination and a cunning that this State has never seen before and is unlikely to see in the future.

Sir Thomas was cunning because he would sit down with industrialists and point out that he was a simple apple grower who knew nothing about what they were saying. He knew nothing about, for instance, mineral development, yet when finally pushed he would know as much as the people to whom he was speaking. He was a person of action, and he drew around him a group of people who were determined to put into effect what Sir Thomas Playford saw as the most appropriate force for the State. As a result of his efforts we saw the development of the Housing Trust, ETSA and the EWS with the reticulation of the water supply from the Murray River.

We would all appreciate some of the lessons that Sir Thomas Playford gave younger members of Parliament and also his determination to know what was going on within his State and to be a part of it. Almost every winter he would go on a trip north to look at the mining and petroleum industries as they developed in this State. I recall a discussion

that took place at the lunch table on a Friday afternoon at about 3 p.m. Invariably, these lunchtime discussions would go on for an hour to an hour-and-a-half. In those days, we seemed to have a little more time. It was probably all part of the learning cycle of any young member of Parliament to sit there and listen to the lessons he taught. I recall his sitting down and talking to Ted Chapman, the member for Alexandra, about who lived on the road running west from Parndana. As they went down the road mentally, he sat there and listed each house and its occupants and how many children they had. It was not just one or two houses but about 15. Sir Thomas knew each person, exactly where they lived and what they were about. Equally, his knowledge of the South-East and the northern parts of the State—indeed his knowledge right across Australia—in industrial circles was as great.

Sir Thomas was very pragmatic about everything he did. The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources can recount the day when he arrived at Sir Thomas Playford's home with a heavy load on the back of a truck. The Minister stated that it would be impossible to unload the truck. Sir Thomas suggested that they sit down and think about it for a moment, which they did. Within about two minutes, Sir Thomas said, 'I know how we will handle it', and that truck was unloaded in about five minutes when, otherwise, it would have required the use of a crane.

I also recall talking to a number of former senior public servants and hearing their stories about Sir Thomas Playford. They told of how he made sure that the door where all Government dockets were brought into the old Treasury building was close to his office so that he could look at every single Government docket that came through that door. He used to read all those dockets. Of course, members would appreciate that in those days there was no photocopier, so at Cabinet meetings Sir Thomas Playford would sit next to the fire in the old Cabinet room and selectively quote from the dockets what he wanted the rest of the Cabinet to hear and understand. If only we could have those days again. I understand that, as the story goes, there is a faint possibility that some of the dockets were signed before they got there.

Whatever Sir Thomas took on he did so with enthusiasm and determination and a desire to make sure that tasks were finished successfully for the people of South Australia. His family would be able to testify to the extent to which he could work for an enormous number of hours with very little sleep. I recall his relating around the dinner table one day how he woke at 5.15 each morning. At this time, he was well into his 70s. When I asked him why, he said with a smile on his face, 'Because I wake up and worry about how the State can get on without me.' He was renowned for working well into the night. I have heard people say that they would drive past his home at Norton Summit at 2 a.m. and would invariably see the light on, of how he would go out in the evening and take with him several cases of dockets and pick out the one with the most minute detail and ask questions about it the next morning.

Sir Thomas also had a great sense of humour. There are many stories about the way he played billiards. He would point out something outside the billiard room window, and when his opponent came back to take the next shot the white ball would be against the cushion. He loved to pull a person's leg, he loved to joke and remonstrate, and he enjoyed the company of others. There are literally countless stories about Sir Thomas Playford, including the day a group of women protested outside his office wanting milk for their babies. I recall on one occasion, when I was about to open some renovations to the Treasury building, Sir Thomas related a story of a former Attorney-General who had increasing piles of difficult dockets in his office that required decisions. One day Sir Thomas Playford found that all these dockets had disappeared. Renovations were being carried out on the Treasury building and Sir Thomas asked the Attorney-General where the dockets had gone. The Attorney-General pointed out that they had gone into a cavity wall during renovations of the Treasury building. Sir Thomas was a person who noticed all the fine details, would quietly store the information and would bring it out at the appropriate time as part of an ongoing story.

This State is deeply indebted to Sir Thomas Playford. On 5 July, in two days, we celebrate the centenary of his birth date. He was a man who will go down in the history of this State. Unlike Finniss, the first Premier of the State, who passed the comment that someone can live long enough to be forgotten, Sir Thomas Playford will never be forgotten as Premier of South Australia. His contribution to the development and direction of this State will never be forgotten, and I think it behoves all of us to recognise that role by the appropriate hanging of this portrait as a permanent feature of this House of Assembly. I support the motion.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I am delighted to support this motion. I met Sir Thomas Playford on a number of occasions when he visited Don Dunstan, who was then Premier of this State. Sir Thomas Playford would come into this Chamber, sit on the Government side and smile benignly on the proceedings. I know that Don Dunstan has enormous regard for the memory of Tom Playford. Some people saw them as opponents: in fact, they were very close friends. Tom Playford would take Don Dunstan home in his car after a session; they would talk politics, but always in a considered and decent way. We are very pleased to support the hanging of the portrait today.

It was said of Tom Playford that he was one of the great Labor Premiers in South Australia's history. Certainly all members would agree that he was the Premier who made the greatest contribution to transforming South Australia's economy. Just look at some of his achievements: ETSA; the EWS; the Housing Trust; and the existence of hundreds of additional private companies, such as General Motors-Holden's, Actil, Philips, Esso, and Bridgestone, which in many cases were and still are great testimony to the diligence with which Thomas Playford applied himself to a task and the success he encountered along the way.

As the Premier said, the seeds of Tom Playford's success in this transformation lay in the dark years of the Second World War. The need to find reliable alternative suppliers to the war effort gave Australia, and South Australia in particular, a comparative advantage. South Australians came to accept the need for Government to intervene directly in the direction of the economy of this State, and that is why Tom Playford was someone whose time had come. Sir Thomas Playford had the vision to realise that nothing would or could be achieved in terms of the building of an industrial base in South Australia unless the infrastructure—the public as well as the private infrastructure—was in place to support it, and that this infrastructure was too important and fundamental to the needs of South Australians to be left only to private enterprise.

It is thanks to Sir Thomas Playford that water restrictions are virtually unknown in the metropolitan area; it is thanks

to Sir Thomas Playford that almost every South Australian has access to affordable electricity; and it is thanks to Sir Thomas Playford that we have a public housing system which was the envy of the rest of Australia for many years and which is often seen internationally as being a leader in community and publicly-owned housing.

Many people do not realise that friendships exist across the Chambers in Parliaments, that sometimes adversaries on the floor of the House can have a drink or a coffee together and discuss matters with an element of humour.Certainly, Sir Thomas Playford had that kind of relationship, based on decency of human relations with the Leaders of the Opposition, such as Mick O'Halloran and Frank Walsh. At all times he afforded them courtesies; at all times he afforded them the basic rights of protocol; and at all times he recognised them at functions, because he realised that the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition had a responsible role to play in the State's development and also an important role in representing the other side of points of view. He believed it was important for there to be two points of view to be argued and debated in a rational, constructive and positive way.

That is the way it should be, and that is the way I know that Tom Playford would like to see it. There are some issues about which we can be bitterly opposed but there are some issues about which we need to be patriots, putting the State's interest ahead of petty Party partisan concerns, and there is no better example of that than the relationship that Sir Thomas Playford had with the Labor Party over those years.

Much has already been said about Sir Thomas, if he were alive, disagreeing vehemently with what is happening with respect to privatisation around Australia and overseas. It is quite clear to me that Sir Thomas Playford would have been much too sensible and too pragmatic to go absolutely ideologically down the privatisation path. Many times he put people before Party, even if it meant incurring the wrath of the Adelaide Club and members of his own Cabinets. He was a pragmatist but he was also a patriot: he put the State's interests ahead of his own Party and he also put the State's interests ahead of things such as perks, and so on. He did what he did because he believed it was right to do so, not because it was politically expedient or conformed to any particular ideology.

The South Australian Housing Trust was transformed under his Premiership into a progressive body, which had built about 56 000 dwellings by the time Playford lost power. Of course, Sir Thomas Playford did not do that alone because, from 1949, the trust was headed by Alex Ramsay, another great South Australian. The trust did not just build houses and flats: it provided land for factories and, indeed, it built factories and even a city—Elizabeth. Sir Thomas knew that the key to preventing people from leaving South Australia was to ensure that good quality, low-cost housing was available. This would keep the cost of living down in South Australia and make the State more attractive to new industry. Commencing in the war years, Sir Thomas introduced rent controls which, combined with the increased supply of new public housing, did more than anything to keep housing costs down—the effect of which we are still benefiting from today.

The landlords were unhappy but Playford did it not only because it was in the best interests of the State but particularly because it was in the best interests of lower income people and industry. We should also not forget, on the centenary of his birth, that power supply in Adelaide was in the hands of a private company, the Adelaide Electricity Supply Company, until 1946. Playford realised that only by the State's taking over that company could he ensure that affordable electricity would be supplied across the State to both householders and the new industries he was attempting to attract. He put his Premiership on the line over the public ownership of the electricity supply, over electricity generation and over electricity distribution. He put his Premiership on the line in the Cabinet and within his Party, and again he won. I am sure that Sir Thomas Playford would be at the barricades today opposing any sale of all or part of the Electricity Trust that he created.

So why was it then, after being the longest serving Premier in the history of the State—and I want to come to the reasons behind that—that he finally lost power? Like most great people, he was unable to please all of the people all of the time. It could be said that, while Playford provided the bricks to build South Australia's future, the mortar needed to bind the bricks was perhaps not sufficient, that is, the social infrastructure of the State. The hospitals system started cracking at the seams; environmental concerns started to be raised; his views on drinking and gambling began to be seen as wowserish; and South Australia fell behind other States in the area of social development. There were other issues apart from the economy. There had to be two sides to the coin. Playford was one side of the coin: Don Dunstan was the other side of the coin. Both helped make up the very important fabric of this State. Interestingly, I was recently reading the work on the life of Sir Thomas Playford by Stewart Cockburn—an excellent work and I certainly commend it to members. It states:

> Blewitt and Jaensch provided estimates of ALP under-representation in the period from 1944 to 1965 (calculated by making allowances for uncontested seats and for the distribution of all minor Party votes), and arrived at the conclusion that 'the ALP would have secured a majority in Parliament in all but two South Australian elections between 1944 and 1965 on the basis of its share of the popular vote'.

I quote that, because it is important in these motions to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Sir Thomas Playford was a great man. He was someone who, I think, would have liked to see the Tonkin Government come to power and he did. That was terrific: he saw a Government that was committed to the social side as well as the partnership between public and private enterprise, and I think it was important that he saw that occur.

Certainly, even after defeat and even in retirement he continued to exert significant influence over the State's future. Don Dunstan relied on Tom Playford's advice. From membership on the board of his own creation, ETSA, until 1978, to his off-the-record advice to Don Dunstan, he was still working for the good of South Australia until shortly before his death. Sir Thomas Playford was not a Dunstan—the other great South Australian Premier. He could not have initiated the great social reforms which have helped so many people the way Dunstan did. But if we in this Chamber are big enough—Liberal and Labor—we should recognise that this century has produced two great Premiers—Playford and Dunstan—and Tom Playford would have been the first and would have been big enough to recognise that in this House today.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The fact that I as Leader of the Labor Party can pay tribute to Tom Playford and that members opposite can be so derisory of the enormous contribution to this State by Don Dunstan says much more

about you than it does about either Playford or Dunstan. Playford was a true servant of the people: he was a war hero and a public hero who put service before self. Would Playford have approved of the way we conduct business today? In some areas he would have approved what we do. He would have approved of the fact that on many occasions we can agree in terms of votes that are important for this State. The increased flow of people leaving South Australia would have concerned him, but Playford would have put the people of this State before Party and would have given consideration to others, including those on the other side of the House and Parliament, because he was a big man in every sense of the job.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): We are not here today debating a motion about any other Premier but one, and that is Sir Thomas Playford. It is a little remiss of the Leader of the Opposition to comment on another Premier about whom a debate may well be held on some other occasion. As the Leader of the Opposition graciously acknowledged, Sir Thomas Playford was a great man. To understand Sir Thomas we must first look at his antecedents. Pastor Tom Playford was the first Playford to arrive in South Australia and he was followed in line by Honest Tom Playford, Honest Tom being a Premier of South Australia and the son of Pastor Playford. When Honest Tom wanted to go to the then very fashionable St Peters College and become a lawyer, his father was horrified and he is reported to have said:

> As for articling you to be a lawyer, I would just as soon article you to the devil. I believe no lawyer can be a strictly honourable man, for in the interests of guilty clients he has to suppress the truth as far as he possibly can and his moral nature must get warped.

Honest Tom went on to become a great Premier and delivered five budgets in this House, not one of which was in deficit. In his first two years as Premier he reduced the deficit by £250 000 and £300 000. That was an absolutely incredible achievement. He went on to be one of the Founding Fathers of the Federation and is given credit for having 'Commonwealth' added to the title 'Australia'. He was a profound admirer of Oliver Cromwell. His grandson—in fact, the sixth Thomas Playford, a tradition which I believe continues in the family to this day—is the person whom we honour today. Like his grandfather, he left school at the age of 13. The education which he received and which must have been considerable when we think of what he did for this State was attained, first, in the East End Market, where he became a proficient dealer with other human beings and, secondly and much more tragically, on the battlefields of the First World War, as the Premier pointed out. In those arenas he did learn a great deal, because he became a member of this House and latterly its longest serving Premier.

The Premier pointed out many of his achievements, such as bringing water from the Murray River, the industrialisation of Whyalla, the Leigh Creek coal fields, the taking into public ownership of ETSA and the creation of Elizabeth. In discussing Sir Thomas with one of my Federal colleagues, who is a great thinker about Liberal politics, he suggested that perhaps we laud Sir Thomas too much because of some of the consequences of his policies today. My answer to that here in this Chamber is quite simple: Sir Thomas was a great leader and visionary; he was a man for his time. He did what was necessary for this State, to take it from an agrarian State to a rightful place in Australia as one of the major Australian States.

If something has since gone wrong, it is for subsequent Governments to look to the tiller they inherited and to look at the direction of the ship. A captain can be responsible only for his own period of command: he cannot gaze into the mists of time and say, 'I should do it this way because of a need 50 years hence.' We may be judged only by our times and in our times, and Sir Thomas deserves that judgment. If Sir Thomas is given that judgment, he comes out of it profoundly well and, as the Premier has quite rightly said, as perhaps the most remarkable Premier of the past 50 years or so—and I say the last 50 or so years only because I do not know much about the Premiers before then.

Many stories are told about Sir Thomas and I, like others, commend to the House the very wonderful biography by Stewart Cockburn which, incidentally, is called *Playford: Benevolent Despot*. He had one characteristic of a great leader: he did not tolerate fools gladly. When the Leader of the Opposition talks benignly about the way he would have treated members opposite, I think they would indeed have cause for concern.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Hart in his usual manner interjects rudely, 'You would have been in trouble.' I probably would have been and, given the man's size and stature, I do not know that I would have stood up to him very hard or long. The Labor Party of late has made it very fashionable basically to claim Sir Thomas as a Labor Premier. In the interests of truth and nothing but the truth, they should get it right. Sir Collier Cudmore was reported to have said in the Adelaide Club one day, when he had Victorian guests and was most agitated, when he looked across at the Chamber and after they asked him what was the matter, and as he went red and shook his finger, 'That's where that damned socialist Playford is.'

Mr Cummins: Bolshevik.

Mr BRINDAL: Bolshevik? I was told it was 'socialist'. I think there is some difference between a socialist and a member of the ALP. I am not sure quite what, but I think there is at least some difference. I would like to quote Hugh Stretton in the *Sydney Messenger* who, referring to Playford, said:

> The aids to workers' living standards did double service.

Playford told an interviewer:

> People shouldn't live in hardship. Any Government worth its salt desires to provide better standards of living for its people, and we as small 'l' Liberals were just as keen to do that as the Labor Party.

That sums up Playford. In concluding, according to the Cockburn book, just before Sir Thomas Playford died, the X-rays revealed 30 pieces of steel in him. I know another story, but that other story is about 30 pieces of silver. I would say that 30 pieces of steel was appropriate for a Premier who did so much for this State and the industries of this State. I commend the Premier for his actions in respect of this motion and for having the portrait hung in this Chamber.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I wish to be associated with this motion and with the remarks of other members. Unlike other members who have spoken in this debate this afternoon, I never met Sir Thomas Playford, although I well remember his passing in 1981. I never had the pleasure of actually meeting the gentleman; he and his era were well before my time. As the member for Playford, I thought I should make a few remarks about this man and the impact he had on South Australia. I am grateful that Sir Thomas's portrait is hanging

on the other side of the Chamber, because from this side it gives us something different to look at. It is an excellent portrait, although I do not know whether anyone has commented on that yet. It is one of the more pleasant—if not one of the best—portraits I have seen around these precincts. It could be because it is new, unlike most of the others which, from time to time, ought to be shifted around. However, it is certainly a good portrait, and we on this side of politics will take a great deal of pleasure appreciating it. I am surprised that Government members did not put it on this side, because I am sure that they are getting sick of looking at some of the faces they see on this side of the House.

When I first came to South Australia with my migrant family—my father, mother and sister—in 1959, before the year of television here, the one name that everybody in South Australia knew was that of 'Old Tom'. That is how he was affectionately known by everyone. I have no knowledge of what the Adelaide Club said about him, but in Elizabeth he was affectionately known as 'Old Tom'. You did not vote for him, and that eventually brought about the end of the Playford Government in 1965. However, at least he was known as an honest, decent and hard working man of considerable imagination.

It is appropriate for us to say that much of what we see in South Australia is a product of those years. Other members have talked about ETSA, General-Motors Holden's and a whole range of industrial achievements in the 1940s, 1950s and well into the 1960s, and I do not need to mention those. However, Sir Thomas Playford might have liked a few things mentioned about him today. For example, as a young man in the Australian Infantry Force, he went to fight in France. As I understand it, he arrived in 1916, on the eightieth anniversary of the Battle of the Somme, which is being celebrated in France throughout July to November. That was his first baptism of fire. He was seriously injured in 1917 at the age of 21 in Flanders, in the Passchendaele offensive, and was given up for dead.

It is remarkable that this man then came into politics in South Australia. Of course, he arrived in this place when the Labor Party was at a low ebb. Indeed, it took 32 years before the Labor Party would again see power. Throughout those years, in the 1930s and 1940s in particular, he took a grip on politics in this State and fashioned a number of changes with which the Labor Party would have felt extremely comfortable at that time.

Certainly, as has been mentioned already in this Chamber, he had a relationship with other persons I had never met such as Mick O'Halloran, Frank Walsh and Don Dunstan. Of course, he had another relationship: he was a confidant of one of our greatest Labor Prime Ministers, Mr Curtin. One story—and it may only be a story but, if not, it should be elevated to historical fact (and no doubt it will be eventually)—is that Mr Curtin had a telephone exchange put in so that he could ring Old Tom during those terrible nights in the Second World War when, like no other time before, this country was threatened with invasion.

Sir Thomas Playford was Premier for some 27 years and was a member of this House for longer than that. He was a man whom members on both sides of politics came to trust. He was a man of considerable achievement. My own electorate of Playford was created in 1970 and, at that time, that electorate constituted most of the southern half of the city of Elizabeth. I am sure that Sir Thomas would have been happy with that, because Elizabeth was one of his great achievements. Since that time, the seat of Playford has moved steadily further to the south and now encompasses the area around Para Hills, Ingle Farm and Pooraka. On the way into the Chamber I was thinking that maybe it is a sad thing that the electorate no longer contains the area for which Sir Thomas is well remembered. Then the thought struck me, 'Of course, Para Hills started its existence under the last Playford Government, as well.'

The operation nest egg, which was the creation of an organisation called Reid Murray Developments at that time and which had a very bad ending, was a product of the last Playford Government in 1962. In almost every area of South Australia, we see the influence of this man. Greatness—and this man certainly had that quality—is something that needs to be recognised in this Chamber. A short while ago, I was a little sad that comments were made on both sides of the Chamber about other great people. It is unfortunate that invective, which we witness here every afternoon (and I am as guilty as most in this place) and which might be considered more appropriate for Question Time, has been evident in connection with this important motion.

I am sure that this will not be the only time that we will recognise people of greatness who have stood in this place representing South Australia and achieved a great deal for our community. Usually, such recognition is reserved only for their obituaries. Most of us want to live long enough for almost everyone here not to remember who we were but to get up and say nice things about us that the library has supplied, anyway. I agree with the Premier: the memory of Sir Thomas Playford will not fade for many years to come.

It was a different generation. Sir Thomas did not have a Cabinet on the twelfth or fourteenth floor of the State Administration Building. I have not been up there for a number of years, so I am not sure on which floor it is. I understand that he ran an operation in the building next door, with a staff of three or four—not one of hundreds—at a time that was largely pre-television in South Australia. Nonetheless, his vision has reached forward and has a great deal of relevance to all in South Australia. It gives me great pleasure to recognise the appropriate hanging of his portrait in this Chamber. I hope that with a bipartisan attitude we may see portraits of other great South Australians hung in this place.

Mrs HALL (Coles): A number of events are planned to commemorate the centenary of Sir Thomas Playford's birth, and I am pleased to support this motion which recognises and pays tribute to his immense service to this State. As the years stretch out, those who had personal contact with him think rather more deeply about his place in history because, since his retirement from South Australian politics 28 years ago, it is important to reflect on and more fully assess his influence over our State.

I was privileged to have known Sir Thomas in both a personal and professional capacity, and I am delighted to be one of the guests at the unveiling of his statue on Sunday at Norton Summit. I pay tribute to the East Torrens Council and Mayor Heather Ceravolo, along with her committee, who, together with members of the Playford Memorial Trust, chaired by my predecessor, Jennifer Cashmore, have organised this special event to commemorate the centenary of Sir Thomas's birth on 5 July 1896. The Playford Memorial Trust has an impressive record in the role it has played in perpetuating the memory of Sir Thomas who, as we all know, was the longest serving Premier of South Australia, and we have heard many accolades to him this afternoon. We can more clearly measure his successes now that the wheel has

turned from social experimentation to the deadly serious business of providing jobs and careers for young South Australians. Sir Thomas's record shows that he was better at this than anyone before or after him, and I pay tribute to my Premier in saying 'so far'.

I have one particularly pleasant memory of a television interview with Sir Thomas when I was a Channel 7 reporter covering the major story of the day—the resignation of the then Premier, Don Dunstan, in January 1979. I can assure you, Mr Speaker, that the best parts of that interview were the off-the-record bits. They certainly would have made a better story if I had been able to put them to air.

However, Premier Playford determined to broaden the base of the South Australian economy when he began his successful industrialisation program hand in hand with the Commonwealth war effort. His particular 'hands on' style of management produced the factories for ammunitions and other products vital to the war effort, as we have heard this afternoon, and they were produced at a speed unmatched anywhere else in Australia, as the Premier and other speakers have outlined. This magic formula was used with great effect after the war and proved to be an effective magnet that drew in dozens of industrial names to South Australia.

During this time there was intense competition among Australian Premiers for Commonwealth funds, and, during his tenure, South Australia received far more than its simple per capita share of Federal Government funding. This provided the infrastructure to support the momentum of growth that he built up in South Australia. For example, this State took in 29 per cent of all British migrants who came on assisted migration programs in one particular peak year.

Time constraints prevent me from detailing his many achievements (although that has been eloquently done earlier) in economic growth and industrial development. However, I commend the biographies that have been written about Sir Thomas, because I believe they provide a valuable record of his life and many accomplishments.

Sir Thomas had other interests besides State development which he pursued with the same passion as his politics. There is probably no greater illustration of the change in political style of the 1990s and intensity than to contemplate the current demise of the billiard and snooker rooms upstairs. I understand that Sir Thomas played with enormous ferocity that was said to be unnerving to his opponents, as the Premier has mentioned, and his parliamentary day was not complete without his snooker game.

Another passion, I am told, was fishing. He was able to demonstrate his skills only infrequently, but rumour has it that his fishing arrangements were made with a certain amount of style. His Ministers at times conveniently arranged an inspection of one of South Australia's 'outposts' by tug or an assessment of fishing resources by a research vessel. The results were always the same: as soon as Sir Thomas stepped on board, he took over the role of ship's captain, the fishing was in deep water and the Premier had that happy knack of always bringing in the greatest catch.

Sir Thomas's life, like that of so many veterans, was indelibly marked by his years of war service. I understand that stories of his wartime experiences were 'not to be missed' events around the coffee table in the bar after the House had risen. He almost always extracted the wry and humorous side from these ghastly events. He deeply valued the relationships that he formed during the war, and on Anzac Day for many years he led his 27th Battalion with great dignity and pride.

But times changed at the end of Sir Thomas's political life. In pursuing his spectacularly successful developmental program, he knew that water was the vital basic ingredient to our development, and his Government expanded its reticulation to most of the settled areas of South Australia. The most impressive first connection was from Morgan to Whyalla—359 kilometres of pipeline—in support of the shipbuilding and steel industry in that city. In order to ensure an unending supply, he tapped the River Murray for metropolitan supplies as well as looking further afield in his vision for a storage at Chowilla. The history of this ill-fated project has been well documented as an important factor in South Australian politics. The confirmation of the superiority of the Dartmouth Dam in Victoria over Chowilla was surely one of his greatest disappointments.

This, together with the dramatic change in our electoral system, ushered in the end of the political years of Playford. But neither of these changes, nor any that have followed since, diminish the mainstream of Sir Thomas's achievements, so eloquently outlined by many speakers today. Sir Thomas was a superb administrator who led directly through a small group of senior public servants who were the most effective in Australia. He was utterly unyielding in his determination to build the opportunities for jobs and profits in our State, and he did so from a position of absolute personal integrity.

Sir Thomas left the Parliament before additional 'higher office' superannuation was included for ministerial service, and the meagre backbench retirement 'super' that he took with him simply did not recognise in any way his service and legacy to our State. His biographer, Stewart Cockburn, encapsulates the public Playford with this description from his book, which has been mentioned today:

> He led his Party to victory at eight successive elections and eclipsed all records for long political leadership in the history of the British Commonwealth. South Australia's population almost doubled under his Premiership. He presided over a period of unprecedented economic growth and prosperity, which he masterminded and directed with a personal authority and flair unmatched in the previous history of his State.
>
> His integrity in financial matters was absolute and was a major factor in keeping South Australian public life virtually free from corruption and debt during his long regime. His boisterous sense of humour and extraordinary memory were vital parts of his political equipment.

One hundred years since his birth and 31 years since his last days as Premier have made Sir Thomas an historical figure for most South Australians and diminished the number who were personally acquainted with him and those who directly experienced the most progressive years of his Governments. Now it is essential that we learn from the lessons of his administration, the essence of which was partnership between careful administration and forward thinking, planning and implementation. This is a direct contrast to the profligate years of successive Labor Governments played out on the stage of hyped up social reform that neglected to provide the essential long-term economic base for jobs and growth.

Sir Thomas was a proud supporter and passionate advocate for private enterprise and small business, in particular. He was a formidable political operator, a strong and wily leader and a personally humble man. Tom Playford's policies built up the South Australian economy for the benefit of everyone, including those who voted Labor; but Tom Playford was not a Labor man. Labor will never disguise its ineptitude nor absolve its guilt by associating itself with the long years of Playford's successes. I conclude

my remarks by paying tribute to the Playford family, as I am sure they will take quiet satisfaction in knowing that Sir Thomas's service to the State is to be commemorated with a statue of him in the Adelaide Hills where he was raised and is now buried.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): My son, at eight years of age, will remember Dean Brown as his first Premier of South Australia; interestingly enough, I was eight years of age when Sir Thomas Playford was in his last year, so I recall him as my first Premier of South Australia. I particularly recall Sir Thomas Playford because my father was involved in purchasing fruit through the McRobertson company at Ashton. At the time both my father and Sir Thomas Playford had a colourful war record, so they had interesting discussions and similar interests in that area.

As an agriculturalist and with my family involved in horticulture, I was always interested to hear of Sir Thomas Playford's commitment to horticulture and agriculture as well as to his other commitments. In my short time on this earth—39 years—I cannot say that I have seen many true statesmen, but I can quite proudly say that Sir Thomas Playford was a true statesman whom I was able to observe during my lifetime.

He was visionary, as has been explained by other speakers here today; and he was passionately committed to South Australia and South Australians. I know, from what my father used to say about him and from what I can remember after listening to the radio and looking at the media, that he had the absolute respect of all South Australians, irrespective of their political colour, and that he gained that respect because he was genuine to the people and committed to South Australian's future.

He was a person for all people and was also known as a true gentleman. My generation—the baby boomers after the Second World War—has so much to thank Sir Thomas Playford for. One of the factors that stimulated me to make the decision to stand for Parliament was my knowledge of what Sir Thomas Playford had done for South Australia. As a South Australian appreciative of what he had done for my generation, I was extremely disappointed to see a lot of the good work that he had done being undermined. I felt, with the rest of the Liberal team, that we would be able to reinstate some of the directions and opportunities that Sir Thomas Playford had provided for this State.

I often wonder what Sir Thomas Playford would have thought about the past 10 years of Government in South Australia. I was not going to say that until I heard the political connotation in the comments of a member opposite. In any event, I am happy to place that on the record. I cannot fathom how anyone could mention Sir Thomas Playford and Donald Dunstan—and I also witnessed Donald Dunstan as a Premier—in the same breath. As a member of the Liberal Party, I believe they were as alike as chalk and cheese.

The fact is that there was clear balance with Sir Thomas Playford; he had both economic and social balance. In his day he was committed to making sure that jobs were available, that the books were kept in order and that there was a viable future not only economically but also that we had the social fabric to enhance the whole community of South Australia. I hope that the input of Sir Thomas Playford into the development of that social fabric over the 27 years he was the Premier and the other years he was a member of this Parliament will—because they are on the record and because of the great job that he did—be able to be reinstated over the next 10 or 15 years. Of course, that will be a difficult job because much of the social fabric that Sir Thomas Playford was so committed to sadly has been degenerating for more than one generation.

It is not easy being a member of Parliament, and it is not easy being in Government. Times have changed. Modern Parliament is different to the Parliament in which Sir Thomas Playford was Premier. I appreciated the bipartisan comment of the member for Playford that, when we walk past the portrait of Sir Thomas Playford, it will re-invigorate us and give us the adrenalin, strength and commitment to continue to develop South Australia along the cornerstones and foundations of the Sir Thomas Playford era.

Whilst I know that none of us on this side will ever be able to beat Sir Thomas Playford's record, because it is unbeatable, I trust that we will be able to work towards providing a sound and strong future for South Australia, a future which, during the Playford era, was very good not only for South Australia but the whole country. I am very proud to stand up in this House, as a member of Parliament today, and say how delighted I am at the Premier's initiative in debating the centenary celebration of the birth of Sir Thomas Playford on 5 July and the proud hanging of his portrait in this Chamber.

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): It gives me great pleasure to support the motion. In 1938, as has been pointed out by the Premier, when Playford became Premier, the State was wholly reliant on agriculture. By the time he left office, we had the highest level of production manufacturing per capita in the Commonwealth. I think that says something of the man. I would like to touch on the personal and emotional side of Sir Thomas Playford rather than the economic side.

As members know, I am the member for Norwood, and along Norwood Parade there are plenty of restaurants, two of which are run by the Anderson brothers. I was always curious about the fact that their surname was Anderson even though they were obviously Italian. So one day I asked one of the brothers why their name was Anderson when they were obviously Italian and spoke Italian. They told me that, during the war, their father had a property at Norton Summit and happened to be the neighbour of Sir Thomas Playford.

Many people from South Australia were supplying fruit and vegetables for the war effort, and this Italian apparently approached Sir Tom and said, 'I would like to supply some produce to the war effort because I am committed to Australia and I want to help the war effort.' Sir Tom said, 'You have a problem; you have an Italian name and we are at war with Italy, so you will not get a contract. But I have a suggestion. I suggest you change your name.' The Italian said,'I can't think of a name; what do you suggest?', and Sir Tom suggested 'Anderson'. The two Anderson brothers are now operating restaurants on the Parade—one is Bongiorno's, and the other brother has a restaurant on the other side of the Parade. To me, that interesting story says something about the man who was Sir Thomas Playford. I might add that, once this farmer changed his name, he received plenty of contract work from the Government and supplied fruit and vegetables for the war effort.

This portrait of Sir Thomas Playford was painted in 1967 by Sir Ivor Hele, who won the Archibald Prize five times. It is my good fortune that Sir Ivor was a friend of mine. Like Sir Thomas Playford, he was a brave man, having fought in the Second World War. Sir Ivor also painted portraits of Sir Robert Menzies and Malcolm Fraser. He told me that Malcolm Fraser was the most boring man he had ever

painted. This may be an artist being angry, but Sir Ivor told me that the problem with Fraser was that when he was being painted he constantly fell asleep so he could never capture the spirit of the man. He also said that Fraser's wife Tamie was a lovely person. Sir Ivor Hele said of Playford that he was a man of underlying strength and character. I think that says something of Ivor, who saw many dead amongst the war, painted them and painted probably more prominent people in this country than any portrait painter in the history of Australia. Sir Ivor died in 1993.

If one looks at the portrait of Sir Thomas Playford, one sees that it is clear that Sir Ivor captured that underlying strength and character. Anyone in this Chamber who has not looked at the portrait and who wants to know something about Sir Thomas Playford should look at that portrait because, it seems to me, it tells it all.

In Playford's time I had a different political allegiance. During the parliamentary break I thought I should read about Playford. I read virtually every book about Playford, the history of the Liberal Party and the Liberal Movement. There were some sorry stories, but I will not go into that. When I was reading about Playford I was struck by the fact that everyone (in particular, Robert Menzies) was frightened of him because he was such a tough character. Apparently, Sir Thomas used to arrive in Canberra and sit there until he got what he wanted. He would just ring up, announce he was going to Canberra for something and stay there until he got it. I have read the book by Crocker, *A Portrait of Sir Thomas Playford*, where reference is made to Sir Robert Menzies meeting Playford who, on one of his jaunts, turned up on the steps of Parliament House in Canberra. The book quotes Menzies talking to Playford, as follows:

> Hello Tom, I'm delighted to see you. How are things in South Australia and when are you going home?

I will conclude with a quote from page 179 of Crocker's book in relation to a tribute that Menzies paid to Sir Thomas Playford, as follows:

> Sir Robert Menzies, in his Foreword to David Nicholas's book, wrote that Playford was 'a really great man, a man who burned with the true fire of patriotism. . . I am glad that I shall never have to argue with him again. . . but I remain his most faithful and respected admirer. . . '

Those words came from a great Prime Minister of this country who had respect for a man who will always be remembered in this State. It gives me great pleasure to support the motion.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I should like to contribute to a brief part of the record which pays the highest tribute to one of Australia's most significant and renowned State Premiers. As the Premier said, Sir Thomas Playford was Premier for 27 years—a record which stands in the Westminster Parliaments of the world. I first met Sir Thomas Playford as a nine year old lad on King William Street in the middle of the night after a function for the queen in Elder Park in 1954. My father introduced me to him. I will never forget that moment. Here was the man, whom I had heard so much about, in the crowd. He had no grandiose disposition: he was just a humble, friendly and lovely man. There he was in the crowd making his way home with Lady Playford. Sir Thomas had just bid farewell to her majesty in her rolls royce, and then proceeded to walk up King William Street with his beloved people. I will never forget that. I thought that he would at least get a ride home in the rolls royce that day, but, no, he chose to go with the people.

Sir Thomas was a house guest in my family's home on several occasions. That is probably why, first, my father and, later, I chose a role in political life. I could not wait to reach the age where I could join the beloved LCL in those days (now the Liberal Party) as a Young Liberal. As a country South Australian I pay Tom Playford the highest tribute on behalf of all country people. Many times when I turn on the light I think of Tom Playford. It was this man who brought 240 volt reticulated electricity to the far-flung regions of South Australia. This was not a user-pays system; it was not a cost-recovery project; and it could not be financially justified. However, Sir Thomas justified it as quality of life and equality for all the people of South Australia, irrespective of where they lived. We will long remember that. Sir Thomas was often referred to as a great Labor Premier—an agrarian socialist (and I am often called that, too). He did it for all of South Australia and for all of us, so I do not mind him being referred to in any of those terms.

I well remember the night when the lights went on in farm houses in 1960. What a transformation it made to our lives. There were no more flat batteries; no more early night curfews when there was no wind to drive the wind light or when the batteries were flat; no more kero fridges; and no more chip hot water heaters.

Tom Playford also had much to do with the introduction of bulk handling in South Australia. He guaranteed the money to build the first silos and, of course, that debt was paid well before time. Sir Thomas had a lot to do with the bulk handling of grain legislation. He had more to do with that than my father would have liked at the time. He and Tom Stott, a friend of Sir Thomas, and Tom Shanahan introduced very good legislation which stands today unchanged—and long may it be so. Our bulk handling authority has been the most successful in Australia.

Sir Thomas Playford oversaw the implementation of reticulated water to the mid-north but, more importantly, to Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie via the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. That was a huge project even by today's standards. Imagine a Government today trying to undertake a project such as that. We would have to save our sheckles for some years to even contemplate it. No-one before or since has done as much for decentralisation in our State and, indeed, probably Australia, as Tom Playford.

Today, we are regretfully the most centralised State in Australia. That is a fact that Sir Thomas would not be very proud of. There is so much more that I could say. Like the member for Norwood, I often remember with great fondness the comments of the Hon. Bert Kelly—the modest member—when he said that Playford was the best milker of the Canberra cow. He always painted a very graphic picture of the Canberra cow in the bale with all the State Premiers going in to milk it. He always said that Tom was the most effective. As he said, he always came home with the biggest bucketful.

My father served under Premier Playford. Our family and all South Australians bow their heads in respect and note this week the centenary of his hundredth birthday. It is very proper that we should hang his portrait in the Chamber today. May it be an example and a reminder to all of us who serve in this place what service to the people is all about and how a humble man rose to true greatness. May he be an example to all of us. This State has much to thank Sir Thomas for. I join the House in paying tribute to him, and I congratulate the Premier for arranging to have the portrait of Sir Thomas where he always liked to be: in the House. Long may he be here, and long may South Australia remember him.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I should also like to record my tribute to a very great man who was Premier of this State for over 27 years. I congratulate the Premier on moving this motion in Parliament today, and I congratulate the organisation through the Playford Trust which moved to put the portrait of Playford in this Chamber. I suggest that the portrait is in its rightful place on this side of the Chamber. I speak about Sir Thomas Playford not as someone who ever had the opportunity to meet the man but as a child in a migrant family who entered this country in the 1950s. From that early residence in this State my family enjoyed a life-style which was set by Tom Playford's blueprint.

A great many things have been stated about the man, but I recollect that, when I stood in this place in 1989 and delivered my maiden speech, I took time to contemplate what perceptions an immigrant family would have of South Australia at the time. I know that my perceptions as a child and my parents' perceptions were that South Australia was a State which had an education system the envy of many other States; a State which had a hospitals system that was the envy of the western world; a State that was moving to a high peak of industrialisation; and a State where economic growth was assisted by the migrant population and the growth that engendered at the time.

I should also like to pay tribute to Tom Playford in respect of his great vision. He was a man not only of his time, as has been said in this place, but he was a man who had a vision for the future. Many of the instrumentalities that he initiated for this State have served us well over time. The member for Custance mentioned the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. On many an occasion I have travelled through the Mid North and seen glimpses of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline maintaining the appearance of a slippery snake as it travels an undulating path through the countryside. I doubt whether anyone who took the time to contemplate the engineering feat of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline would doubt that it took a great deal of vision not only to initiate the reticulation of water in this State to areas where it was needed but to support and make sure that that project not only got under way but was well and truly implemented.

Members have spoken of the South Australian Housing Trust, which was established for the benefit of all South Australians, of the EWS and of ETSA. From what I have read, I believe that Playford was a visionary also in respect of future possibilities. He would not even exclude or discount the possible future use of nuclear power, and I believe he contemplated the use of solar and wind power. So, in that sense, he was a great visionary not only of his own time but of our time.

I would like to conclude this small tribute this afternoon by referring to a book to which the member for Norwood also referred. This book was written by Sir Walter Crocker who was for some time the Lieutenant Governor of South Australia and a close confidant of Tom Playford. In his book, he refers to what Playford believed to be the essentials of good government, as follows: absolute straightness and honesty; scrupulous fairness in dealing with people; absolute equality before the law; and careful and economical management of public finances. The fourth essential of good government is stated as follows:

> An agreement made by a Government should be carried out in its fullest intention. If Governments evaded or watered down agreements, trickery seeped into society as a whole. It was not easy to force Governments to comply with agreements; Federal Governments had a record as regards compliance which was less than perfect.

The fifth item is most important to record as follows:

> The need for economic development was normally best met by the four foregoing conditions of government. They provided the stability which was the precondition for sound private enterprise, itself the precondition for sound economic growth. Unemployment was reduced not by artificially creating jobs but by creating industry which needed employees.

That, in itself, thwarts some of the interpretations that have been placed on what Playford saw as the need to create industry—not artificially, not to create training positions that did not lead to jobs but to bring industry into this State and therefore to create jobs. I think in that there is a parallel with what this Government is attempting to do and the visions that have been presented by our Premier on our behalf. Once again, I take great pride in being able to offer this small tribute to a great man, Sir Thomas Playford.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): I, too, support the motion with a great deal of enthusiasm. I regret that, in the 10 years I have been here, I have not had such a brilliant thought as the Premier has had to hang in this place the portrait I hope not just of Sir Thomas Playford but of other Premiers who have graced the benches here because, with respect to the present incumbent, I do not think that Speakers contribute much to the well-being and the development of the State. People are not born Speakers. Prior to ascending to the Chair they do a great deal but, if we are honest, we must recognise that, as Speakers, they do not contribute a great deal to the development of the State—

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member is not reflecting on the Chair in any way.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Absolutely not, Sir. But Premiers do. I think it would be excellent if we could have the portraits of all Premiers, as much as space allows, displayed in the House of Assembly rather than those of Speakers. If Sir Thomas Playford is to be the first—if this becomes a precedent—I think that is totally appropriate because, without a doubt, he was one of the outstanding Premiers of this State: there is absolutely no question about that. As has been mentioned, the portrait is outstanding. I do not put myself forward as a connoisseur of art but, when you look at some of the portraits in this place, particularly those of some of the previous Presidents of the Legislative Council, I think you can pick a good one when you see it—and this is a particularly good one. So, I am very pleased about that.

What particularly pleases me about Sir Thomas Playford—and I had quite a few conversations with him—is that even long after he retired he was not afraid to mention some of the things he did during his long period of service from which the State still benefits. Of great pride and joy to him was the fact that he nationalised the private electricity companies. When members of the Legislative Council said that they might block this initiative, he said that he would get the cabbage growers in the Hills to sort them out. Of course, he sorted out enough of them so that the Bill got through. So, for him to have nationalised the electricity industry on behalf of the people of this State was a major triumph. The Labor Party will fight all the way to see that his vision continues with the State ownership of ETSA being maintained for the benefit of all the people and not just a few foreign owners, which is now the case unfortunately with the EWS—another great monument to Sir Thomas Playford. It is a tragedy that

the EWS is now, in effect, owned by the French and the British.

I refer more particularly to Whyalla and the South Australian Housing Trust. With respect to the reissuing of mining leases around the Iron Knob and Middleback Range deposits, what Sir Thomas Playford did was absolutely brilliant. If BHP wanted to keep those leases when they expired, he said that there was a *quid pro quo*, and that was, of course, the establishment of an integrated steelworks at Whyalla. For that, again, we must be grateful to Sir Thomas Playford.

The most significant thing that Sir Thomas Playford did was the establishment of the South Australian Housing Trust. Without a doubt, that is the most significant State institution that has been created in South Australia—and I have said that many times both inside and outside the Parliament. On a social level, what the South Australian Housing Trust has achieved in bringing industry into this State and supporting it by housing people has been absolutely stupendous. For that alone, Sir Thomas Playford deserves to have his portrait hung in Parliament House.

I would also like to comment on the speech of the Leader today in seconding this motion, because he mentioned that it was not all roses with Sir Thomas Playford, that he did see some things as being in the interests of the State which, in some areas, would not be acceptable today. There is nothing wrong in saying that. For the members for Mawson and Unley, or any other member, to suggest that there is something wrong in pointing out that he was born 100 years ago, and that some of his attitudes were formed a long time ago and would not be acceptable today, I believe that Sir Thomas Playford would have been big enough to cope with that. I am sure that some of the opinions we place on record today in the House—if people care at all, which is unlikely—will be considered by others in 50 years to be rather quaint, and that they may or may not say nice things about us.

I can remember that, in 1968, the first significant demonstration I ever attended in Australia was against the Playford gerrymander, when 10 000 people stood on the steps of Parliament House, including some very prominent South Australians who were certainly not members or even sympathisers of the Labor Party. In fact, some of them turned out to be members of the Liberal Movement. They were demonstrating to abolish the Playford gerrymander because, for all his virtues, Sir Thomas Playford did have one or two faults, one being that he did not believe in people voting if they were likely to vote Labor.

He managed very effectively to ensure that none of the grubby Labor people were permitted to vote for the Legislative Council. It was not so easy in the House of Assembly to prevent their voting, so Sir Thomas Playford arranged the Playmander, as Blewitt and Jaensch coined the term. It was, in fact, a malapportionment of electorates that ensured that up to six or seven Liberals were elected for every elected Labor member, irrespective of how people voted. When we talk about the longevity of Sir Thomas Playford as Premier, we ought to bear in mind that, had the system had any democratic features whatsoever, Sir Thomas Playford might not have held that record. In a very balanced way, the Leader made that point today and it is worth repeating.

The member for Newland read from the book about how fair Sir Thomas was. Sir Walter Crocker—an impartial observer, as we all know, of things political—said that Sir Thomas was always fair. Perhaps the definition of fairness was different in those days, but it seems to me extraordinary that, when I came to Australia, my side of politics invariably got majorities in elections but found it very difficult to get a majority of seats. In the Legislative Council, under Sir Thomas Playford, the seats were 16 Liberal members and four Labor members. The only reason the Labor Party had four members was that the Liberals did not contest one of the districts, or it would have been 20-nil.

In those days that might well have been seen to be fair, but many people even then—even 30 years ago when I came to Australia—did not think it was fair. Let us praise Sir Thomas Playford for the very wonderful things he did. Had I been here, I would have been right behind him in this Parliament supporting the nationalisation of ETSA; supporting the building of the great infrastructure; and even, let me say, supporting a level of debt in this State at 60 per cent of gross State product during Sir Thomas Playford's time. He was not scared to borrow to build the infrastructure to—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Exactly. I agree completely. He was not afraid to borrow to build the infrastructure that this State needed. He would talk about that when he came into the Parliament after he had retired, and he was absolutely right to do so. Another brilliant move by Sir Thomas Playford was to support the preselection and subsequent election of the Leader of the parliamentary LCL, Steele Hall. To my mind, that was one of his greatest achievements. He was not obliged to do it, but he chose a man who would bring democracy to this State.

In all the conversations I had with him after he retired, I never heard Sir Thomas Playford on Steele Hall. He did not have those kinds of private conversations with me, but I have no doubt that some of the members opposite would have had them. I am not quite sure what he thought of his actions in doing that but, nevertheless, he did it. It was traumatic for Steele Hall and it was traumatic for the Liberal Movement. I know that the present Premier was very prominent in that. I remember him on the news at night, with his nice, long sideboards and bushy, curly hair saying how much we needed democracy in this State and that the Playford era was over. Again, I agreed with him. While we are talking about Thomas Playford, let us also record that his chosen successor was Steele Hall, and for that we can all be grateful.

I was in Parliament from the time of the Liberal Movement in 1975 and I remember the angst, particularly in the Legislative Council, about allowing these people in Whyalla, for example, to vote. But in 1979 with a fair system, or with very little of the Playmander left, the Liberals won hands down, so it was possible to win. Whilst we praise Sir Thomas for ETSA, the Housing Trust and all these other achievements, I think we should also praise him for promoting Steele Hall.

I join with the Premier, the Leader and other members who have spoken in support of the portrait's hanging in the Chamber. I congratulate the Premier for promoting that idea and I hope that this portrait will not be the last because, contrary to the member for Mawson, I believe there have been other Premiers in this State who are worthy of the same honour.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Premier): I thank members of the House for supporting the motion. Today is an historic day in that we acknowledge once again the tremendous achievements of Sir Thomas Playford. Some members have talked about those achievements, and when one sat and listened to the debate one realised what outstanding achieve-

ments they were. Some of his achievements have not even been mentioned. No-one talked about his role in the development of the Cooper Basin, or at least from what I heard no-one referred to it. Sir Thomas would head off to the Cooper Basin every winter. He would love to sleep under the stars as did the people involved in exploration back in the 1950s.

Regarding some of the oil exploration developments in this State, today the Cooper Basin is the biggest on-shore petroleum development in the whole of Australia. It provides gas to South Australia; the majority of electricity to South Australia; and gas to Sydney and Brisbane. The Cooper Basin alone has had an enormous impact on the development of Australia, providing ethane for the new ICI ethane plant in Sydney. One could go on from just that one development. As members have indicated, we could look at a whole range of manufacturing industries. We have not touched on what Sir Thomas did for the white goods industry in South Australia—how he helped Kelvinator, in particular, and the development of the Simpson operation. There was a time when South Australia was the biggest manufacturer of white goods in Australia, with manufacturers such as Simpsons, Kelvinator, Metters, and others.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: All Bank of Adelaide customers. His advice to me, which is something that the former Labor Government should have listened to, was, 'You always want to make the former Under Treasurer the Chairman of your State-owned bank, because any Under Treasurer tends to be pretty mean, and you want to make sure that the Chairman of your bank is a pretty mean person who doesn't allow over expenditure.' Certainly, South Australia would have been in a better position today if that advice had been followed back in the 1980s.

Unfortunately, one misinformed member—and I will not name him—suggested that at the end of the Thomas Playford era hospitals in South Australia were run down and neglected, but I would say that that is entirely false. In fact, Sir Thomas Playford put an enormous effort into hospital development throughout the whole of South Australia, particularly the development of community hospitals. I say that from some personal knowledge, because my father was involved as an architect in the design of 63 South Australian hospitals from 1946 to the late 1960s. He was personally involved in the development of many community hospitals as the architect. Some of those projects involved additions, many of them multiple additions, while others involved the development of new hospitals. As a young lad I can recall going to town after town looking at the hospitals developed under the Playford Government.

There is one other area which I must touch on, because it has not been referred to in some detail. I refer to the values of Sir Thomas Playford as a person, his own personal beliefs and the way he upheld those beliefs. He had the highest values we would find in anyone and he not only had a great commitment to maintaining those personal values but there was almost an expectation, which must have disappointed him at times, that his fellow men and women would follow the high standards that he personally maintained. Of course, those values reflected very much on the way he carried out his role as Premier. He would always put other people first; he would always make the ultimate sacrifice to go that extra distance to help anyone he possibly could, no matter what his own personal predicament was.

Today this State honours one of its great leaders—the greatest Premier of the State—a man who has made an enormous personal contribution to South Australia. He has given hundreds of thousands of South Australians jobs as a result of the vision he had in the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s. As a young South Australian, he always used to call me 'laddie', and I will always be eternally grateful for what he did for South Australia and for the leadership he gave to the State. Therefore, I urge members to support the motion.

The SPEAKER: Before putting the motion, I would like to add my personal support for it. I refer to two decisions I have been involved with in relation to Sir Thomas Playford in this Parliament. The first was when I was pleased to approve the Premier's request to have this portrait hung. It calls into question whether we need to review the position involving paintings and other items exhibited in this building and from time to time see whether other paintings or items might be exhibited.

The second decision allowed Sir Thomas Playford to come back and use the facilities of this Parliament. In my second Parliament I organised to get myself elected to the then Joint House Committee, and one of the first decisions in which I participated was to vote with the Labor Party to allow former members of Parliament to use the facilities. It was not a popular decision with some other members on the committee, but that allowed us to enjoy the company of Sir Thomas Playford in the Parliamentary Dining Room, and the stories he told about the Snowy Mountains Scheme and other tales he recounted would not have been possible if that decision had not been taken.

Motion carried.

INDUSTRIAL AND EMPLOYEE RELATIONS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Minister for Industrial Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial and Employee Relations Act 1994. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: 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 proposes amendments to the *Industrial and Employee Relations Act 1994* which will remove the requirement that Judges of the Industrial Relations Court must also be Judges of the District Court and extend the sunset provision affecting Industrial Agreements carried over from the *Industrial Relations Act (SA) 1972* from 8 August 1996 to 31 December 1996.

It is the intention of these amendments that they will result in an increase in the flexibility available to the Senior Judge of the Industrial Relations Court in relation to the work of that Court and on the issue of Industrial Agreements, provide a small extension to the transitional arrangements so that the parties to these agreements can attend to their conversion to Enterprise Agreements under the provisions of the new Act.

Industrial Relations Court Judges

Proclamation of the *Industrial and Employee Relations Act 1994* on 8 August 1994 saw the introduction of new administrative arrangements for the South Australian Industrial Relations Court whereby the Senior Judge and Judges of that Court were appointed Judges of the District Court and then assigned by the Governor as Judges of the Industrial Relations Court.

This statutory requirement has had the unintended consequence of reducing the flexibility available to the Senior Judge of the Industrial Relations Court in relation to the work of that Court, in that legally qualified Tribunal members cannot perform judicial functions in the Court, such as sit on Full Benches or hear other matters when single members of the Court are unavailable, unless they are also appointed as Judges of the District Court. One unde-

sirable consequence of this in the Industrial Relations Court has been the use of two member rather than three member Full Benches during periods of limited judicial resources.

The lack of flexibility which this statutory provision has created for the Industrial Relations Court has not been offset by greater flexibility in transfer of Judges between the District Court and the Industrial Relations Court. Consultation with both the Senior Judge of the District Court and the Senior Judge of the Industrial Relations Court has revealed that there are now no Judges of the District Court anxious to hold appointments as Judges of the Industrial Relations Court, nor are there Judges of the Industrial Relations Court who hold a District Court commission, who wish to sit in the District Court.

The proposals contained in this Bill will provide greater flexibility in the administration and operation of the Industrial Relations Court. They have been developed in consultation with the Senior Judge of the District Court and the Senior Judge of the Industrial Relations Court.

Industrial Agreements—Transitional Provisions

The new Act also provided transitional provisions dealing with the operation of Industrial Agreements made under the former Act. These transitional provisions allow for Industrial Agreements to continue for a two year period only, ending of 8 August 1996. During this two year transitional period it was anticipated that Industrial Agreements would be renegotiated as Enterprise Agreements, or would otherwise lapse.

Progress in the replacement of Industrial Agreements by Enterprise Agreements during the transitional period has been slower than expected partly as a result of difficulties with the maintenance of Registry records as a result of the constant changing of the status, and in some cases existence, of employers, unions or employee associations since 1972 and partly as a result of inadequate attention by the relevant employers or employee representatives as to the requirements of the transitional arrangements.

Failure to extend the transitional period in cases where new Enterprise Agreements have not been made would mean that the Industrial Agreements which currently exist will no longer have legal effect after 8 August 1996 and that industrial rights and obligations would, from that date, automatically reflect award provisions, if any, governing the workplace. This would have undesirable consequences for some employees whose minimum wage entitlements may be lower under an award than under the agreement. It would also have undesirable consequences for some employers who have negotiated a lower cost structure under their Industrial Agreement than under the industry award.

Whilst the Government might be entitled to be critical of the parties to these agreements for having failed to renegotiate Industrial Agreements into Enterprise Agreements, the Government can not ignore the practical consequences of the transitional provisions on 8 August 1996. It is therefore necessary to consider an appropriate amendment to these transitional provisions.

The amendments contained in this Bill have been the subject of consultation with the Industrial Relations Advisory Committee, the President of the Industrial Relations Commission and the Enterprise Agreement Commissioner who all support the proposals contained therein. South Australia's peak employee and employer groups, the South Australian Employers' Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the United Trades and Labour Council of South Australia have both endorsed the amendments contained in this Bill.

I commend this Bill to the House and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in Hansard without my reading it.

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Substitution of Division 4 of Part 2

This clause provides for the appointment of judges specifically to the Court.

Clause 3: Amendment of Schedule 1, s. 7

This clause extends until 31 December 1996 the period on which industrial agreements continue in operation. The Commission is required to take reasonable steps to ensure that the parties to industrial agreements are aware that the agreements will lapse on that date and, as far as practicable and appropriate, encourage the renegotiation of the agreements as enterprise agreements.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

OMBUDSMAN (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Minister for Tourism): 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 makes a number of amendments to the Ombudsman Act 1972. The Bill provides for the establishment of a new Committee of Parliament to make recommendations relating to the appointment of the Ombudsman. In addition, the Ombudsman has made recommendations in his recent Annual Reports for amendments to the *Ombudsman Act* ('the Act'). The Bill adopts a number of those recommendations.

At the last election, the Government announced that it would introduce legislation to provide for Parliamentary involvement in the appointment of the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman holds a special position of independence. The Ombudsman investigates administrative acts of Government. Despite the independent, apolitical nature of the position there is currently no mechanism by which Parliament can be consulted or involved in the appointment. The Government believes that, to ensure and enhance the independent status of the Ombudsman, Parliament should be involved in the appointment of the Ombudsman.

The Government proposes to deal with this matter by establishing a separate committee of Parliament to make recommendations in relation to the appointment of the Ombudsman. However, given that historically Parliament has not been involved in making such appointments, the process will need to guard against politicisation of the office and the appointment. The Government does not envisage the type of system adopted in the United States of America where possible appointees to office have their lives dissected in the public arena.

Clause 4 of the Bill deals with the appointment of the Ombudsman. It provides that the appointment of Ombudsman will be by the Governor on the recommendation of the Ombudsman Parliamentary Committee. The Schedule to the Bill sets out the provisions relating to the establishment, membership and duties of the Committee.

The Committee will be a joint committee of Parliament and will be comprised of six members. The Committee will have at least one representative of the Government and one member of the Opposition from each House. Matters disclosed to, or considered by the Committee for the purpose of making a recommendation on appointment of the Ombudsman cannot be the subject of public disclosure or comment. The recommendation of the Committee must be approved by resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

Clause 7 of the Bill also relates to the relationship of the Ombudsman with Parliament and, in particular, the investigation of matters which Parliament may think appropriate. This provision would allow either House of Parliament or any committee of either of those Houses to refer to the Ombudsman for investigation and report, any matter which is within the Ombudsman's jurisdiction and which that House or committee considers should be investigated. The Ombudsman is then required to carry out an investigation and submit a report to the President and/or the Speaker.

The Ombudsman already investigates matters referred by individual members of Parliament. However, the Government considers there is value in clarifying the role of the Ombudsman in relation to Parliament generally.

This Bill also deals with a number of miscellaneous matters. The Ombudsman has recommended that the Act should be amended to ensure that it automatically applies to a council upon constitution or reconstitution. Section 3(1) of the Act defines 'agency to which this Act applies' to include 'a proclaimed council'. All councils have been proclaimed. However it has been necessary to make a number of proclamations as councils are formed or reconstituted. The Ombudsman considers that, for reasons of convenience and certainty of application, the Act should be amended so as to ensure that it will generally apply to each council.

The same argument applies to health units incorporated under the *Health Commission Act.* At the moment, before a health unit incorporated under the *Health Commission Act* is subject to the Ombudsman's jurisdiction, it must be proclaimed to be an authority

for the purposes of the *Ombudsman Act.* The proclamation is sought routinely whenever a health unit or hospital is incorporated.

The Government considers it is sensible to amend the *Ombudsman Act* to provide that local councils are automatically covered and that health units incorporated under the *Health Commission Act* automatically become an authority under the *Ombudsman Act*. Clause 3 of the Bill makes these amendments.

Clause 5 deals with the appointment of an Acting Ombudsman. The Ombudsman has recommended that an amendment should be made to permit an acting Ombudsman to be appointed from a member of staff who happens to be a public servant, without the need for the person to resign from the public service.

The Government agrees that it is impractical to require a person to resign from the public service to cover short absences by the Ombudsman. However, it considers that the acting appointment should be limited to a maximum of two, three month periods as it would be inappropriate for a public servant to act as Ombudsman for an extended period of time.

Clause 6 of the Bill amends Section 12 of the Act by removing the reference to the *Government Management and Employment Act* and replacing it with a reference to the *Public Sector Management Act*.

Clause 8 of the Bill inserts a new section into the Act to provide the Ombudsman with specific power to deal with complaints by conciliation. The NSW legislation and the *Police (Complaints and Disciplinary Proceedings) Act* include provisions relating to conciliation. The Ombudsman considers such a provision would be useful, particularly in the new area of health complaints. The Government considers that the provision may have a practical effect of encouraging conciliation rather than investigation.

Clause 9 of the Bill provides for an amendment to enable the Ombudsman to issue a temporary prohibition on administrative acts for a period of no more than 45 days.

In his Eighteenth and Nineteenth Annual Reports, the Ombudsman suggested that consideration should be given to modifying Section 28 of the Act by adding a provision similar to the New South Wales provision to allow the Ombudsman to apply to the Court for an injunction restraining any administrative action or conduct by an agency where the action or conduct would affect the subject of an investigation or proposed investigation by the Ombudsman. The New South Wales Act provides for injunction proceedings.

Following consultation on the issue, the Ombudsman revised his original recommendation. The Ombudsman has now suggested an amendment which would enable him to stay any administrative action for a limited period not exceeding 45 days if he is of the opinion that there is a sufficiently serious cause for so doing.

The Government prefers the revised approach suggested by the Ombudsman. Under the terms of the Bill, the Ombudsman may by notice prohibit an agency from performing an administrative act for a period up to 45 days. The Ombudsman cannot issue such a notice unless satisfied that the administrative act is likely to prejudice a investigation or the effect of a recommendation. The amendment would only apply where the issue of the notice is necessary to prevent hardship to a person and the compliance with the notice would not result in the agency breaching a contract or legal obligation or cause another party undue hardship. Such an approach would meet the needs of the Ombudsman while at the same time minimising the inconvenience and cost to agencies.

The Bill also amends Section 30 of the Act. Section 30 provides that no liability attaches to the Ombudsman, or any member of staff, for any act or omission, in good faith, in the exercise, or purported exercise, of powers or functions under the Act.

Section 9 of the Act provides that the Ombudsman may delegate any of his powers or functions under the Act to any person. The protection offered by Section 30 does not extend to persons exercising a delegation under Section 9. Clause 11 amends Section 30 of the Act to extend protection to delegates of the Ombudsman.

I commend this Bill to Honourable Members.

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation

This clause makes a number of minor changes to the definitions contained in the Act. Most of these are consequential on the removal of the concept of 'proclaimed councils' (which means that the Act will apply to all councils, without the need for a proclamation). In addition a change to the definition of 'authority' will mean that hospitals and health centres incorporated under the *South Australian Health Commission Act 1976* will automatically fall within the ambit of the Act, without the need for a proclamation. The only other change is the insertion of a definition of 'Committee' (ie. the Parliamentary Committee established in the proposed schedule) which is consequential to the proposed amendment to section 6 of the Act.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 6—Appointment of Ombudsman

This clause amends section 6 to provide that the Governor may only appoint a person as Ombudsman on a recommendation of the Committee that has been approved by resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 8—Acting Ombudsman

This clause amends section 8 to provide that a Public Service employee may be appointed to act in the office of the Ombudsman while remaining a Public Service employee for a maximum term of three months. On expiry of that term the person may be reappointed provided that the terms of appointment do not exceed six months in aggregate in any period of 12 months.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 12—Officers of the Ombudsman

This clause removes an obsolete reference.

Clause 7: Insertion of s. 14

This clause inserts a new section 14 into the principal Act allowing for the referral of matters by Parliament to the Ombudsman for investigation. Following an investigation the Ombudsman must submit a report on the matter to the referring House or, in the case of a referral by a joint committee, to both Houses.

Proposed subsection (3) applies the principles contained in sections 13(3) and 16(1) (which outline circumstances in which the Ombudsman is not required to investigate a complaint) to matters proposed to be referred by Parliament under this section. These principles may, however, be overridden here by a resolution of the House or committee that proposes to refer the matter.

Clause 8: Insertion of s. 17a

This clause inserts a new provision giving the Ombudsman power to resolve complaints by conciliation.

Clause 9: Insertion of s. 19a

This clause inserts a new section 19a into the principal Act allowing the Ombudsman to issue a notice temporarily prohibiting an administrative act. The Ombudsman must not, however, issue a notice unless satisfied—

- that the administrative act is likely to prejudice an investigation or proposed investigation or a recommendation that the Ombudsman might make as a result of an investigation or proposed investigation; and
- that compliance with the notice by the agency would not result in the agency breaching a contract or other legal obligation or cause any third parties undue hardship; and
- that issue of the notice is necessary to prevent serious hardship.

If an agency fails to comply with a notice the Ombudsman may require the principal officer to make a report on the matter. If, following receipt of the principal officer's report, the Ombudsman if of the opinion that the agency's failure to comply with the notice was unjustified or unreasonable, the Ombudsman may report on the matter to the Premier and may forward copies of the report to the Speaker of the House of Assembly and the President of the Legislative Council with a request that they be laid before their respective Houses.

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 25—Proceedings on the completion of an investigation

This clause amends section 25 to make it clear that the section does not apply to an investigation following a referral by Parliament under proposed section 14.

Clause 11: Amendment of s. 30—Immunity from liability

This clause amends section 31 to ensure that it includes not only the staff of the Ombudsman but any person engaged in the administration or enforcement of the Act.

Clause 12: Insertion of schedule

This clause inserts the schedule in the principal Act.

SCHEDULE

Schedule Inserted in Principal Act

The schedule to be inserted in the principal Act deals with the Parliamentary Committee. The Committee's duties are—

- to consider the general operation of the Act (but not to conduct reviews of individual investigations by the Ombudsman);
- to recommend the appointment of the Ombudsman;
- to consider other matters referred by the Minister;
- to provide an annual report to Parliament.

Information disclosed to or considered by the Committee for the purpose of its making a recommendation in relation to the appointment of the Ombudsman will be treated confidentially.

The Committee is to consist of three members of the House of Assembly and three members of the Legislative Council, and must include both Government and Opposition members.

The members of the Committee are not entitled to remuneration for their work as members of the Committee.

The schedule also deals with the term of office of members of the Committee, removal from, and vacancies in, office and the procedures of the Committee.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

TRUSTEE (VARIATION OF CHARITABLE TRUSTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Minister for Tourism): 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 amends the *Trustee Act 1936* to give the Attorney-General power to vary the objects of small charitable trusts.

Charitable trusts are trusts for the relief of poverty; trusts for the advancement of education; trusts for the advancement of religion; and trusts for other purposes beneficial to the community. Some charitable trusts may be very large but some may be very modest.

Charitable trusts may be, or become impossible or impracticable to put into effect. This can be for a variety of reasons. The object of the trust may, for example, have ceased to exist; conditions may have changed over time; the object of the trust may have ceased to be charitable; or the property may be more than is needed to carry out the selected objects. An example which is causing the Public Trustee concern at the moment it a trust establishing prizes for children attending a named school which no longer exists.

If a charitable trust is initially impossible or impracticable to put into effect, or subsequently becomes so, the courts will apply the property *cy-pres, i.e.*, apply it to some other charitable purpose 'as nearly as possible' resembling the original trusts.

Applications to vary the objects of charitable trusts are made by the trustees to the Supreme Court under section 69b of the *Trustee Act 1936.* The cost of such proceedings is not inconsiderable and where the trust is small the cost of the application may deplete the trust or be out of proportion to the amount of the fund.

Several States have overcome this problem by giving the Attorney-General power to alter the object of small charitable trusts without recourse to the courts. The most recent example is found in the Tasmanian *Variation of Trusts Act 1994.*

The provisions of this bill, like the interstate legislation, give the Attorney-General power to vary the purposes for which trust property is required or permitted to be applied if satisfied that a trust variation scheme proposed by the trustees accords, as far as reasonably practicable, with the spirit of the trust and is justified in the circumstances of the particular case. These are the same grounds on which a court may vary a trust under section 69b of the *Trustee Act 1936.* The Attorney-General has a discretion to refer an application to the Supreme Court if he or she considers that the application raises questions that should be considered by the Court.

The Attorney-General is given the power to vary the objects of charitable trusts where the value of the trust property does not exceed $250 000 or such other amount as may be prescribed. There is nothing magic about this amount. Under the New South Wales legislation the Attorney-General can approve schemes varying the objects of trusts where the value of the trust property does not exceed $500 000 or such other amount as may be prescribed. The Tasmanian legislation applies where the value of the trust property is $100 000, if the property includes real property, and $50 000, if the property consists of personal property only (or such other amounts as may be prescribed). A figure between these two extremes seems to be about right. There will be a cost to the Attorney-General in approving a scheme to vary a trust and provision is made to allow the Attorney-General to recover the reasonable costs incurred by him or her of an application to vary a trust. These costs, as are the costs of applications to the court, are payable out of the trust property.

Advice from Tasmania is that the Tasmanian legislation is providing a solution, which has been well received, to the problems experienced by many small charitable trusts. The enactment of this Bill will be of similar benefit in South Australia.

I commend this measure to Honourable Members.

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 69B—Alteration of purposes of charitable trust

This clause amends section 69B of principal Act which currently deals with variation of a charitable trust by the Supreme Court. The amendments to the section would mean that the Attorney-General would also have power, on application by the trustees of a charitable trust, to approve of a variation to the trust where the value of the trust property does not exceed $250 000 or another limit prescribed by regulation (see proposed subsection (3)). The proposed amendments also provide as follows:

- Subsection (4) allows the Attorney-General to refer an application to the Supreme Court where appropriate.
- Subsection (5) provides for the giving of notice of an application.
- Subsection (6) provides that the Supreme Court or the Attorney-General (as the case may require) must be satisfied that the variation proposed accords, as far as reasonably practicable, with the spirit of the trust and is justified in the circumstances.
- Subsections (7) and (8) provide for recovery of the reasonable costs of an application from the trust property (which, in the case of an application decided by the Attorney-General, include costs payable to the Crown to defray the cost of investigating and deciding the application).
- Subsection (9) provides for the keeping of a public register of approvals given by the Attorney-General under this section.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS ENTERPRISES (COMPETITION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 June. Page 1700.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): This Bill, which should not unduly delay us, stems from an initiative by the Government to bring in a pricing mechanism for Government business enterprises in South Australia. It is part of a package of reforms intended to create competition within Government business enterprises. This legislation will provide for commissioners who will monitor the price at which services are provided to the community in South Australia and who will report to the Parliament and the Government. The Commissioner will ensure—theoretically, at least—that there will not be excessive pricing in South Australia and that we will have someone who is independent of Government. I say 'theoretically' because one of deficiencies in the legislation is that the commissioners are appointed for only a two-year period. It is a curiously short period, and I signal to the Premier or the Minister, whoever is handling this portfolio area, that we will be asking some questions on this matter when we go into Committee, which I imagine will be soon.

Certainly, this measure is a step in the right direction. This is one of the downstream decisions that have been made by the Government to bring about competition within its own enterprises, following the 1991 COAG meeting at which it was decided that all Government enterprises—be they State or Federal—would be opened up for competition. Normally with this sort of legislation, we would go pretty well straight to a third reading, but my Caucus would like me to address some matters when we reach Committee. I also note that

there are amendments to be moved by the Premier, so we need to have a Committee stage in any case.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Appointment of commissioners.'

Mr QUIRKE: We are puzzled as to just how many Government enterprises will be roped into this legislation. For the past couple of years, we have had a number of Government activities outsourced; in particular the EWS became SA Water. We then saw an outsourcing of its primary function to a company created for that purpose, United Water, which has a private shareholding, although I am well aware that the Government has retained the billing and the pricing for SA Water accounts. Under this legislation will the Commissioner have a purview over SA Water pricing?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The advice I have received is that the Bill covers ETSA and EWS, which involves SA Water. There would need to be Cabinet approval for or recognition of any other pricing mechanism outside those two bodies. Clearly, if Cabinet decided to pull some other near monopoly into the exercise, it could do that, but it would clearly have to advise this Parliament. The commissioners could act only on the direction of Cabinet, with the approval of the Governor. Executive Council would virtually make those recommendations.

Mr QUIRKE: That is the answer we expected. Can the commissioners function only if they are given a Cabinet direction to function?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: They must have a specific investigation referred to them in relation to any GBE. Consequently, it requires Cabinet approval through Executive Council.

Mr QUIRKE: Obviously, if that is the case, what we have is not a pricing ombudsman, so to speak, for Government business enterprises but a fall-back position for the Government to instruct if it sees the necessity for investigating prices. Is it accessed only through Cabinet directive?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Whilst the reference is required to come through Executive Council, the commissioners, once a reference is received, are not required to accept the advice of the Minister and/or Cabinet. They are independent regarding that advice but, clearly, they are required to get that reference first through Executive Council.

Mr QUIRKE: It is a curious provision. We are creating a prices watchdog for Government business enterprises. The Government can put up the price and the watchdog can operate only if the Government tells it to do so. It is a puzzle to me. However, if that is what the Government wants to do, I am happy for the Government to do it. In any case, this will hardly remove the Government from any political damage if costs go up too much. Pointing to some commissioner and having some sort of inquiry that the Government decides on is something that could really be a script for Monty Python.

Clause passed.

Clauses 6 and 7 passed.

Clause 8—'Liability to prices oversight.'

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I move:

Page 4, line 7—Leave out 'market dominance in one or more markets' and insert 'the market power of a monopoly or near monopoly in one or more markets'.

This amendment will ensure that the definition of the GBEs to which pricing oversight may be applied more closely reflects the definition expressed in the Competition Policies Agreement.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 9 passed.

Clause 10—'Budget for carrying out investigation.'

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I move:

Page 5, line 4—Leave out paragraph (b) and insert—
(b) discuss the budget with the GBE and the GBE's portfolio Minister; and.

This amendment will enhance accountability and ensure that the portfolio Minister is fully informed of discussions concerning the budget for pricing investigations.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 11 to 15 passed.

Clause 16—'Principles of competitive neutrality.'

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I move:

Page 8, lines 4 to 6—Leave out subclause (1) and insert—
(1) Principles of competitive neutrality are principles designed to neutralise any net competitive advantage that a Government or local government agency engaged in significant business activities would otherwise have, by virtue of its relationship with the Government or local government, over private businesses operating in the same market.

This amendment will ensure that the principles of competitive neutrality are more precisely defined and adhere more closely to the Competition Principles Agreement.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 17—'Complaints.'

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I move:

Page 8, line 16—Leave out 'with a public sector body'.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (18 to 22) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MOTOR VEHICLES (TRADE PLATES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Minister for Tourism): 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 introduce a simple single trade plate system to replace the current 'general' trader's plate and 'limited' trader's plate system.

The criteria for the issuing of trade plates and the conditions governing their use have, for a number of years, been the subject of criticism from various groups within the motor industry. The view generally expressed is that the present legislation no longer meets the needs of industry, and is open to abuse by some plate holders.

At the present time the issuing of trade plates is limited to persons who are engaged in the business of manufacturing, repairing or dealing in motor vehicles, or the manufacture of agricultural machinery. These criteria, which also require the person to have 'suitable premises', excludes, for example, the owner of a mobile workshop from obtaining a trade plate, even though the owner may be genuinely engaged in repairing vehicles. Accessory fitters, such as liquid petroleum gas tank fitters, are also excluded from obtaining a trade plate by the existing legislation.

The present criteria provide for a trade plate to be used 'for any purpose directly connected with a business carried on by the trader'. This is considered to be too general and has led, in some cases, to traders using the trade plate for their own transport to and from their residence and workplace, thereby avoiding the payment of registration, stamp duty and insurance charges.

The Bill provides for the regulations to prescribe the purposes for which a trade plate may be used and excludes all other uses. To assist in effectively controlling and policing the use of trade plates, restrictions on the use of a vehicle will be applied according to the category

of vehicle on which the trade plate is to be affixed. These categories are:

- heavy commercial;
- motor car;
- motorcycle;
- trailer; and
- agricultural machinery.

An applicant for the issuing of a trade plate will be required to nominate the category or categories of vehicles for which the trade plate is required. The Bill will also allow for a heavy commercial vehicle, operated on a trade plate, to carry a load for demonstration purposes. This will enable the performance of the vehicle to be more adequately demonstrated to prospective purchasers than is currently the case. A separate charge will be payable for each category, with the charge for each vehicle type tied to the equivalent registration charge for that class of vehicle. There will be no charge for a trade plate required for agricultural machinery. The Bill also provides for a trade plate to be issued for a period of up to three years. However, an administration fee of $20 will be payable on the issue of a trade plate, irrespective of the period for which the trade plate is issued.

The criteria for obtaining a trade plate will be that the applicant is genuinely engaged in a business in which trade plates are reasonably required. The Bill will enable the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to engage the services of the Motor Trade Association, the Royal Automobile Association, or other industry association, to assist in assessing applications for the issuing of a trade plate.

The Bill also provides an innovative approach to allow vehicles being loaded onto, or unloaded from, a transporter to be exempt from registration. This will enable vehicles to be driven to or from a transporter without the need to attach a trade plate to each vehicle.

A specific third party compulsory insurance premium class will be created for transporters, so that the increased risk associated with loading and unloading operations is reflected in the premium cost. Some improvement in the efficiency of the industry can be expected.

The opportunity is being taken to rename trader's plates to trade plates, which is the expression commonly used in the motor industry.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 10—Exemption of vehicles with trade plates

This clause removes references to 'trader's' and replaces them with 'trade'.

Clause 4: Insertion of s. 10a

10a. Exemption of vehicles being loaded or unloaded from transporter

This section allows a vehicle to be driven on a road without registration if it is driven for the purpose of loading onto, or unloading it from, a transporter and the vehicle is driven not more than 500 metres from the transporter.

Clause 5: Amendment of heading preceding s. 62

This clause replaces the reference to 'trader's' with a reference to 'trade'.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 62—Issue of trade plates

This clause amends section 62 of the principal Act to—

- empower the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to issue trade plates to a person if the Registrar is satisfied that the person is engaged in a business in which trade plates are reasonably required for a purpose of a kind prescribed by the regulations and stated in the person's application;
- allow the Registrar, in determining whether an applicant satisfies the requirements for the issuing of trade plates—
  - to seek and obtain the advice and assistance of a person or body that represents the interests of those engaged in a business of the kind in which the applicant is engaged; and
  - to enter into arrangements with a person or body for the purpose of obtaining such advice and assistance;
- replace references to 'trader's' with references to 'trade'.

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 64—Specifications of plates

This clause replaces the references to 'trader's' with references to 'trade'.

Clause 8: Substitution of ss. 65 to 67

65. Duration

This section provides for a trade plate to be issued for 12 months, 2 years or 3 years at the option of the applicant, and to be reissued for any such period.

66. Use of vehicle to which trade plates are affixed

This section permits a motor vehicle to which trade plates are affixed in accordance with the regulations to be driven on a road for a purpose prescribed by the regulations and stated in the application for the issuing of the plates. If a vehicle to which plates are affixed is driven on a road other than for such a purpose, the driver of the vehicle and, where the driver is not the person to whom the plates were issued, the holder of the plates, are each guilty of an offence. The maximum penalty is a division 8 fine ($1 000).

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 70—Return of trade plates and refunds

This clause replaces reference to 'trader's' with references to 'trade' and provides for the regulations to prescribe, or set out the method for calculating, the amount of a refund payable on surrender of a trade plate.

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 71—Transfer of trade plates

Clause 11: Amendment of s.98n—Trade plates not to be used for the purpose of a towtruck in certain circumstances

Clause 12: Amendment of s. 99a—Insurance premium to be paid on applications for registration

Clause 13: Amendment of s. 136—Duty to notify change of address

Clause 14: Amendment of s. 137—Duty to answer certain questions

These clauses replace references to 'trader's' with references to 'trade'.

Clause 15: Amendment of s. 141—Evidence by certificate of Registrar

This clause—

- replaces references to 'trader's' with references to 'trade';
- inserts a new evidentiary provision to facilitate proof, by means of a certificate of the Registrar, of the purposes stated in an application for registration, renewal of registration, exemption from registration or a permit in respect of a specified motor vehicle or in an application for the issuing of specified trade plates.

Clause 16: Amendment of s. 147—Financial provision

Section 147 of the principal Act appropriates the General Revenue of the State for the payment of refunds of registration fees authorised by the Act. The clause widens that appropriation to cover the payment of refunds of other fees authorised by the Act.

Clause 17: Amendment of fourth schedule—Policy of Insurance

This clause amends the policy of insurance to cover the use of a motor vehicle to which trade plates are affixed.

Clause 18: Transitional provisions

This clause provides for trader's plates issued under the existing provisions of the principal Act to be taken to be trade plates for the purposes of the Act as in force after the commencement of this amending measure. It also ensures that the current restrictions on the use of trader's plates issued under the existing provisions will continue to apply after the commencement of this measure for the unexpired portion of the period for which the plates were issued.

Schedule: Consequential Amendments

The schedule amends the *Local Government Act 1934* and the *Road Traffic Act 1961* to replace references to 'trader's' with references to 'trade'.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

DEVELOPMENT (MAJOR DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 May. Page 1557.)

Ms HURLEY (Napier): I note that there has been a reasonable consultation period since the draft Bill was circulated. In this Bill the Minister addresses some of the concerns expressed about the provision that the Government previously sought to introduce in the Development (Review) Amendment Bill 1995. It is particularly important to achieve consensus in this area of development, and the former Labor Government delivered that consensus in its planning review. Indeed, the Brown Government recognised this in its support for the proclamation of the present Development Act. The Government now seems to be in a hurry to introduce its

amendments. The complexity of the debate about the provisions is shown by the fact that interested parties are still having talks and negotiations about the direction that the amendments should take.

Basically, I understand that this Bill attempts to address a perception that South Australia is a difficult State for developers to do business in. It was also a problem under which the previous Labor Government suffered. It is well known that major projects proposed by the former Government, which were not undertaken, generally suffered from a lack of finance rather than the restrictions imposed by the Development Act. In some cases the then Opposition adopted a spoiling role, but the present Opposition has no intention of adopting any position which jeopardises proper development in this State.

Indeed, the Labor Party is still keen to see development in this State—the sort of development which benefits the developers, the environment and the people of South Australia. We are keen to help developers because they are the people who are able to bring in exciting projects which generate economic activity, create jobs and build up the State. Increased development will provide jobs for the people whom the Labor Party was established to represent. Developers are the people who will build the project, keep it running and keep it supplied.

In this process we recognise that developers need to make a profit, otherwise, self-evidently, they will not undertake projects—but with the caveat that the process should also produce development which, at the very least, does not damage the physical or social environment of South Australia. We need quality development in appropriate places, and the development legislation (which we are now discussing) is the main tool available to achieve this goal. I want to labour this point because it is a crucial difference with regard to a few gung-ho development advocates. Some people are great believers in the market and will go along with any project which demonstrates enough of an interest to command a project manager and some financing. The belief is that the market is the prime determiner of what should occur and the shake-out from that process will be about right, provided that a few basic safeguards are in place.

I am of the view that this State deserves better than that. I think that we should look north to some of the Asian tigers who have experienced rapid and unfettered growth and who are now paying the penalty of that growth in terms of expensive repairs to infrastructure and the environment and the need to build infrastructure which has been ignored. It may be argued that our first world society in South Australia has gone beyond that stage and that we are not in danger of making such mistakes. However, recent reports cite Sydney and Melbourne as among the most polluted cities in the world; and there are examples in most so-called advanced cities of urban projects which have been an expensive blight on the cityscape and which have ramifications for further development and growth of a city. It is not too late to cause similar damage in South Australia if we do not maintain our careful scrutiny of development legislation.

We always need expert advice on a range of issues in a major development. I believe that experience has shown that often the most acute group of commentators on development issues are local residents and committed interest groups. The Labor Party is therefore determined to ensure that these groups retain a key role in the development approval process along with the proponents of a scheme. We have been fortunate in several major development proposals in South Australia that the wider implications of the development have been considered and have included broad environmental considerations in drawing up the proposal. A prime example of this is the Golden Grove development: this was a large development which combined private investment with an appropriate amount of Government funding. It addressed social and environmental issues and ensured that appropriate infrastructure such as schools, child-care, medical facilities and shops were in place for incoming residents. It has been widely praised for its aesthetic appearance and functionality. It is widely perceived as a development which benefits its residents and the State as a whole. These are the sorts of developments which I believe we would all like to see.

I should like to address some key provisions of the Bill. The first issue I believe is relatively easy—councils are given an extra 12 months to review the extent to which the development plan for their area complements the planning strategy. The Opposition supports this provision, given that many councils are currently in the throws of amalgamation discussions. Secondly, the Bill enables a council to determine the majority of applications relating to development to be undertaken by the council or undertaken on council land. This is a more contentious provision since it is a general principle that an authority should not be in a position to make a ruling on its own proposals. However, the power is limited to small scale developments, and the right of interested parties to lodge objections and appeal against such developments is retained. I think that there is some acceptance that the current system is cumbersome and that the proposed new system will work reasonably well. The Opposition will also support this provision.

The next major proposal is to extend what is called the ministerial call-in powers. Under this provision the Minister can decide that the State has an interest in a development and he or she can call in the application from a council. This provision already exists in the Act and was used for several major developments within the life of this Parliament, for example, Wirrina, the Woolworths Bulk Store at Gepps Cross and the Collex plant at Kilburn. This Bill widens the grounds on which the Minister can call in a development as follows: first, that it raises an important issue of policy; secondly, that it has a significant impact beyond the boundaries of a council area; and, thirdly, that a council has not dealt with the application in the statutory time.

When the Minister calls in a development under these conditions it is proposed that it then be assessed by the Development Assessment Commission. Opposition to this proposal has come quite stridently from councils and the Local Government Association. Developers with whom I have discussed the issue say that councils can cause significant delays in approving development projects, and this is what they are most concerned about.

As to the issue of delay, I am particularly interested in South Australian data produced under the former Commonwealth Government's Local Approvals Review Program (commonly known at LARP). LARP was introduced by the former Deputy Prime Minister, Brian Howe, in response to developer concerns. It is obvious that South Australia is not the only State in which developers have concerns about delays in the development process, so we need not think that we are unique in this area.

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

Ms HURLEY: Before the dinner adjournment I referred to the perception of delays on the part of councils in approving development applications and to the introduction of the Local Government Approvals Review Program (LARP). In South Australia that program was facilitated by the South Australian Local Government Association and supported with the resources of councils and the South Australian Government. It appears that this is the only available reliable data on the performance of the State's development system and as such it deserves close examination. The Local Government Association has now publicly released this information, the data being based on 17 individual reviews of council development approval systems. An independent consultant, Mr Garth Heynen, was engaged with Commonwealth funding to undertake reviews over an 18 month period of some 2 700 applications across the 17 councils.

As I understand it, there is no total data on the development system in South Australia. The Local Government Association estimates that in any one year about 45 000 development applications are lodged, about 4 000 to 5 000 applications with the Development Assessment Commission and the remaining 40 000 with councils. Given that 2 700 applications were reviewed, we are looking at a valid sample which, in effect, represents about 7 per cent of all applications lodged with councils in a year. Regarding those 2 700 development applications, the average time taken by councils to convey a response to the applicants was 18.3 working days, or less than four working weeks.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: Thank you, I will shorten my speech.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Ms HURLEY: Although I understand that members have received the letter from the LGA describing this data, I remind them that under the development regulations certain target approval times are provided, and the shortest of those periods is four working weeks. So, we know that more than three-quarters of all applications beat the shortest benchmark under the regulations. We will all have a view about these statistics, and some of us may think that approval times could be shortened, but I think the average of 18.3 working days is at least creditable. For example, I see that in New South Wales, one planner has suggested that approval times of 12 months are not unusual. I would therefore be quite pleased to promote this average figure of 18.3 working days outside the State. This is a lesson that the Minister could learn in addressing any perceptions of developers that South Australia is a difficult State in which to do business. He should, in fact, promote these sorts of statistics.

The LGA's letter refers to a rating of how clients perceive the system. Council performance received a 92.1 per cent positive response while only 7.9 per cent ranked the service as inadequate. Of that 92.1 per cent, 26.6 per cent said 'very good', 35.3 per cent said 'good', and 13.2 per cent said 'adequate'. So, feedback from customers who have used the system is quite good. I have left until last the most recent and worrying figure released by the Local Government Association regarding the amount of time taken by State agencies to give their response where their views are required before a decision is made. I believe that about 17 agencies are involved, including the Environment Protection Authority, the Health Commission, the Road Transport Department and so on. In virtually all instances, State agencies did not give a development approval; they simply advised on one aspect of an approval, for example, how the entrance met the main road, whether native vegetation could be cleared, and so on.

I am told that the Local Government Association compiled a major report on the whole area in 1994 in an attempt to focus attention on this matter. The issue appears to involve the performance of the Government's own patch in respect of development approvals. Council concerns are borne out in the statistics. The average referral time taken by a State agency in respect of one issue is 17.5 working days. For instance, the Department of Transport might approve access to an arterial road, or the painting of a heritage building might be referred to the State Heritage Branch, or a slightly more complex issue involving contaminated land might be referred to the Environmental Protection Authority, but an average of 17.5 working days is added to the process. That is fractionally less than the entire time taken on average by council to do an assessment.

This raises some serious questions about State agency performance within the development system rather than about council performance. I expect that the Minister has a range of other internal statistics on the Development Assessment Commission and other State agencies, and I look forward to his making them available. Only about 8 per cent of applications require referral concurrence from a State agency. However, these tend to be the most prominent applications and the ones which encounter more resistance than others and which shape the views of developers about the system in this State. It appears that council is much less to blame than State Government agencies.

That brings us back to the Bill. The statistics provided by the LARP analysis raise some real questions in my mind about this Bill—whether it is really well thought out or whether it just hits a few buttons that are easily touched. In terms of the ministerial call-in proposals, previous proposals dealt with under this system under the current Act do not give us much cause for confidence. For example, we do not want to see another Collex waste disposal type of proposal.

The Hon. E.S. Ashenden: That's not development; it's planning, and we know that.

Ms HURLEY: That is the sort of development that residents most emphatically do not want, and local councils and even surrounding businesses do not want it, yet the Minister is pressing on, using every avenue available to him in order to force this development through. That is the sort of action that induces in us a lack of confidence in the Minister's judgment and a concern about giving him any more power than he already has under the current Act. I know the Minister says that the Collex waste disposal proposal is more a planning decision than a development decision, but it nevertheless illustrates the attitude of this Government, which gives people in the industry cause for concern, in addition to the changes that have been dealt with in the Act.

Given the nature and background of that sort of proposal, I do not see how the Minister can possibly ask us to support ministerial call-in powers under those arrangements unless he can provide us with very compelling statistics that refute the Local Government Association statistics, and unless he can provide us with real assurances that developments, such as the Collex waste disposal proposal, will not get through.

The next amendment involves the major developments and projects provisions, which enable the Minister to declare a development of major interest and provide for three levels of assessment: (a) an environmental impact statement (EIS); (b) a public environment report (PER); and (c) a development report (DR). The extent of the assessment, as I understand it,

will reflect the degree of information already available and the potential for adverse impact.

The Bill establishes a ministerial advisory panel to advise the Minister at which level the project should be assessed. However, the Minister is not required to accept the decision of the advisory panel and there is no appeal against that decision. I am very puzzled, given that one of the stated reasons for introducing this Bill is to reduce red tape and bureaucracy, to see the Minister setting up yet another panel. It seems to me that the expertise is already available within the Development Assessment Commission. It is even more puzzling that the Minister goes to the trouble of setting up this extra panel, yet there is no requirement on the Minister to take notice of its recommendations.

This and previous amendments leave the Minister open to accusations that the Bill has been set up to give the Government's big business mates a good run. Those mates will have the direct ear of the Premier and his Minister, and the Minister can assure those mates a quick and comfortable ride through the development approval process. Those not so much in the good books, and those smaller developers who do not have the ear of the Premier or his Minister, may not fare so well. In addition, and very importantly, those small developers and those residents who may be affected very adversely by the development will have no chance at all.

Perhaps we should consider a reverse situation that might arise—perhaps not under this Government but under another Government—where the Minister takes exception to a development that has the general support of a council: he can rip the matter away from the council and ensure that it does not get the go-ahead. In that case, where does the developer go to appeal? The developer might find that an appeal process could be advantageous to it. I cannot phrase the appeal process any more eloquently than did Brian Hayes, QC, in an article in this week's *City Messenger*.

I apologise for quoting at length, but I think Brian Hayes phrases it very concisely and his arguments are very cogent in this instance:

> The State Government, on the other hand, appears to prefer shielding some of its decisions from the scrutiny of the courts. The new Bill, concerned mainly with major development or projects, has a provision which smacks of Jeff Kennett legislation under the quaint heading of 'Protection from proceedings'. This provision in the Bill effectively prevents:
>
> · any proceedings being taken to challenge or question any decision or determination of the Governor, the Minister or the advisory panel set up under the Bill;
>
> · any proceedings or procedures or act omissions, matters or things incidental or relating to the operation of the assessment process dealing with major developments.
>
> A clause of this kind is not only unusual and extremely rare in legislation, it is also unnecessary, given the history of the previous sections dealing with major developments. There is very little, if any, historical evidence to suggest that decisions by the Government on major developments have often been challenged in legal proceedings.

Here again we are dealing more with the perceptions by developers rather than with actual fact. I believe that if the Minister or the Government took a lead in this matter we would not have so much problem with perception. I continue to quote the article by Brian Hayes.

Mr Brindal: Who?

Ms HURLEY: Brian Hayes, QC, who says:

> If the Government is satisfied with the structure of its legislation and the processes for assessing major developments, why would it want to give the impression to the community it does not wish to be held accountable and bound by due process and natural justice by excluding all challenges to its decisions on major developments? This provision gives bureaucrats a sense of security—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I quote the member for Unley Standing Order 137. He should refer to that Standing Order.

Ms HURLEY:—which is inimical to good and careful decision making.

He expands on what he means by that, as follows:

> But what politicians always fail to appreciate is that when individual rights are taken away, particularly where there appears to have been a blatant breach of the law or process, the community resorts to informal and unorthodox methods of enforcing the law.

He goes on to give several examples of that and states:

> When such informal methods of enforcement are used, the developer and the authority no longer have any control or influence on the process.

That states the position clearly and harks back to what I was saying earlier: this is an area where it is particularly important to have consensus in order for proper development to proceed in this State. Returning to some of the detail of the amendment, I acknowledge that there may be good reasons for having the graded assessment system, which is the EIS, PER and DR: it may well cut costs and time for developers and interested participants. I say this because there have been criticisms from both sides of the lack of flexibility of the EIS process and the dearth of opportunities to have an input to the EIS guidelines. While this amendment does not properly address all the criticisms, it perhaps goes some little way towards doing so.

I would prefer to have had a longer and more open review of the performance of the EIS system. We seem now to have gone down the path of making reform in a piecemeal fashion and I suppose we have to make the best of it. I wish to recap on this area: I see no reason why we cannot utilise the expertise of the Development Assessment Commission, which has an ongoing role in development assessment and a close understanding of the process. The task of advising the Minister on the appropriate tier of assessment should be given to the DAC.

Interested participants should have some input into setting the parameters for the assessment process before the DAC considers the issues and makes its decision. Importantly, there should be some appeal against the decision on which level of assessment should apply. I strongly believe that this should be the case because, although under the previous system there was no appeal against the Government's final decision on EIS, in this Bill the Minister is creating an entirely different process. For example, the PER process allows only four weeks for public comment and the DR process a minimum of only two weeks. Most process groups are volunteers and do not always have a lot of time to devote to writing submissions. Also, they frequently have to organise public meetings to get agreement on their submission. The shorter periods of time impact greatly on the effectiveness of their response.

There is then the question whether the actual outcome of the EIS, PER or DR findings should be appealable, as decisions of the Development Assessment Commission or a council. This is a serious issue that needs to be considered. However, as I said earlier, negotiation is still ongoing on this issue, and the Opposition does not intend at this stage to move any amendments. However, we intend to ask a series of questions in Committee and to determine our position in the other place. We will continue to consult with and listen

carefully to interested groups before the legislation reaches the other place.

As I said originally, we are keen to see a consensus reached on this legislation. We are prepared to listen to the views of the Government, developers and interest groups, and we would like to think that we can reach an agreed position on this. I shall be interested to hear the Minister's views on the points raised, particularly about the sweeping powers of the ministerial call-in and the lack of any rights of appeals for groups, given that the process, particularly for the PER and the DR, is scaled down almost to the level of the council assessment process.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I will make a brief contribution to the debate. The shadow Minister has not changed over the past year or so. She is still a good and faithful servant of the Local Government Association. Listening to her contribution tonight, I thought it was very plain to all of us here, who had received—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brindal): Order! The member for Hart will come to order. If the member for Hart wants to disagree with the ruling of the Chair, I suggest that he leave the Chamber or the Speaker will come back—one or the other.

Mr OSWALD: During the dinner adjournment, we all received a copy of the letter from the LGA which has been circulated to the shadow Minister and also to the Hon. Mike Elliott in another place. The honourable member's speech pretty well followed the contents of that document. A lot of us recently read with interest in the media the results of the Local Approvals Review Program (LARP). We are pleased to see the turnaround time for approvals in local government, and I do not think anyone has anything but praise for that. We must bear in mind that those statistics refer to general approvals. We would expect fast turnaround times, anyway. In years gone by, that was always one of the big problems. The Government of the day—and it does not matter whether it be a Liberal or Labor Government—must have the ability to facilitate specific approvals if a developer comes to it from interstate or intrastate; the mechanism should be there.

The Government is here to govern and to take the criticism if the development does not happen. It is fine for the Local Government Association to say that it wants to be the sole planning authority, but local government and every other instrumentality is there quickly to criticise Government if they do not get new developments into the State, and this type of legislation is there to facilitate that problem.

There is no doubt that the development industry still views South Australia as a place that needs more fine tuning in its development process. I have recollections of a development some time back in the Barossa Valley. A tourist report found a need for a tourist complex in the valley, and I recollect that three councils assessed it individually, which led to confusion and delays. Nothing happened, but it is a perfect example of where a Minister could have used a call-in power to facilitate a development. As it turned out, the five councils and the Government got together and formed a strategy, but the fact is that that problem existed before the solution. I am sure that officers of the department could come up with countless examples of where it is necessary for a Government to have a call-in power. For local government to become suddenly precious about it is unnecessary; it is just something that this State needs to facilitate progress and to have a mechanism for development to happen.

During the dinner adjournment I looked at the Minister's second reading explanation, and I can paraphrase it down to about four or five paragraphs that pick the eyes out of the principles espoused in the Bill. The explanation goes into much detail, although I am sure that the shadow Minister has not read the fine detail of the Bill. She may have the briefing notes from the LGA, but let me go back to what is in the Bill.

First, the Bill does not alter the basic tenets of the Development Act. Local government will retain its role as the principal decision maker on development applications. Nobody can argue with that. While there will be some increase in ministerial powers, these will not extend to giving the Minister the power to determine an application. That is a basic principle, so no-one should argue with that. Secondly, the Bill is about presenting a positive perception to the development industry that South Australia is a State where developers can come and do business without fear of delay as a result of bureaucratic red tape and unwarranted court action. That is exactly what we wanted.

Thirdly, the Bill enables a council to determine the majority of applications relating to developments to be undertaken by the council on council land. Fourthly, in respect of the call-in powers, the Bill enables the Minister to call in from a council in specified circumstances set out in the Bill a small number of development applications for determination by the DAC. That really does not apply to the statistics in the letter from the LGA tonight, but it is a small, specific number.

The criteria for this call-in are limited to three areas. First, applications where, in the opinion of the Minister, the proposed development raises an important issue of policy that is inadequately addressed in the relevant development plan. The example I gave in respect of the Barossa Valley is a classic. Secondly, it would have significant impact beyond the boundaries of the council area. Thirdly, the council has failed to deal with an application within the time period set out in the regulations. That last item is absolutely vital. There are times when, through its own political process, a council may, through the difficulties of local government politics, have problems in getting something through. The Government of the day, regardless of political persuasion, has a responsibility to look at the matter globally on a State level and to make a decision on whether something should get up. The development industry knows that and the public knows that. On many occasions you just cannot afford to have a multimillion dollar project held up because of that.

Fourthly, public notification requirements and third party appeal rights are unaffected by this call in. The DAC cannot approve applications which are seriously at variance with the relevant development plan. Finally, the Bill enables the Minister to declare a development or project of major economic, social and environmental significance or of State interest for assessments under this division. Then it describes the EIS, the PER and the DR process, the creation of the advisory panel, and so on. I should like to refer to the panel. I spent hours talking to the Australian Democrats and, to a lesser degree, the Labor Party about the panel. The panel was asked for—

Ms Hurley: Not by me.

Mr OSWALD: I will give the Australian Democrats some credit for talking about desk-top audits. The Leader of the Democrats and I had some common ground in respect of the desk-top audit.

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier has made one speech—two are out of order.

Mr OSWALD: There will be occasions when a project of economic, not necessarily social or environmental, significance will come to the State, and there has to be an opportunity to be able to decide. The great sticking point in the past has been how to determine when something is of social, economic or environmental significance. As I read the Bill, the Government has suggested an expert panel to advise the Minister, and the Minister will listen to that advice. Clause 6 provides that the Minister will decide which process should apply, although he or she will not be able to decide on a process other than an EIS unless the Minister has first referred the matter to a special advisory panel for advice. That was asked for in the Upper House, and the Government has put it into the Bill. Therefore, we have a panel to decide whether something is of economic, social or environmental significance, and that should be enough to satisfy people.

I have not recently spoken to the Hon. Mr Elliott in another place, but a year ago, when we were discussing this matter, he agreed in principle that we could separate something of economic significance and put it through, but then there may also be something of social significance. I think that the Government has gone two or three steps further than we went last year in breaking it down into various levels of assessment. I hope that for the sake of this State the Opposition will look at the Government's proposal, perhaps step back from its relationship with the LGA, and see what is good for this State. Perhaps it will even talk to former Labor Planning Ministers who I know believe that what I am saying is what should happen in this State.

If the Opposition could wind back the clock to 1993 and look at the process that we are putting in place, accept that the Government has a responsibility and a role to play, that local government is not the sole planning authority and that there are times when the Minister of the day has to have a call in power, I think it would agree that the attempt in this Bill to provide the panels and have the PERs, the DRs and the EISs is an excellent compromise.

I commend the Bill. It is necessary for people who want to develop in this State to know that at last we have sorted out this legislation, which has been around since 1993. We had excellent bipartisan agreement until we got to this final process with the Government having the right to call in major projects. I am sure that, if the roles were reversed and the shadow Minister and the Labor Party were on the Treasury benches, they would be making the same argument. I ask Opposition members, behind the closed doors of their Party room, to look at the proposal and, if necessary, talk to former Planning Ministers of a Socialist persuasion, because then they will see that we have common ground on those small one-off projects that need the Government to say, 'This is a special project for South Australia, it needs to be declared as a major project, the Minister and the Governor need the power to bring them in, and there is a need for the DAC to become a planning authority.' The DAC is being brought in through the panel system as the authority to give an opinion and advise the Minister. The principles in the Bill are sound, and I urge the House to support it.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I support the second reading of this Bill and my colleague the member for Napier in her capacity as shadow Minister. I have some questions and perhaps reservations about a couple of aspects of the Bill. I note that in the Minister's second reading explanation he referred to the increase in power he will receive from this Bill. I note also the Minister's comments about the Bill presenting positive perceptions to the development industry in that ours is a State where developers can do business without fear of bureaucratic delays. Certainly, I support that proposition. I am not very clear at this stage about whether the Bill actually does that, and I will ask a series of questions in the Committee stage to be satisfied that that is actually the case and an effect of this Bill. It seems to me that the Government has raised a lot of expectation within the development industry. I know from my experience on the Public Works Committee that various developers who have given evidence and comment expect, from what the Government has said, that this piece of legislation will makes matters easier. I will be interested to see whether the Bill lives us to that expectation. I wonder whether they might be disappointed with what is actually in the Bill.

Another aspect about which I have some questions in the Committee stage relates to the Development Assessment Commission. I quite regularly receive complaints to my electorate office concerning applications deferred by councils to the commission. For example, there may be a request for a subdivision or something local in terms of planning, and the council might say that it supports the idea in principle but that it does not actually fit in with its current development plan policies. The council will reject the application by a small developer on the basis that the Development Assessment Commission would not approve it, anyway. When I have approached the Development Assessment Commission with respect to such a matter it says that it thinks it is a very good idea but that it is not in line with the council's policy. The reply always seems to be, 'We are very sorry; we would like to approve it but the other agency wouldn't; so, we will not do so either.' When the Minister addresses this matter I will ask whether the Bill does something to address that situation and problem for small developers.

I note the contribution by my colleague the member for Napier who referred to statistics showing that single referrals to State agencies often on average take as long as an entire development approval by a council. I would be interested to hear whether the Minister bears out that claim because that seems to be a surprising fact. My colleague supplied some statistics to verify it. That is an important issue that I hope the Minister will address in the deliberation of this Bill.

To summarise, I support the second reading. I hope that this Bill is a step forward for development in this State. I must say I am not totally convinced on my own reading of it, so I will be interested to question the Minister as we proceed to satisfy myself that, for all the hype the Government is putting around about this being a step forward and signalling a new era in development in this State, it is actually borne out by the legislation.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I commend the Government and the Minister for bringing forward this Bill. It is necessary, because there is the perception out in the community, and in some instances rightly so, that developments have been held up, and we have to do something about it. I do not know whether other members are aware of this, but during the dinner break I passed by my pigeonhole and there found a copy of a letter to the Minister which has attached a copy of the letter to the shadow Minister (Annette Hurley), and one to the Leader of the Democrats in another place.

I was surprised at finding this, because it is dated 3 July. I had not seen it before, and I went to the Minister and asked

him whether he had previously seen this letter from the LGA. He said he had not seen the letter that was sent to him, a copy of which happened to be in my pigeonhole. If that is consultation by the LGA, it is very poor consultation. As a member of the Minister's backbench committee on local government, I am very much aware of the effort and time that the Minister puts in to trying to arrange consultation with the LGA. It is right that we must consult with every area in the community.

However, if this is the result of the consultation, that members of this Chamber receive the mail of the Minister before the Minister has an opportunity to look at it, I believe that that consultation has broken down. It is not the fault of the Minister; it is not the fault of the Government; it is the fault of the LGA. If people want us to consult, they should give us enough time. I received this letter this evening, and this is not sufficient time for a member to have for consultation. If I had not gone past my pigeonhole, I would not have known that this letter existed.

Members interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: Well, I think it is important that the Minister should receive his correspondence before other members of this place. I am sure that the shadow Minister, the member for Napier, would agree. Has the member for Napier had a copy of this letter?

Ms Hurley interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: No, I am referring to the one dated 3 July.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hartley has been here long enough to know that, first, members do not make displays and, secondly, they do not indulge in discourse across the Chamber but direct their remarks through the Chair. Further, the member for Napier is going very close to getting herself into serious trouble.

Mr SCALZI: Mr Acting Speaker, as you can see, I am quite outraged at what has happened, and I believe I have good reason. If communication is going to the Minister, the Minister should have adequate time to look at that communication before copies go to members of this Chamber, and that has not happened.

I support the Bill because, despite the communication that has taken place, there is still the perception that developments are not going ahead and that certain developments have held up this State. In the majority of cases, the Bill does not intend to take away from the responsibilities of local government: it is only when there is a significant economic, social and environmental impact for the State that the Minister, first through a panel and then the DAC, will have an input in determining whether the development should go ahead. I think that is reasonable. The Government should have some input, and that is what this Bill is all about. It is about taking a responsible approach to development. It is not about taking away the powers of local government; it is not about us and them; but it is about consultation, although, in instances where there is a social, economic and environmental impact, the Minister has an input, first, through an expert panel, and then through the DAC, which will make a recommendation to the Minister. The Minister can then intervene, and I believe that is reasonable.

I am sure that, if members opposite were honest to themselves, they would agree that that is reasonable, because everything cannot be left to local government. I am talking not about specific council areas but about projects in this State that have broader and wider implications. If they have significance to the State on environmental, economic or social grounds, there should be broader consultation. I thought that members opposite agreed with broader consultation and expert panels to make sure that things are looked at apart from the specific area in which a project takes place.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: I don't know what the member for Hart is saying.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member for Hart, whatever he is saying, is not coaching in correct parliamentary procedures, so he can be quiet.

Mr SCALZI: At present, there is no provision for the Minister to request the Development Assessment Commission to rule on a development application. That is not good enough. The Bill before the Parliament, when passed, hopefully with the support of members opposite and the blessing of the LGA, will enable the Minister to call in from a council certain development applications for assessment by the DAC. This provision is essential if South Australia is to progress. The DAC cannot approve applications that are seriously at odds with relevant development plan policy, but it is in a position to look at applications from a broader perspective than can individual councils. That is reasonable.

At times, members opposite act as though Adelaide is a sparse place, that what happens at Enfield has no impact on what happens in the City of Adelaide, and *vice versa*. Adelaide is not that big. The people of Adelaide are dependent upon each other and the State. Certain developments in certain areas have an impact on the State. If such an impact exists, the development should be looked at from a broader perspective. We should not be just territorial. We need to have a broader outlook, and that is what this Bill is about. There is local government control over the majority of decisions, but when a decision impacts on the whole State there should be a provision enabling scrutiny from a broader perspective.

Other provisions in the Bill are aimed at ensuring that the Minister has some say in considering projects that are of major significance to the State. Surely, the State Government should make the decisions regarding matters of State significance. After all, that is its mandate. I believe that the Government and the Minister should be commended on this Bill. We are acting responsibly. While the LGA might argue that most applicants are happy with the way their development applications are dealt with by council, that is not the feedback that I am getting and, I am sure, other members are getting.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There is no need for fractious behaviour.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr SCALZI: As I was saying, while the Local Government Authority might argue that most applicants are happy with the way their development applications are dealt with by council, that is not the feedback that a lot of the members of this place and I are getting, and I am sure that is not what the Minister is being told in the mail coming to him. I speak to local government members, and the response I am getting is that not everyone is happy; there are problems. The Government believes that there is always room for improvement, especially where projects of significant economic importance to the State are concerned, and we will continue to work toward that goal, irrespective of the LGA. The LGA has an input, but it is not its place to stop development.

In conclusion, I commend the Bill but I am extremely disappointed that I received the letter to the Minister, the

member for Napier and the Hon. Mike Elliott in another place before the Minister received it. If that is supposed to be consultation with the Government and the Minister by the LGA, to my mind it is a failure. You cannot expect to have communication unless you have two-way traffic. You cannot build a bridge unless you have that premise. I know that the Minister and the Government are doing their utmost, as the former Minister did his utmost, to consult with the LGA and local governments in all areas, and we are not getting the same response from the LGA as the Government is giving.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I am very pleased to be able to speak on this Bill tonight, and I commend the Hon. Scott Ashenden, the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations, on introducing it. Four issues have been of major concern to me with respect to the State and its future. One of those was clearly the unsustainable debt and the fact that it meant that we did not have a sustainable future for our existing and future generations. That was a major issue that had to be addressed both on a recurrent basis and also with respect to that core debt which we were servicing and which was hamstringing us to the tune of about $2 million a day just in interest being thrown against the wall.

The second issue that concerned me immensely was the degradation of the environment. Clearly, unless we have a ecologically sustainable environment and development opportunity in the State, we will have major problems in the future. The third issue that has been of major concern is one about which I have talked a lot in this Chamber and will continue to talk about, namely, the breakdown of the social fabric of this State and this country.

We had to be prepared to take those three fundamental issues on board; even if some of the medicine was not all that palatable initially, the fact was that, if we were to be restored to health, we had to take that medicine and accept it. Another issue that has been of major frustration to me in the private sector and as a member of Parliament in the past 2½ years has been the issue of getting projects up in this State. I do not for one minute condemn the efforts of the councils with respect to planning issues. In fact, my father-in-law has been a longstanding member of the Yankalilla council.

The fact is that in many areas councillors, who are great volunteers for their communities, have enough on their plates without taking on the responsibility of assessing major development opportunities for this State when they are already working a 40 hour week. We also know that, in all tiers of Government, but especially at local government level, there is a very easy opportunity for people to get into council on single issues and block particular developments. That is a major concern to me, because the south has high youth unemployment and in the past has not had the infrastructure and the job creation opportunities that I would have liked.

I am delighted to support this Bill. I see problems at a council level on some of the micro issues, and I would like to place on record one or two examples. The mushroom farm and its odour problems have caused great concern to the constituents of my electorate, as well as the proprietors of the mushroom farm. That matter could have been fixed in the best interests of the residents and also of the mushroom farm at the time when certain planning assessment reports, or supplementary development plans, as they were then called, were put in place. Unfortunately, this week I picked up some council meeting minutes and I saw that, whilst generally another council in my electorate is supportive of some economic development opportunities, when it came to small, peripheral matters to enhance the main street there was major dissension and frustration with respect to erecting signage at the beginning of that main street and the car parking issue associated with coaches, etc., at the visitor centre.

These matters should have been fixed long ago. People thought the problems were fixed but, at the last minute, when the cutting of that car parking facility had taken place, some counsellors chose to raise objection in the council. They are only the micro opportunities; let us also look at the macro opportunities. Let us look at the opportunities, as my colleague the member for Hartley has talked about, that are fundamental to economic, social and environmental issues in this State: major issues, such as the opportunity to establish another Mitsubishi, or attracting another five star hotel, or any of those infrastructure projects into South Australia.

Time and again I have received letters from people frustrated by the blocking tactics and the length of delay in trying to get those approvals through. If South Australia is ever to get out of the mire it has been in over the past few years, then we must be prepared to start putting up green 'Go' signals on our traffic lights, not red 'Stop' signals on all occasions, and not amber signals that merely indicate caution. We have a country now that is becoming ever more, on a daily basis, part of an international global development for economic opportunities.

The fact remains that South Australia cannot be in the back blocks when it comes to putting the green lights on to get those economic opportunities into South Australia. Have a look at what has happened. One matter I did not go into when I highlighted the three or four major concerns I had about the direction of this State was the fact that we have lost approximately 33 600 full-time equivalent jobs in the manufacturing sector over a 10 year period. We did not have a broadening of the economic basis that we should have had in this State, which is why we now have to go hard on things such as information technology to bring new business opportunities into this State and why we have to go out and target opportunities such as Bridgestone Australia which has recently brought its headquarters into South Australia. By doing this we have, thank goodness, been able to encourage companies such as Seeley International to come to the south and create 350 jobs.

The fact is we have had to restructure and put out the right signals, but time and again situations arise where these matters have been blocked—and Wirrina Cove holiday resort is another classic case. I have young people living in my area who do not want to be brain surgeons or go to the University of Adelaide, but they would like to be chefs, hospitality managers, or tourism operators. They would like to have the opportunity of working in the hospitality and tourism areas, and one of those great opportunities is that of the Wirrina Cove Resort, which is only 45 minutes from the farthest part of my electorate. New developments allow people to take jobs on board, but look at the dilemma that happened with Wirrina. It is a fairly difficult task to ask a small regional council by itself to take on a development of that magnitude. For instance, it would require handling two jumbo jet loads of people just from Malaysia visiting the development each week; creating about 250 full-time equivalent jobs; building water and road infrastructure; and creating a development that is going to be of best practice.

It is the sort of issue that the State Government, through the Minister, should have more control of. That is the issue that some councillors, off the record—whilst they may not

say it in the council chamber—have quietly come to me and said, 'This project is too big for us to take on. We would like to concentrate on some other issues.' It is not about taking the day-to-day running of local government areas away from the councillors and local government at all: it is about having a clear direction for this State, where a green light is always there for investors and developers who want to bring dollars, infrastructure and jobs into our State to get South Australia back on the track that it should have been on and has not been on for some time.

Therefore, whilst I do not want to get into the technicalities of this Bill now, I would like to thank Minister Ashenden for the opportunity of allowing us as members of Parliament on the Government side to look at this Bill in detail and to discuss issues of concern that we had before this Bill went to Parliament. That is the sort of thing I as a member of Parliament appreciate Ministers doing. The technical work has been done. The fact is this is a good Bill. It is a Bill that I ask to be supported on a bipartisan basis. There are times when Oppositions need to oppose—and I respect and accept that—but there are times, particularly when we are trying to get on that road to recovery from a very difficult benchmark base, when Oppositions need to be responsible and to be part of a bipartisan agreement to get more development and job opportunities into this State. I appeal to the Opposition to support this Bill on a bipartisan basis, together with the Democrats, so we can send that green light to investment and development businesses and companies in this country. I applaud once again the Minister for what he has done and I trust the Opposition will be responsible and pass this Bill with haste.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I do not know what agitated the Opposition, but it can cease waving. The member for Ross Smith.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker—ever wise and firm as always. I support the comments of the Opposition's lead spokesperson on this matter and, in particular, the reservations that the Opposition has with the legislation and the power it invests in the Minister of the day with respect to these development issues. But to listen to the contribution from the member for Mawson one would think that no development has taken place in this State whatsoever since Adam, and indeed none at all whilst the Labor Government was in office.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: I do not mind interjections from the member for Ridley—and we all understand it is a full moon—but what I will do is get on with the issue before us.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member for Ridley is wrong to interject and the member for Ross Smith is equally wrong to answer the interjections.

Mr CLARKE: As usual, you are right, Sir; if only your preselection panel agrees with you.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member for Ross Smith will return to the substance of the Bill.

Mr CLARKE: I will, Sir. Listening to the member for Mawson, one would believe that there has been no development and that, where development has taken place, it has ridden roughshod in some respects over some of the sensitivities of certain councillors, resident groups and environmental groups in this State. One need look only at the ASER site, for example, to realise that development has taken place in the North Terrace precinct where none was planned originally. The member for Mawson's Liberal Party colleague in the Upper House, Hon. Legh Davis, waxes lyrical about the destruction of that precinct caused by the ASER development. The member for Mawson and his kind seem to be suggesting that we must have a 'let her rip' mentality when it comes to development, that we have become such a beggared State that we must submit ourselves to any developer's proposal, no matter what the thoughts, beliefs or feelings of resident and community groups are about any part of our city, suburbs or State.

Indeed, I thought the member for Mawson was extremely paternalistic in regard to local government and I am sure councillors from the City of Noarlunga and the District Council of Willunga will be only too happy to read his comments that some projects are simply too big for local government to grapple with, that local government officers are too unintelligent and incapable of getting their heads around certain development proposals and are incapable of making reasoned decisions. We know that is an absolute nonsense, because development occurs in this State every day of every week. True, that is a bit of an exaggeration since the Brown Government came to office 2½ years ago. It would not be a development every day of every week: it is now more an occasion of celebration to see development take place in this State since the Premier took office, not because of the planning laws but simply because of the economic policies followed by this Government of which you, for the time being, Mr Acting Speaker, are a member.

We have major councils and local government authorities, such as the City of Port Adelaide Enfield with over 100 000 residents and ratepayer income of more than $60 million, with a fully professional staffed outfit qualified to assess development applications, and it has gone to a great deal of trouble in assessing development applications. Irrespective of those attributes of local government and the Port Adelaide Enfield council, which is closest in many respects to the wishes of the local community, this Government is hell bent on overruling it, whatever the issue. As I indicated in my remarks yesterday, we have a simple issue in my electorate and it is a bit rich for the Minister to come in to the Parliament and say to me as the member for Ross Smith, 'Trust me in having greater powers with respect to development.'

Under the present legislation the Minister is already riding roughshod over the unanimous views of every member of the Port Adelaide Enfield council with regard to the Collex waste treatment plant. This is also the overwhelming view of residents in that area with regard to sticking a waste treatment plant at the former British Tube Mills site, for the reasons I gave yesterday. I will not go into why they oppose it now, but this Government is hell bent on supporting that development for a handful of jobs involving not even a net gain in terms of employment, because many of the jobs are just consolidated in that one area. It causes a great deal of chagrin to light industries located nearby, such as Trio Hinging.

That was an example I gave last night where that company, export orientated, was hoping to have 300 employees by the end of this decade and is not at all keen on having a waste treatment plant established next door to it. The Supreme Court has found that a number of offensive odours—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will deal with the matter. I remind the Deputy Leader that his remarks must relate to the Bill before the Chair. He is now straying wide

of the mark and, in the remaining 14 minutes available to him, I suggest that he concentrate on the Bill.

Mr CLARKE: I have already said my piece with respect to the Collex waste treatment plant, and I am sure that my contribution tonight will read well elsewhere. What a load of hogwash and hypocrisy comes from the Government in this area of development: it claims that our existing development laws do not allow for industry to take place in this State. This comes from the very Government that had as one of its esteemed members on the front bench the former member for Coles who, with respect to the Wilpena Pound development, said that she would stand in front of the bulldozers rather than allow development to take place there to provide a tourist resort in that area.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: I am sure that the member for Eyre probably did want to drive the bulldozer and carry an automatic with him at the same time, in case anyone escaped the tractors. I find this whole issue very rich indeed on the part of this Government. We saw how it agitated among some of the so-called yuppies in its own political Party over the chairlift proposal that was to go to the Mount Lofty summit. A significant number of members of the Liberal Party went around trying to sabotage that project for purely Party-political gain. That is something which you, Mr Speaker, would not agree with. However, here we have a Minister of a political Party now in Government who, when in Opposition, did not mind cosying up to the so-called greenies whom the Government now apparently despises.

We saw what happened when it came to the Wilpena Pound development, the development and chairlift proposal at Mount Lofty, Jubilee Point, the marina project originally talked about down at Sellicks Beach, and the like. Yet, the political Party now in Government says that the existing laws are far too restrictive on development in this State and we need to have a fast track mechanism. That does not wash with this Opposition, and this Minister does not have a good track record in so far as this whole issue is concerned. His predecessor, before being unceremoniously dumped with the then Minister for Primary Industries (because those two Ministers at the time had the guts to stand up to their Leader and Premier and say that he had nothing between his ears)—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is not relating to the Bill. That remark is not only unwise but unnecessary. I suggest to the Deputy Leader that such comments are not in the best interests of this House. I ask him to withdraw that reflection on the Premier and suggest that he concentrate on the Bill, or I will withdraw leave.

The Hon. D.S. Baker interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: In deference to the embarrassment of the member for MacKillop, I am more than happy to withdraw those words. I realise his sensitivities in this area. The member for MacKillop was an outstanding Minister, as was the former Minister for Housing and Urban Development. I have been critical of the former Minister for Primary Industries on development issues—I nicknamed him 'chainsaw Baker' and I knew how well he was loved by the environmentalists. Nonetheless, he was a man of forthright views and would clearly and honestly state his opinions on whatever the subject matter. I will not digress too much; I would hate to have my words used in his election pamphlets at the next election, which I know will only garner him more votes, so I will return to the Bill.

I conclude by repeating that basically this Government is saying to local government, 'You do not know how to handle the development processes. Notwithstanding that we are encouraging you—and compelling you in many instances—to amalgamate and to equip yourself better with the resources that you need to handle development and a whole range of other areas that we will push on to you in terms of additional responsibilities, we do not believe you can be trusted with the development of this State.' I might add that South Australia has been self-governing since 1857, and this State has certainly progressed—although not always in the sense of the very best of development.

Some buildings that have been pulled down should have been kept, and some developments have taken place that, in hindsight, should have been maintained. Nonetheless, development has taken place in this State. Progress has been made, under both Liberal and Labor State Governments, and we have not needed the jackboot approach in terms of development issues that this Government is now seeking to foist onto the public of South Australia, in particular to act as the Gauleiter over local government, the most important tear of Government in this State with respect to planning and development applications that come before it.

At the end of the day, local government is often a lot closer to the wishes and aspirations of the local community than are State Governments, particularly those which have large majorities and act—as this one does—with arrogant disregard for the common good. With those closing remarks, I commend the reservations put forward by our lead spokesperson on this matter. Unfortunately, I know that Government members in this House probably will not listen to our words of wisdom on this matter. However, further up the corridor, they will be absolutely compelled to listen. When we were in government, that House was often regaled as the repository of the permanent will of the people. I can only say that this Minister will find out all about the permanent will of the people on this issue.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I support the legislation. There is no way in the world that the member for Ross Smith can have read clause 46C. After all, the legislation requires consultation. It is not possible for any Government to take control of all development, and it is appropriate for that development to be dealt with at the local level where possible. Quite clearly, that is where we placed all the responsibility with previous legislation.

It is clear, though, from the efforts of the past, that the law is not adequate. Where large projects are involved and high retaining costs occur, if there are substantial delays from the time of the initial signing of contracts for purchase of property before the development can proceed, we will find that we are unable to get any commitment of capital of any quantity at all. It will go elsewhere, and the jobs that are needed for the honourable member's constituents—and mine—who are now unemployed will never eventuate. This is the only means by which we can do it: to ensure that we get some of those large projects up and running.

A State Government—of any political persuasion under the provision of this legislation—will still have to go through the consultative process and consider the views of those who live in the locality in which the development is occurring. This change provides the just means by which we can get the process streamlined. The Government does not need to be compelled: it is already committed to consult.

All I need to say in conclusion is that the platitudes that we have heard from members opposite are nothing more and nothing less than a shameless attempt to one-up the Democrats before they get a chance to say anything about this legislation in another place and try to win the support of the Greens and the other ecocentric elements within the community who believe that they know better than the Government, yet none of whom as individuals have been able to win the political support of any electorate to make their way into this place. That is the acid test and, if the member for Ross Smith and the rest of his colleagues—the whole 11 of them on the other side—really think that the public of South Australia—

Ms Stevens: It is 10.

Mr LEWIS: I didn't know that any of you had died.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: By golly, I wonder sometimes whether any of you are alive. Members opposite are perambulating zombies in political terms; there is no doubt about that, and the tragedy is that we have to put up with it. The people who take succour from the kind of remarks that have been made for political gainsay by members of the Opposition ought to re-examine their conscience and their commitment to whatever motivates them to believe that sort of drivel.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN (Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations): First, I should like to thank those members who have contributed to this debate, some positively and some less positively. A number of issues have been raised by members opposite that I should like to address, because I am concerned as to what appear to be some fairly serious misunderstandings about where the Government is coming from in this Bill.

Members opposite kept saying that they want to see development in this State. There is one way that they can prove whether they want development, and that is to support this Bill, and not just to cry the crocodile tears that we have seen from them. One cannot help but be a little cynical when one hears Opposition members say that they want to see development go ahead and the State progress, because they know only too well that every time we get a new development in South Australia and create jobs for this State it will be many years before they will occupy these Government benches. From pure self-interest we see them taking a tack to defeat this Government merely because it wants to encourage development and investment in this State.

At one stage the shadow Minister spoke quite negatively about development in Asia. I do not know whether she was referring to Singapore, but if she was I suggest that she take a trip to Singapore and see what has happened in that nation, which not very long ago was absolutely down and out but which is now one of the leading economies in the region. If the shadow Minister is trying to say that development *per se* is bad, I suggest that she take a trip to Singapore and have a look for herself at what has occurred there.

The honourable member referred to past problems in Sydney and Melbourne, but I would like to know what Sydney and Melbourne have got to do with what we are trying to do here in South Australia. I had great difficulty in linking her comments about past problems in those two cities with what we are trying to achieve in South Australia. I also cannot understand some of the Opposition's concern in relation to the steps that the Government has taken. I have read very carefully the debate in another place last time that a similar Bill was brought before the Parliament, and I believe that the Government has addressed the concerns of the other place and of a number of interest groups and yet, at the same time, achieved its goals.

Reference was made by the shadow Minister to call-ins, and I want to stress that if a call-in occurs the process that will be adopted by DAC will be identical to that which is presently adopted within a council as far as consultation and all other processes are concerned. Yet she was trying to convince this House that, if the call-in provisions were allowed to proceed, a fate worse than death would be awaiting South Australians. I would also point out that, when she spoke about those matters of major State significance, there will be very detailed public consultation which is an integral part of that process.

The shadow Minister also referred to the present call-in powers. All we are saying is that we believe that we need to make it quite clear under what conditions a Minister should be able to call-in a matter for consideration by the commission. Let us look at those three reasons. First, if a council fails to meet its statutory requirements, the Minister will have the power to call-in that matter.

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: The honourable member says that we already have it: therefore, the Opposition should be happy to support it. The second issue relates to matters which will impact on more than one local government area.

Ms Hurley: It's already in the Act.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: The honourable member opposite may not have a concern—and that is good—but everything else of which she spoke was a mouthing of what the LGA has been saying. It is disappointing to hear the shadow Minister acting as spokesperson for the Local Government Association: what she was saying is exactly what the LGA has been saying. I heard her interject to say that she accepts that the Minister should have the power to call-in where a development impacts on more than one local government area—so that is two out of three. You never know your luck; we might get three out of three.

The third area is where a development application will impact on policy. Do members really believe that an individual council should make a decision about a matter which relates to policy, or should it be this House or a person who is able to take a point of view which is for the greater good of the State rather than for the perceived good of a council? Far be it from me to cast any aspersions on any individual council, but why should a council comprising perhaps a handful of ratepayers be the body which makes the decision which, in fact, is a policy decision? Surely that decision should be made at a higher level; that is the third level. We are saying that in relation to policy the decision should be made to ensure that it is for the good of the State as a whole.

The honourable member trotted out the arguments being put forward by the LGA. I will not say that the honourable member's contribution was written for her by the LGA, but I was bitterly disappointed to hear the speech by the shadow Minister, because it reflected exactly what the LGA has been saying. The honourable member referred to statistics which have been provided by the LGA, and she mentioned the LGA's protestation that not too many cases have caused problems. As members are aware, the Local Government Association has issued three media releases in an attempt to indicate that councils are improving the speed at which they assess development applications. All three media releases have been based upon the Local Approvals Review Program

(LARP) and involved a sample of only 17 councils out of what was then 118 councils—a very small sample indeed.

While I support the LARP initiative, which is aimed at increasing the efficiency of councils in the development assessment process, the data supplied does not indicate the degree to which such decisions, particularly those made by elected members, comply with the policies of the Development Plan as is required by the Development Act.

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: The honourable member can bring in a whole heap of red herrings. Let us look at what we are trying to achieve in this Bill. The development industry has indicated that, while the speed at which the decisions are made is an issue, the consistency of the decisions when compared with the policies of the Development Plan is the main cause of concern.

So, it is nothing to do with numbers; it is all about consistency and being able to determine whether a council will make a decision in keeping with the development plan. At this stage I think that it is quite fair for me to refer to one specific council, because the latest statistics show quite clearly that it has 2.5 times as many appeals lodged against it compared with the two adjoining councils. In addition, this council loses the majority of its cases because the ERD Court has stated that the refusals by that council were not in accordance with the policies in the development plan. That is the nub of the Bill. There is a problem there—

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Again the honourable member interjects. Even when I explain in words of one syllable, she still has difficulty in understanding.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier was heard in silence. I suggest she not interject.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: It is the Deputy Leader's fault if she was not.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: The Bill retains councils as the primary decision making body. But the call-in powers provide a safety valve—nothing more, nothing less—when certain circumstances arise. I am committed to assisting the LGA in its education program for elected members to ensure that councils take a consistent planning authority approach. This is essential, because the council I was referring to just a minute ago is one where the officers strongly recommended in at least one major case that a development should be allowed to proceed, but the elected council rejected that advice—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Here we go—it is terrible. The company is very happy for me to identify it and the council. It is Radio Rentals—a South Australian company—and it would like to proceed with a major development at Mitcham. So, now it is out in the open. If the honourable member wants to deny that this has occurred, I suggest she talk to many of the people within the city of Mitcham about the problems that have been—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I suggest that the honourable member look at the elected members of the Mitcham council and to which Party they owe their political allegiance. And it ain't us. That leaves one. While I consider that it is important to focus on the positive ways of ensuring consistency in decision making, when I hear that an application lodged in September 1995 is still to be resolved and that, within that time, the council incorrectly instituted section 84 proceedings against a proponent, I feel there is obviously room for improvement in the Act presently in existence in South Australia. I note that the honourable member is quite strangely silent. That is the important aspect we need to consider: a change is obviously needed.

The shadow Minister went on in relation to further points that have been made to me many times by the LGA. All I can say is that I wish that, instead of trying to curry favour with the LGA, the Opposition would look at what is best for South Australia. This Bill is well thought out and meets the concerns that were previously expressed in another place. When a similar Bill was previously considered, a number of points were made by the Labor Opposition and by the Democrats in another place. We have looked at that carefully and, as I said, this Bill, without a doubt, meets those concerns.

Another point that concerns me very much in relation to the speech that the shadow Minister gave is that it appears she did not understand the difference between a Development Act and a Planning Act, or a development application and a planning application. For purely political reasons, I think the Deputy Leader also determined that he would fudge that and try to bring in a planning matter under what is, in fact, a Bill to amend the Development Act. I ask Opposition members to look at this matter. We are considering matters related not to the Planning Act, but to the Development Act. There is a very big difference, and I would have thought that by now the shadow Minister would have understood the difference between them.

Ms Hurley: The same Minister.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: The same Minister, but totally different processes relating to different matters and areas.

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Again, the member is interjecting, which shows her ignorance and lack of understanding of what is a planning matter and what is a development matter. Then there was talk about there being no appeal regarding matters of major significance. If the member had been listening to developers and investors—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader has had a fair go. If he wants an early minute, let him continue with his present behaviour and be will be accommodated. He has had enough warnings today.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: If the member for Napier had been listening to developers and investors in South Australia, she would have been aware that they have expressed two major concerns. The first is that there is no certainty in the process once an application is lodged, and the second is that once a decision is made it can be appealed.

I am sure that the member is aware, as I am, of a situation not far from her electorate where, because of commercial considerations from a competitor, a development has been held up for about three years. Does the member seriously believe that a situation that allows that to occur is the right message to send to developers and investors in other States to whom we are looking to bring their dollars and jobs to South Australia? The message that they are getting loud and clear is, 'Avoid South Australia. You will tie up your money. Not only will it take a long time to get an answer, but, even when you get one, it will be appealed left, right and centre, and money will be tied up which could be used for earning other money in developments in other States.'

That is what I want to fix and that is what the member said she wants to fix, yet she is fighting a Bill which will bring about those very changes. We are trying to bring certainty into this State. I think it was the shadow Minister who, in relation to the appeal process, asked, 'Why would they come here?' If I recall her words, she was saying that under this new process an application could be declined. Of course, that is a possibility, but at least the developer will know. Developers want a 'Yes' or a 'No', not a 'Maybe,' and that is what they are getting at the moment. Even when they get a 'Yes', it is only a 'Maybe', because the decision can be appealed. They are looking for certainty, and this Bill is designed to bring in that certainty.

The member for Napier was concerned that there would not be consultation. Consultation is an integral part of the amendments that I shall be proposing this evening. The major developments or projects division of the Bill requires: first, that the guidelines for each development or project must be placed on public exhibition; secondly, that the EIS, PER or DR, whichever is the case, must be placed on public exhibition; thirdly, that the community has an opportunity to make submissions on any development or project; fourthly, that a public meeting will be held to discuss the proposal and the process; and, fifthly, that the assessment report will be released to the public. Yet the member for Napier is trying to tell the House that we are not consulting. How much consultation does she want? I come back to the point that she wants not consultation, but delay after delay after delay, just as we have now, so that we will frighten away developers and investors and enable Opposition members in 18 months to prattle on and say that this Government has not been able to attract investment to South Australia.

The major development or project division of this Bill fully involves the public. Clause 48B precludes legal challenges to the Supreme Court on procedural matters. Again, that is not a qualification which the honourable member decided she would concentrate on but is the fact. This provision has been included because of recent trends by which commercial competitors—and I refer again to a situation with which I am sure the honourable member is very familiar—have tended to initiate Supreme Court challenges not for any development or planning reason but purely and simply to frustrate a competitor entering the area. Such challenges have not been concerned with the planning issues but primarily with stopping the competitor. Does the honourable member suggest that that is the sort of situation we should continue with?

The Environment, Resources and Development Court Act has limited the extent to which issues can be taken to a higher court in an attempt to reduce these delays, but in recent times this has led to procedural challenges coming to the fore, and hence this clause is aimed at ensuring that merits, rather than the amount of money a person or a company has, will determine whether or not a development should proceed. If I understood the honourable member correctly, she said that she wants to use DAC for major developments but not for call-ins because—

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Well, that is what you said. You said that you could not understand why major developments could not be considered by DAC.

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I will certainly check the *Hansard*. I thought the honourable member referred to the fact that she would like to see DAC consider major developments and yet she says she does not want it to consider call-ins. The honourable member is shaking her head. I will take her word for it; perhaps I did misunderstand her on that point. As I said, I will not labour that point because it appears that that is not what the honourable member intended. As far as appeals are concerned, I understand from what members opposite said that they want these retained.

I come back to the point that, if you were a developer or investor considering developing or investing, you would develop in a State such as Victoria where legislation gives the Minister far greater powers than I seek in this place. The Victorian legislation introduced by the Kennett Government and supported by the Labor Opposition there gives the Victorian Minister far greater powers than I seek. The Victorian Labor Opposition said that it wants to attract and support investment and development in Victoria. So, the Opposition there has taken a very much better approach to the matter than have its counterparts here.

I suggest to the honourable member, if she has not already done so, that she contact her colleagues in Victoria, because they will confirm that in Victoria a Development Act has been introduced which gives the Minister far greater powers than I will have. The Labor Opposition in that State supported it because it knew it was good for Victoria. I come back to the point that here we have a Labor Opposition opposing what we want to do. Therefore, if you were an investor or developer looking to invest or develop in either South Australia or Victoria, where would you go?

Ms Hurley: I would rather live in South Australia.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: That is because the honourable member has quite a secure position. What about the millions out there who are not so secure?

Mr Clarke: Such as yourself.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I can assure the Deputy Leader that my position is a damn sight more secure than his as Deputy Leader—I know that for sure. If you do not believe that, have a look at the polls which show only too clearly that we would come back with an increased majority even over what we had at the last election. I am very happy to talk about that. I look forward to coming back after the next election and seeing the present Deputy Leader of the Opposition sitting in the backbenches where he rightly belongs. Anyway, let me return to the Bill. The honourable member also mentioned—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: It is all right for the honourable member, but there are other people out there desperately looking for jobs. We want to introduce a Development Act that will allow development and investment which will bring with it some much needed jobs. The Opposition is saying that it does not want the development, the investment or the jobs. That is fine, as long as the Opposition is honest, because even if it is not I will ensure that the public is well aware that the Opposition does not want development, investment or new jobs in South Australia.

Mr Clarke: That is a nonsense.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Well, support the Bill. That will be great.

Ms Hurley: We are.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: You are? It did not sound like it when you were speaking. The shadow Minister also referred to the lack of discussion in relation to the time for consultation. She deliberately left out a very important word, and that is the word 'minimum'. With respect to an EIS, she talked about six weeks, four weeks and two weeks, but she

did not mention that in each instance they will be the minimum periods over which consultation will be required to occur.

If I understood the member for Taylor correctly, she indicated that developers are disappointed with what is in the Bill. All I can say is that I would like to have seen greater powers in this Bill than are included, but what I have genuinely tried to do, through consultation with the Local Government Association, the Opposition, the Democrats and all sorts of interest groups throughout South Australia, is to bring in a Bill which I believe will meet the need that I identify—namely, to give an assurance to developers and investors that South Australia is open for business—and which, at the same time, will meet the concerns that were expressed.

Let me give an example. We talked about the panel. The original panel was to have comprised five persons. However, the LGA and conservation groups suggested that the panel could be improved. So, I have increased the membership to six, and I have brought in a representative of the LGA as well as a representative of the conservation movement. I have shown that I am willing to act and not just talk about change. I have made more than 30 changes to the original draft of the Bill, each change being made because of a suggestion from the LGA, the conservation group or even the Opposition.

The mayor of a council suggested to me that, when a matter is being considered by DAC, he would like to see a planning officer from the relevant council present to put that council's point of view. I have written to that mayor and said, 'Excellent suggestion; I agree.' I have time and again amended the original draft of the Bill. I agree with my colleague the member for Hartley: I am bitterly disappointed that, I understand, he and every member in this House received a copy of a letter from the President of the LGA which I am still to receive. It could have been faxed to my ministerial office, I do not know, but it certainly has not come to me at Parliament House.

I am disappointed, under the consultation process that I have put in place, that, in spite of the vast majority of changes I have made because of requests from the LGA, the LGA is now saying, 'You have made the changes but we still reject what you are trying to do.' It makes me ask, 'What really is the point of consultation?' I would hope that the Opposition, rather than taking instructions from the LGA, will look at the Bill, look at what the Government is trying to achieve, compare what I want to do with what their colleagues in Victoria have agreed to, and ask themselves, honestly, 'Why are we attempting to throw out this Bill?' I have already given the answer.

The Deputy Leader talked for a long time but said very little. He talked about reasoned decisions of councils. Let me give him an example of a reasoned decision of a council. There is a council—and I will not name it at this stage—

Mr Clarke: Name it.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: All right, the City of Tea Tree Gully.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Very much downhill since I left, yes. There were three houses in very close proximity to Tea Tree Plaza and the officers felt it would be a good idea to rezone these houses from residential to commercial. Let me quote the words that one councillor used when that matter came before the council. He said, 'There is no way in the world I will agree to this, because all we will be doing is putting money in the pockets of the developer.' When those sorts of statements are being made about development, it is no wonder that we have trouble attracting development to this State.

The honourable member referred to the professional staff of councils. I agree that there are some excellent professional staff employed by local government, but I am also aware of the frustration they feel. I again cite the example of the Mitcham council where recommendations are put forward by officers but rejected by elected members. The Deputy Leader referred to Collex. This has nothing to do with the Bill, and again it shows his absolute lack of understanding of the difference between a planning and a development matter.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I thought that might be the case. One of the last points I want to make is that the LGA and members opposite seem to have a tremendous concern for what they appear to think will be hundreds if not thousands of applications that I will either call in or declare to be of major State significance. When I sat down with my officers to look at the number of applications of which we have been aware in South Australia over the past 12 months, we could not even cover the fingers of one hand. So, there will be very few applications, but—and this is the important point—we want to send a signal that, if you want to bring in a development which is of major State significance, there will be an assured process for consideration of that matter and when the decision is made it will be final.

The shadow Minister has already agreed with two of the three reasons why a Minister should have the power to call in, but I cannot understand why she does not agree to the third reason on policy. However, the number of applications that will come under this umbrella is not large: in fact, it is very small. As I have said, in those key areas we want to send a clear message that, if you have an application or a development of major State significance, there is an assured process, and when the decision is given you can be assured that it is final. I have not yet heard one reason from the Opposition as to why that is not reasonable.

The other point that I want to make is that, if there is a problem with the application before local government, we are setting up a procedure by which we will be able to bring in that matter for consideration by the DAC rather than the council, but you must understand that the process will be the same: it is just the decision-making body that will be different. Again, what is wrong with that? They are the key issues that lie at the crux of this Bill. I look forward to the contribution of members opposite regarding those matters.

I was delighted to hear the Opposition say that it is prepared to leave the door open for further discussion. I take that as a signal by the Opposition. I appreciate the manner in which the shadow Minister has entered into discussions with me on this matter. We have met on a number of occasions, she has spoken with my officers, and I have found her at all times to be prepared to listen.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I have abused the Opposition, and I say that without apology. I was delighted to hear that the Opposition is prepared to leave the door open for further discussion, and I am hopeful that commonsense will prevail in relation to this Bill, because the Opposition says that it wants development, the Democrats say that they want development, and we have a Bill which will bring about development. I only hope that the Opposition sees that.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Definitions.'

Ms HURLEY: In relation to PER, new subsection (5)(a) provides 'a detailed description and analysis of a limited number of issues', etc. What is the Minister's definition of 'limited'?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I think the honourable member refers to the difference between the procedures. Probably the best example I could give is where, if an application were made in Whyalla, we might be looking at issues in relation to contamination and perhaps the coast—in other words, quite clearly defined areas—whereas there could be a whole range of issues in another application. This provides that if there is a whole range of issues we would be looking at an EIS; and the fewer the number of issues, the more we would be looking at two other stages. So, we would be looking at the significance of a number of issues that would need to be considered. If there were a number of issues, we would be looking at a full EIS.

Ms HURLEY: Will the Minister be more specific? Are we talking about two or three, or four or five?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: The honourable member will find the definitions in the regulations. We seek to introduce here a system very similar to that which operates in New South Wales, where it is not the number but the significance that is of consequence. It is important to understand that the more significant the impact on the environment, the more likely it would be that the full EIS procedure would be adopted.

Ms HURLEY: That analysis of significance would be up to the Minister, I presume?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: No, that is the role of the advisory committee. Remember, we are setting up that independent panel to review the applications. That body would be making the recommendation, not me, as Minister.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Determination of relevant authority.'

Ms HURLEY: I am interested in subclause (c), in which there is provision for the conditions under which the Minister might call in developments. What evidence does the Minister have that councils are delaying development approvals?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I impress on members opposite that if they talk to investors or developers, not only in South Australia but interstate, the image, impression, or whatever one wants to call it, of South Australia is that it is a State to avoid at all costs. Earlier in the debate, the honourable member referred to statistics which indicated that people are happy with the time, but I thought I referred to where the real concern should lie. Many organisations and umbrella bodies have indicated to me that they have also spoken with members of the Opposition. I would presume that they passed on the same message to the honourable member as they gave to me: that South Australia is seen as a State in which it is difficult to get approvals and, having got approvals, they cannot then be certain.

I referred in the debate to a major development. I do not think I am at liberty to divulge the costs incurred to that major South Australian company because of the actions of a council, but I can assure the honourable member that is a very large figure. In each instance where the refusal was given and the appeal process was undertaken by the developer the appeal went in favour of the developer. I understand that, at one stage, the court said to the council, 'Why on earth have you allowed the situation to develop to its current position?' There is no doubt whatsoever that South Australia does have problems and that South Australia is perceived to have problems. The comments I have received from investors and developers are legion. If the honourable member has not received that information I would be amazed, because I have been told otherwise.

Ms HURLEY: In much the same way as the Minister has been informed, I am aware of the perception to which he refers, but I would have thought there were other ways in which the Minister could address perceptions by the development community by talking to it. He mentions a legion number of problems, and I wonder whether he would like to give some figures. He mentioned one case where the court found against the developer, yet he says that the court wondered why the council had brought it to that stage. It seems to me that the court must have found some reason why the council brought it to that stage, otherwise it would not have rejected the developer's point of view.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Let me just give an example of one council.

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: In fact it is not one example, because what I have here indicates that one council has had 50 appeals lodged against decisions.

Ms Hurley: Mitcham?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Mitcham again, yes, but there are many others. The honourable member is purely and simply trying to bring red herrings into the issue. She knows the situation as well as I do because she has received the same representations from developers and investors as I have. It is not only the number that we know we have lost, but I have received indications from other developers and investors who have said, 'Look, when our board had to make up its mind, we could afford only one or two investments throughout Australia.' Those companies have indicated to me that South Australia was the first State ruled out, because it is seen as a State in which it is hard to get a decision. Again, I refer the honourable member to that situation not very far from her electorate, and I have referred to other areas tonight.

When this sort of thing is happening in South Australia, what is the message being sent to interstate developers and investors? The honourable member knows as well as I the answer to that question. I am trying to introduce a Bill which, as I said, is much 'softer' than the Victorian Bill (which was supported by the honourable member's counterparts). I have tried genuinely to take into account the concerns expressed by the LGA, conservation interest groups, the Opposition and councils. I have made many changes to the provisions I originally intended to introduce—and the original Bill had many more changes than the one brought to this House in the first place. So, I do not want it to be said that I have not tried to achieve all the goals; that is, to ensure that there is a fair system but a system that offers certainty.

Ms HURLEY: If the Minister cannot give me statistical information about council rejections of development proposals, can he tell me what the record of Government departments is in responding to requests for input and whether that might have caused significant delays as well?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: That is a question that I am very happy to answer. I acknowledge that problems have occurred because of the lack of support staff within my own portfolio area. If the honourable member had looked at the budget papers, she would have seen that I have been successful in obtaining substantial additional funds to enable me to appoint a number of additional staff in this very area to

ensure that the State Government will be able to process these applications expeditiously.

Mr Clarke: So, it's your mob who is to blame.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Not at all.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—'Substitution of Division 2 of Part 4.'

Mr CONDOUS: I refer to new section 46. In recent months the Lord Mayor of Adelaide has gone on record in the press calling for planning power on major projects in the City of Adelaide to be taken out of his and his council's hands. The reason for that is that many of the decisions have not been made on the merit of the development and the value to the city, but on factional lines, on the basis of bitterness by groups who have something against him personally and by people who have vested interests in various groups and do not want to see a commercial development in the city. An example of the risk of losing something of economic importance in the community is the Le Cornu site in O'Connell Street, North Adelaide. One has to look at who the developers are and what their history is all about.

The Oberdan family is an Italian family of great repute who for many years ran one of the best reception centres in South Australia. Upon the sale of that centre, they decided to go into the property development industry. The first two projects they decided to take on were both building projects which were on the State Heritage Register and on the Lord Mayor's Heritage Register. I refer to the Liberal and Verco buildings on North Terrace which have remained as a facade to the Myer-Remm redevelopment. Both these buildings were in a run-down state and housed the dental and medical fraternity.

The Oberdan family restored them with an enormous amount of care and intricacy so that what we see today are two examples of the finest architecture that one can see of this type anywhere in Australia. They then decided to refurbish the Tattersalls building in Grenfell Street and again did that immaculately. Then the State Labor Government, and rightly so, decided that two residential buildings in North Adelaide, Kingsmead and Belmont, adjacent to the site of the old Hotel Australia, should be developed. The Oberdan family restored Belmont to something of which all South Australians can be proud today. However, the one major error the family made in its development history was the purchase of the Le Cornu site. What should have been a simple development with conditions placed on it by the council to allow them to develop a major shopping centre and picture theatre complex for the benefit of the people of North Adelaide became a fight involving the family and a small vested interest group comprising residents, many of whom were in the legal fraternity.

They decided that the best idea would be to try to break the Oberdan family by stretching out the planning applications for as long as they could until they virtually sent them bankrupt. As members know, the story went on for four to five years back and forth not only between the developers and Adelaide City Council but then to appeals tribunals and the Supreme Court. In the end the Oberdan family obtained approval, but it meant that the holding charges over that five-year period amounted to $6 million, which was enough to put enormous financial strain on the family. I understand the Lord Mayor asking that those matters be taken out of his hands. I can remember as Lord Mayor trying to get a developer to develop in the City of Adelaide, but his reply to me was, 'I'd love to do it. I don't mind jumping hurdles, but I'm not about to start pole vaulting in South Australia.'

That is a reflection on how we are perceived in the development industry around the country. In other Australian capitals they roll out the red carpet for developers, grab them by the arm and lead them right to the end until they have a planning approval in their hand and a project ready to go. What do we do here? We procrastinate, hold back and try to break people. Is it any wonder that we have only one crane on the skyline? It is simply because it is too damned hard in South Australia. We have people with their own little vested interests totally disregarding developers, treating them badly and, in the end, no-one wants to touch us with a 40-foot pole.

What should we be doing? Let me go back a bit, because I worked very closely with the previous Labor Premier, John Bannon, who would have loved the power and ability to shortcut many of the applications. If he had been able to do that, we would probably have been left today with half a dozen or more tourism development programs.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: We would have had them in South Australia. We would have done something with Kangaroo Island, Wilpena Pound, Victor Harbor and Mount Lofty, but we did not because we had 40 people with placards standing there saying, 'We don't want it,' when one million people did want it. Members should consider this aspect, because there are many projects that need special treatment. Provided we have sensible and intelligent people in positions to listen to applications and give them sensible consideration—

Ms Hurley interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: Well, there are a lot of great South Australians who can sit down and consider these projects without any problems at all, and they will not strap this State with a development which they approved and of which we will be ashamed for many years to come. Nobody wants that. The one special thing about this State is that it does things well and has a track record of doing that. We do things better than they do anywhere else, and here we should be getting on with supporting the Minister because we may send a signal to developers and investors in other parts of this country and overseas that South Australia does have a different attitude and that, when they have a good project that is environmentally sound, we will listen to them and give them their planning approval in quick time.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I thank the honourable member for the remarks that he has just made and point out to members opposite that he has more experience in local government than have most other people. We heard only too well the points that the honourable member made about the problems that exist and, despite the statements of the Opposition, it is not perception. We heard the honourable member say only too clearly how factual are the arguments that I have been putting forward. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN (Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I am pleased to rise this evening in the grievance debate to report on the Riverland passenger transport study, which was brought about by efforts of the Riverland Development Corporation and completed in

about June. I was particularly pleased to present this report, via a deputation in my electorate office at Berri last week, to the Minister for Transport (Hon. Diana Laidlaw) when she was in the Riverland. She was welcomed there to commission the first part of construction of the Berri bridge. Tonight I will give an overview of the passenger transport study because it gives a very good summary in terms of the need and options with respect to the whole public transport arena in the Riverland, which is a significant regional economy, producing something like 10 per cent of South Australia's gross State product.

The Riverland has real passenger transport needs. Easily affordable passenger transport services between the towns in the region are effectively non-existent, and the situation creates some problems of hardship with various sections or groups in the area. This has been brought to my attention regularly, so I am well aware of it. In noting this (and as the report illustrates), I point out that a considerable mismatch currently exists between demand and actual services available.

The Riverland passenger transport study was made available in June and has provided a comprehensive assessment of the current situation. It was prepared by a strategic planning and management collective consultancy in liaison with the Riverland Development Corporation, and its funding was assisted by the Commonwealth Office of Labour Market Adjustment and the South Australian Passenger Transport Board. The study has drawn together a broad range of problems arising from current transport patterns, has summarised the factors generating demand for services and has looked at the benefits that would flow from improved services.

The methodology used has drawn on relevant other studies, particularly the southern and Barossa community transport schemes, and experience in New South Wales. The outcome is a proposal for a Riverland community transport system. Key variables are identified in this study that have had considerable impact on the proposal. The demand for transport between the Riverland towns (that is, 100 kilometres from Morgan in the west to Paringa in the east) stems from—

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr ANDREW: Well, we are working on the Barossa model. I commend what is obviously happening in the Barossa; I note that the member for Custance has had some good influence there. I am sure that we will endeavour to build upon that. That has been highlighted in this study. It stems from interrelated factors: the centralisation of Government financial and specialist health services in Berri, the high degree of economic interdependence between the Riverland towns and the predominance of a number of major shopping centres.

On 1993-94 figures, the Riverland, with six major towns, had a population of over 34 000. Most transport needs are met using private cars. I was surprised and interested to note that the figures brought forward in this report indicate that passenger vehicles per household in the Riverland are about twice the State average, at 2.5 vehicles per household, compared to 1.7 vehicles in Mount Gambier and 1.3 across South Australia. Other principal means of transportation are taxis and buses, private operators and community minibuses. These minibuses are generally managed by health units at Riverland hospitals and have been acquired by a mix of HACC and local government funding. Under current eligibility criteria, their usage is strictly limited. This could undoubtedly affect the availability of these minibuses for any future integrated passenger system.

People most affected regarding transport services include the unemployed, students seeking education and training, the disabled and the elderly. Better transport for the elderly means less isolation and better utilisation of services already available to support them, thereby improving their ability to live independently for longer. Similarly, for the unemployed, students and the disabled, improved passenger transport access can bring about more efficient and effective delivery of services which target their specific needs. Disability service organisations such as Options Coordination and Orana currently use their own resources to provide transport for clients, and this, of course, reduces the availability of funds for other purposes.

Specific examples of Riverland transport destinations include: a wide range of regional services—Government and private—which are concentrated at Berri, and patient visits to health and dental professionals located Berri. Most surgical procedures occur at the Riverland regional health service at Berri. Other examples include Social Security and CES offices being based at Berri; disability community support and development programs; education and training facilities, particularly TAFE and the Rivskills program; and the requirement of shopping and commercial centres.

The report also notes that places of employment are in three broad categories: jobs in town centres; major food packaging, processing or wine making enterprises based outside major towns; and work on fruit orchids, where the level of seasonal work is greatest. As the study recognises, considerable difficulties would be associated with meeting these diverse transport needs. The overall picture has two parts: a relatively stable base demand and a seasonal demand fluctuating with the harvesting of seasonal fruit crops of the main horticultural industries.

For an inter-town transport system in the Riverland to be effective, it will need to provide a service that meets the transport needs for a wide variety of potential users. The study proposes a Riverland community transport system that is responsive to demand, flexible and completely under local control. The major components would be an information system, a brokerage and the provision of a transport service.

The task of a transport brokerage, that is, matching potential service users with available services, would facilitate opportunities for car and van pooling for a wide range of purposes. Groups that need minibus services periodically could be assisted to obtain access to vehicles that are not in use. However, the scale and nature of unmet transport demand in the Riverland is such that a Riverland community transport service will need to be involved in direct service provision in addition to brokerage activities if demand is to be satisfied. This raises issues concerning costs and vehicle options, which, as the report indicates, involves three basic alternatives. The first is to utilise existing health unit minibuses when these are not in use; secondly, the lease or purchase of new minibuses rather than use the health unit minibuses at all; or, thirdly, supplement the Riverland community transport system minibus service with health unit buses or private sector services as appropriate.

The benefits of a Riverland community transport system are important, and I believe that a successfully operated system would generate real benefits for the entire Riverland region. These would include assisting regional economic development for key export industries; underpinning the efficiency of centrally located services at Berri; ensuring

access to much needed services for disadvantaged people, as I have mentioned; and contributing to the identity of the Riverland as a region, enhancing a sense of social and economic vitality and cohesion in the region.

This study addresses the inequities that result from not having a public transport system comparable to that available in the metropolitan area. It has provided the community with guidelines for a structure and operation beginning with a brokerage and a limited transport service. In Stage 1, all workers would be volunteers except for the program coordination. I believe that this report has given a very objective and realistic vision for the better provision of transport services for the people of the Riverland.

I particularly thank the Minister for her positive and open reception and encouragement of the deputation to move forward with the next stage of the options, and that is to provide a business plan for funding requirements. I have also provided a copy of the report to the Passenger Transport Board, and I look forward to its favourable assessment as part of this process. I thank the Riverland community for its contribution to the study, and members will note from the detail that I have presented that it represents a very comprehensive input in terms of passenger transport needs in the Riverland.

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

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Last week in the Estimates Committee I spent some time talking about the Julia Farr Centre, and I want to refer to some of those issues again. As I said last week, I was approached by a number of parents who had sons or daughters with an acquired brain injury and who were in the Julia Farr Centre to avail themselves of its rehabilitation service. Those parents who came to me with their concerns, having tried on a number of occasions to raise them, felt that their concerns were not being heard.

Coincidentally, in the *Weekend Australian* magazine, there was an article entitled 'A Long Season in Hell'. I recommend that all members read that article and, if they cannot get hold of it, I am happy to give them a copy. The article tells the story of a woman, Gail Graham, and her teenage son who, at the age of 17, had a serious car accident and was brain damaged. It talks about the horrific experiences that that family had in dealing with his injury and his final rehabilitation. It is a moving story and it raises a huge number of issues. In fact, it raises many of the issues that the people from Julia Farr Centre raised with me, so I recommend that members read that article.

One of the things that I have learnt in dealing with this issue is that there has been a need to change Julia Farr Centre and its operations substantially in recent years, and particularly its treatment of acquired brain injury. We need to understand that with the great advances in technology many people who would have died in the past from brain injury are now surviving. They go to the intensive care sections of the hospitals, they are saved and then they need rehabilitation. Because of this significant change, Julia Farr Centre also has had to change. Over the past three years or so there have been at least two large reports about this change and the need for things to be done differently. Those reports outlined extensive changes—not just minor changes but extensive changes—that needed to occur.

In approaching this matter and in raising these issues, I realised that many stakeholders were involved: the patients themselves; their families and carers; the staff of Julia Farr Centre, most of whom, if not all, want to do the right thing and do a good job; and, finally, the management of Julia Farr Centre. In making the decision to raise this issue, I also asked myself the question, 'Who are the least powerful players in this equation?' I believe that the least powerful players are, first, the patients themselves with an acquired brain injury, many of them unable to communicate, to stand up for their rights or make their needs known; and, secondly, the families of those people with acquired brain injury. To deal with that situation, to see a healthy young person you love severely injured like this, would be a devastating shock to any parent.

In raising this sensitive matter, I weighed up the issues and decided that it was very important to let the voices of those people be heard, and that is why I raised this issue last week. Last week I quoted from a letter written to me by Dawn Brooks on behalf of the people who met with me to discuss this issue. The letter also states:

> This raises the question that must be answered. If Governments and society consider it important to save lives at great cost at the time of injury, then there must be adequate attention to providing the ongoing rehabilitation, community supports etc. to ensure a reasonable quality of life for the individual and their families.

There can be no argument against that. But it requires change in practices and outlook. However, any change is difficult, particularly in relation to this issue which requires sensitive handling; it requires opportunities for people to voice their concerns and have their complaints heard for these things to be worked out and for people to feel that the best things are being done for them and their sons and daughters.

I was interested and concerned to see the response of the Chief Executive Officer of Julia Farr, Mr Chris Firth, in relation to these issues. First, on Channel 10 I saw Mr Firth say that occasional mistakes are made: that is true in all situations. He denied any neglect and said that he had received no complaints from parents. That is very interesting because the people who came to see me said that they had tried to discuss the matter with him but had left feeling frustrated because they had not been listened to. Last night, on 5AN, Murray Nicoll followed up this matter and interviewed Dawn Brooks and Mr Firth; and a caller who supported the issues that I had raised last week in Parliament rang to further discuss the matter.

I would like to return to what Mr Firth said. He said, first (and I have the transcript), that he had the utmost respect and sympathy for a number of the families who are trying to cope with what is basically unresolved grief. Certainly, families in this situation are coping with their grief, but what the families that I spoke to wanted most of all was to feel that what was happening for their son or daughter was the best that could happen; that they were getting the rehabilitation they required and that they could have the opportunity to talk to Julia Farr and ensure that this was happening. It concerns me sometimes when we say that it is basically unresolved grief, because that can be used to discount people's views and people's feelings. The other thing that I am concerned about is this comment:

> I am incensed in some ways by the Opposition and the way they have used Julia Farr to run their own political agenda. . . Well, I think that what they have done is to discredit themselves by using allegations against what is clearly a valuable and needed community resource. . . Why did the Opposition not at least bring those allegations to Julia Farr to see if there was any truth in them?

I believed those people when they came to see me. Also, it is my job as a politician, as shadow Minister for Health, to stand up for people in our community who have these problems and to raise them with the Minister for Health. I do

not resile from that: I will never resile from that; and people who are the least powerful in our community can be sure that they will get this hearing and that their voices will be heard. That is not to say that the solutions are not difficult; it is not to say that other people do not have a role to play; but that is my position.

Motion carried.

At 10.7 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 4 July at 10.30 a.m.