

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 9 July 1996

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

AMBULANCES

A petition signed by one resident of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to examine the impact upon patient health of the reduced use of ambulance services was presented by Ms White.

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 67, 81, 87 and 99.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. D.C. Brown)—

Social Development Committee—Eighth Report—Rural Poverty in South Australia—Response by the Premier.
Economic and Finance Committee—Seventeenth Report—Aspects of the Operations of the MFP Development Corporation—Response by the Premier.

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Public Corporations Act—Regulations—Information Industries.
Friendly Societies Act 1919—Rules—Confirmation Pursuant to section 10.

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

National Road Trauma Advisory Council—Report 1994-95.

By the Minister for Infrastructure (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—

Statutory Authorities Review Committee—Report—Costs of Transporting Coal Extracted from Leigh Creek Mine—Response by the Minister for Infrastructure.

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

South Australian Health Commission Act—Regulations—Hospital and Health Services Fees.

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

District Council of Millicent—By-Law No. 10—Straying Stock.

SAMCOR SALE

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. S.J. BAKER**: The future of the South Australian Meat Corporation (SAMCOR) has been the subject of recent discussion in this House and another place, and I believe it is appropriate to provide an update on the progress being made by the Government to transfer this organisation to the private sector. At the direction of Cabinet, SAMCOR

was placed on the market via public tender on 7 August 1995. The Asset Management Task Force conducted an extensive marketing program, and the sale process generated interest within Australia and overseas. Delays in the sale process have occurred due to the withdrawal of export licences by the Australian Quarantine Inspection Service (AQIS) and difficulties with the unions involved in negotiating redundancy agreements which would allow the sale of SAMCOR.

Further complications have arisen about a perceived conflict of interest between the General Manager of SAMCOR, Mr Des Lilley and one bidder, Better Beef Limited. From the outset, may I stress that Mr Lilley has had no involvement in the assessment of the bids for SAMCOR, nor was he ever in a position to influence the outcome of the determination of the Asset Management Task Force and subsequently Cabinet. After allegations were raised about Mr Lilley and his links with Better Beef, I requested that an investigation into the claims be undertaken by the Crown Solicitor. The Crown Solicitor initiated two interviews with Mr Lilley, and it has been confirmed that Mr Lilley did travel to Canada while on recreation leave at the expense of Better Beef Limited and that he had been offered a position with Better Beef should it be the successful bidder for SAMCOR.

While I find this action inappropriate in a sale process, I must repeat that Mr Lilley has not, is not and will not be in a position to influence the outcome of the plan to remove SAMCOR from the books of the State Government. The bottom line is that the Government has not received any final conforming bid which would satisfactorily allow for SAMCOR to be transferred to the private sector. Unfortunately, this is not surprising given SAMCOR's appalling financial performance. In 1994-95, SAMCOR made losses of \$3.27 million. To December 1995, SAMCOR losses were \$1.364 million and, since May 1996, the Government has injected funds of \$1.2 million to enable SAMCOR to remain operational. At present SAMCOR is costing the Government of the order of \$150 000 per week to keep operating.

Despite this drain on the public purse, the Government has decided to make one last effort to ensure the future of the Gepps Cross abattoir. During the sales process, one bidder, Canadian meat processor, Better Beef Limited, put forward a lease/purchase proposal which would involve that company's underpinning the operations of SAMCOR by improving the throughput for sale to both local and export markets. This is an arrangement that the Government will now explore in a new process. Each of the parties which originally submitted bids for SAMCOR will be invited to resubmit their offers on a lease/purchase agreement. In doing so, the Government is making a significant commitment to the meat industry in South Australia and every effort will be made in the coming weeks to achieve an outcome which is positive to both industry and the taxpayer. A strong commitment will also be required by the SAMCOR work force if this process is to be successful. However, I must stress that if SAMCOR cannot be made financially viable the Government will be left with only one option and that is to close the abattoir.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

The **Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Emergency Services)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Last night television news bulletins attempted to paint a picture of tension brewing again in Yatala Labour Prison. The central theme of these reports was the allegation that some prisoners had embarked on a hunger strike in protest at protectee prisoners again working in the prison kitchen for the first time since the May 6 hostage incident. Some media outlets broadcast the concerns of an alleged Yatala inmate. One television media outlet attributed statements to me. At no time did I speak to that media outlet yesterday, nor were quotes given to them on my behalf by my staff.

Unfortunately, sections of the Adelaide media have again highlighted the desperate lengths to which they are prepared to go in search of a story—even when they know that it is not true. Last night's media reports occurred after my ministerial office and the Department for Correctional Services conveyed the following to media chasing up the claims:

- yesterday (Monday 8 July 1996) protectee prisoners did return to work in the kitchen at Yatala Labour Prison.
- a rotational roster system has been introduced whereby both protectees and mainstream prisoners will work in the kitchen, but on different days of the week.
- about 19 of the 380 prisoners accommodated at Yatala yesterday refused their evening meal allegedly in protest over protectees working in the prison—19 prisoners out of 380.

The Acting General Manager of Yatala Labour Prison advised me that, to his knowledge, no prisoners had advised prison staff of being on a hunger strike on 8 July 1996. Further, he advises that no prisoners refused their breakfast this morning, and early information is that no prisoners had refused their lunch which was prepared in the prison kitchen.

Following the 6 May hostage situation a comprehensive investigation was undertaken by the department into the circumstances of the incident. Police also undertook their own independent investigation. Included in the Department for Correctional Services inquiry was an investigation into the allegations made by the prisoners on the night that protectees were contaminating prisoners' food. The investigation found the allegations could not be substantiated and were without foundation. Further, departmental staff advised me that it would be almost impossible for prisoners in the kitchen to contaminate the food for a particular group of prisoners because not only are they preparing 350-plus meals twice a day, but they have no idea into which part of the prison the food is going. Additionally, it is a well known fact that prisoner complaints about the food they eat were more prevalent and widespread during times when mainstream prisoners were assigned to the kitchen, the only difference being that the media did not report on these other occurrences.

After the 6 May incident I appealed to individual journalists from all the major media organisations in Adelaide to report on the incident responsibly and ethically. I informed them that to the majority of prisoners in the prison system—not only in Yatala but throughout the State—the only form of news they receive is through the television sets or radios in their cells, and what is reported through those mediums is viewed by prisoners as gospel. Last night's news bulletins were another example of some media organisations not wanting the facts to get in the way of a good story, no matter what the consequences might be. The inaccuracies broadcast last night serve only to unsettle the mainstream prisoner

population, the majority of whom want to serve their time as peacefully as possible.

QUESTION TIME

SAMCOR SALE

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Why did the Treasurer tell Parliament on 19 June that Mr Lilley's involvement with Better Beef 'does not taint' the SAMCOR sale process? Who gave the Treasurer that advice? The Treasurer told the Estimates Committee:

Should Better Beef be the successful tenderer, Mr Lilley would have a part to play in its future operations.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I thought I had explained that, but I will repeat the explanation for the benefit of the member for Playford. All members would understand that when we go through a sales process—and unlike the previous Government, which had a very questionable process in train for most of its contracts—we have a very clear process.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The Deputy Leader should look at some of the contracts that have come across my desk signed by people like the Leader of the Opposition and his former Cabinet colleagues. I can say that they are some of the worst contracts I have seen signed up in my life. They have left this State with huge liabilities. In terms of the sale of assets, we have clearly defined processes, and that has been outlined in this Parliament previously—

Mr Quirke interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: If the member for Playford will hang on for a second, I will reiterate what I have said here and elsewhere. The process is in three stages. Once we have been past the second stage of the process, the manager of the organisation being sold is taken out of the sale process. Indeed, the stage 3 process is a matter of the best bids being submitted and assessed under criteria laid down in the original proposal and the information memorandum. In those circumstances, once we passed stage 2 of the process, Mr Lilley did go to Canada. I understand that he was given a job offer and I understand that he took recreation leave and spent some time with Better Beef in Canada. Personally, I find that very difficult to explain; I find it very difficult to condone; and I think—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: No—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I make it quite clear that I find that totally inappropriate. In terms of it tainting the process, Mr Lilley is not involved in the final stage of the process: he never has been and never will be. During visits people are shown through factories or premises and, whilst there is close involvement by various parties in that process, it stops at a particular point and the negotiations go on between the Asset Management Task Force and the people who wish to bid for the enterprise. That is what happened on this occasion. Certainly, I am not particularly happy; I do not think it was very smart for Mr Lilley to become involved at the level that has now become apparent. In terms of it tainting the process, I do not think it has, but I do not appreciate that it happened.

More importantly, from the Government's point of view, at the end of the stage 3 process, the Asset Management Task Force, Cabinet and I were not happy with the outcome. Not only did we not have a clean sale but it would have cost more

for SAMCOR to stay open than to close. Indeed, we still did not have acceptable guarantees on the performance of SAMCOR. We will change and go through this process again. Hopefully, this time we will get an outcome which will be acceptable to all South Australians and which will assist the meat industry of this State. It will also enhance our export effort, which to date has been abysmal, and that will inject quality into our meat processing. We will all be the better for it. I have said to this House on at least one occasion that, if I am not happy with any part of the process, I will stop it. I have done so on this occasion.

MINERAL EXPLORATION, SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Can the Premier provide the House with an update of the most recently available information concerning mineral and petroleum exploration in South Australia?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Government is now having enormous success in attracting new investment in mineral resource development, including exploration. I highlight to the House that, in 1992, just \$10 million was spent on exploration in South Australia, and the exploration licences covered about 20 per cent of South Australia. In 1995, that had doubled to \$20 million a year being spent on exploration. The exploration licences have increased from 20 to 35 per cent of the State, and the forecast is that expenditure will exceed \$35 million by 1997. Therefore, in one term of Government, we have gone from \$10 million in 1992 under the Labor Government to an anticipated \$35 million under this Government, by the end of our first term. The number of mineral exploration companies operating in South Australia has increased to 105 in 1995, and they include a considerable number of significant companies looking at iron ore, coal, gold and, of course, the potential to expand significantly further mineral prospects such as Olympic Dam.

The potential for the Olympic Dam mine is huge. It is the world's biggest single copper, uranium and gold deposit. At the present mining rate—at about 85 000 tonnes a year—the potential is there to continue to mine on that basis for something like 600 years. Of course, it was an initiative of the former Liberal Government. As we all know, it was opposed by the former Labor Government. In fact, it will be interesting to see whether Labor comes out and supports it this time, because in the past we had people like the Leader of the Opposition deliberately running around fabricating information and putting it out to try to stop Olympic Dam.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: You do that all the time in the Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It was the Leader of the Opposition who led the charge in front of a judge, in a court.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We all know that in 1981-82 the Labor Party voted against the legislation. It took one of its own members to cross the floor (and great courage Norm Foster showed in doing so) to make sure that the legislation went through. One thing that South Australians now know is that you cannot depend on the Labor Party to allow the development of new mines in South Australia, and you certainly cannot depend on the Leader of the Opposition,

because he was the man who led the charge more than anyone else in trying to stop Olympic Dam.

SAMCOR SALE

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Why did the Treasurer fail to act earlier on Mr Lilley's conflict of interest arising from his relationship with Better Beef, given that he was aware of the relationship earlier in the year and that the Asset Management Task Force Chairman had expressed concern about the situation? A submission to the Auditor-General by the Australian company bidding for SAMCOR, referring to a meeting with the Chairman of the Asset Management Task Force, states:

During those discussions Dr Sexton made the point that the Hon. Stephen Baker was aware of Mr Des Lilley's intentions earlier in the year. He also stated that he, Dr Sexton, was most uncomfortable with the whole situation.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I will reiterate what the process involves. The parameters to be placed on the asset to be sold are a matter of Government policy. It is a clear matter of Government policy, and it has to be passed by Cabinet. The proposal to sell and under what conditions, whatever asset we are talking about, has to go through that process, provided that the asset is of a certain value. It goes through stages 1, 2 and 3, and each of those processes has to be ticked off by Cabinet. At the end of taking stage 2 to Cabinet, that is the end of my involvement in any part of the process until stage 3 is complete. I have explained that, and I will explain it again: it is the end of my involvement. I do not believe that Ministers should have a say in the outcome of this process and they should not be involved during the process.

The only time that I met Better Beef—again, I said that I would meet Better Beef only during the stage 3 process—was to assure it that if it wished to come to South Australia there was a future for it at the SAMCOR abattoir. Better Beef was concerned that the Government may wish to have the company in South Australia and then close the abattoir and leave it high and dry. That is the only thing that I discussed with Better Beef. In terms of my responsibility, I do not interfere—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The Deputy Leader is interjecting. I have not interfered, and I do not and will not interfere in that process until we get to the end of stage 3. At the end of stage 3 I interfered and said, 'We do not have a deal.'

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr BASS (Florey): Will the Minister for Health advise the House whether he has had any indication of the response of people in the north-eastern suburbs to the services at Modbury Hospital since it transferred to private management?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am delighted that the member for Florey has asked this question. I know that in particular the members for Newland and for Wright and even the member for Elizabeth will be interested in the response. Modbury Hospital was placed under the microscope late in 1995, which was towards the end of the first year of private management of a public hospital. The South Australian Association of Quality in Health Care carried out a survey entitled, 'The patient's viewpoint,' which was directed at patients of the hospital. It set out to obtain the level of

satisfaction of patients with the services that they had received.

The survey asked 21 questions covering a number of topics, such as cancellation of surgery, the amount of time in hospital, staffing standards, hospital quality and outcomes of hospital care. The Modbury Public Hospital facility rated above average on two-thirds of the questions, at least 5 per cent above average on the other third and, in particular, a great deal of regard was shown for the exemplary efforts of the staff of the hospital. The hospital rated very highly on the willingness of staff to meet patient need, the teamwork of the staff and their ability to make patients feel comfortable. But the absolute crunch is in the following figure: 97.9 per cent of patients indicated that, if family members or friends needed hospital care, those patients would recommend those people to go to the Modbury Public Hospital. It highlights the success of Modbury Hospital under the private management of Healthscope.

As you know, Mr Speaker, there have been a large number of achievements at Modbury. There were increases in ENT outpatient sessions; the number of ENT surgery cases increased from 78 in 1994 to 329 in 1995; the number of cases from the booking list went from 1 976 in 1994 to 2 358 in 1995; an outreach nurse was appointed; an Associate Professor of Medicine was appointed in January 1996; an international facial surgery conference was held in December 1995; fine needle biopsy mammograms and general angiograms, which were previously provided outside the hospital, are now provided internally; and the list goes on. Of course, the taxpayer benefits by \$6 million every year of the contract.

Indeed, I hope that Labor is listening, because one can ask: what have been the results of the Labor Party's scare campaign on Modbury Hospital? Peter Duncan, the former Labor MP, used it as a plank in his campaign and was thrown out. Local MPs now advise me that their constituents believe that Modbury Hospital is a real positive. As I have indicated today, independent assessments demonstrate that the satisfaction level of patients is at 97.9 per cent. We are very keen to hear the public's views, and with views such as that is it any wonder that we will continue to investigate private sector management in the provision of public health services?

SAMCOR SALE

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): When did the Treasurer become aware that the SAMCOR General Manager had accepted a free overseas trip from a bidder for the purchase of SAMCOR, and will the Treasurer assure the House that no other gifts have been accepted by any Government personnel or representatives involved in the sale of Government assets from bidders for those assets? Today, the Treasurer said he now believes that Des Lilley's actions were inappropriate even though the Treasurer revealed to the Estimates Committee he was aware of Mr Lilley's job offer some time ago. Why did the Treasurer not think it was inappropriate then?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is obviously hard of hearing and slow to learn. I will go over it again so that the Leader of the Opposition clearly understands. At the end of the stage 2 process it is left and Ministers stay right out of the whole process, as they should, and as they should have under the former Government. I learnt of Mr Lilley's potential job offer over a month ago.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: Just wait a second. My only comment upon being made aware of that potential job offer was, 'Am I right in assuming that Mr Lilley is not part of this sales process?' The reply was, 'Yes, that is true; he has no part in it and should play no part in it.' In terms of when the bids were to be received, from that point right through to the end of this process, there was to be no involvement by Mr Lilley in that process. I have said that and I will continue to say it. Irrespective of whether Better Beef or any of the other people involved had said to Mr Lilley, 'I like your style and I think you can do a good job; there is a job offer on the end of it,' that is up to them. Mr Lilley had no part in that process beyond the point of taking potential bidders through the factory and explaining the workings of the factory, as we have done with SGIC, PASA and right through all the asset sales. The process is clearly defined to the extent that you leave aside those people who have been part of the operations and you leave it up to the professional assessment process. In terms of who said what to whom, I was informed about it and I assured myself that Mr Lilley had no part to play in the assessment.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: What about the free trip?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: That is a matter which came up more recently. At that time, I asked whether it could possibly have affected the outcome of the sales process. I was also given an assurance that it could not. But, from my point of view, as I said, I believe it is totally inappropriate.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I said I believed that it was totally inappropriate.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Who gave you the assurance?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I was given the assurance in terms of the timing of the trip and—

Mr Foley: By whom?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: By the Chairman of the Asset Management Task Force.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader will not get the call if he makes another interjection.

Mr Clarke: It wasn't me.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hart will be in the same category.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: From my point of view, and I will say it again: I do not involve myself in that sales process until the end of the process.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader knows he cannot have a running commentary across the House. The member for Hanson.

CRIME STOPPERS

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): Can the Minister for Police provide the House with details of his response to the new television program *Crime Stoppers*, which was launched on Channel 9 last night? I understand that the *Crime Stoppers* concept was developed in 1976 in New Mexico and has since been extended around the world as an important program in gathering information to solve crime.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: *Crime Stoppers* was launched last night, and it is great to record that there was a significant response from the public to that show. Indeed, there has been a call by the Commissioner and others involved for those who could not get on to the telephone lines last night to contact the

police today. There is a dedicated number for that purpose. It is important to understand that *Crime Stoppers* does not only revolve around a television show but is the collection and collation of information from the public on all nature of crimes and offences amalgamated into one area. So, *Crime Stoppers* is the bringing together of information from various parts of the Police Force, the details then being sifted in order to provide the most useable information for catching criminals and preventing crime.

The Channel 9 launch last night went exceptionally well. I am sure that those people who had an opportunity to watch the show would have been impressed by the quality of the production and the professionalism shown by Channel 9. As I said, we had a very significant response to the various unsolved crimes: for the Suzanne Poll murder 16 calls were listed; the Yasmina Sinodinos murder, four calls; the Lee and Burns murders, two calls; the Lower Light skeleton, two calls; the missing person, Sheppard, three calls; and on general information there were five calls. The important thing to note is that not only were there calls concerning the scenarios shown on television for people to see if they could recall certain circumstances about those incidents but also it jogged the memory of people and reminded them to be active in their responsibility and involvement in preventing crime.

One of the very positive aspects to come out of that show was that other pieces of information were elicited which had nothing to do with those presentations but had more to do with the wider issue of crime prevention. I congratulate the police and Channel 9 on their initiative. The program has worked well and programs such as *Crime Stoppers* will be a feature of policing in this State whereby we will be able to call on the resources of the wider community. Congratulations to everyone involved.

SAMCOR SALE

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Treasurer. In view of his statements earlier in Question Time that he found the actions of Mr Lilley difficult to explain and that he was unhappy with those actions, what is the Treasurer's view as to the integrity of Better Beef Limited in offering Mr Lilley inducements such as a position with the company and a free trip to Canada whilst it was one of the bidders for SAMCOR?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I will say it one more time: Mr Lilley's involvement stopped at a certain point. His involvement in the sales process stopped prior to bids being received. Will members opposite please understand something which appears to be very simple?

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not appropriate for the Leader to ask questions by way of interjection.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I will say it again: at the end of stage 2, it was no longer appropriate for Mr Lilley to be involved in the receipt or assessment of bids. Mr Lilley was not involved in the receipt or assessment of bids, and there was a clear distinction in that process.

ENTERPRISE BARGAINING

Mr WADE (Elder): Is the Minister for Industrial Affairs aware of a recently produced South Australian Employers' Chamber survey of South Australian business expectations and, if so, what do the results of that survey say about the

views of the business community on future industrial relations reform in South Australia?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: In addition to what the Minister for Health has indicated today, we have another good news story in terms of the support of South Australian businesses for this Government and the Federal Government. Shortly after the election, the Employers' Chamber conducted a major survey of businesses in South Australia to ascertain their ideas and views on industrial relations. It is interesting to note that 85 per cent of businesses believed there would be an excellent opportunity under enterprise bargaining in relation to non-unionised workplaces; 74 per cent said that they had previously not entered into enterprise bargaining but that, in the light of the new legislation proposed both federally and in this State, they would consider that option; 43 per cent said that they would now establish the enterprise agreement process; 74 per cent said that, whilst they had not previously considered it, they would now consider that option; 65 per cent thought that one of the benefits would be increased productivity; and 72 per cent believed there would be a significant increase in flexibility.

These statistics fly totally in the face of the comments of the Deputy Leader, who argues that workplaces in South Australia, and workers in particular, are not interested in enterprise bargaining and are frightened of the Federal and State laws. Clearly, non-unionised work forces and workplaces want to get on with better, more flexible and more productivity-based enterprise agreement processes. These statistics also reflect clearly the strong support for South Australian enterprise agreements, there now being 204 agreements in this State covering 33 000 employees. That is nearly four times the number achieved by the previous Government under its very protective system, and it augurs well for the future of enterprise agreements in this State.

DOCTORS, MOUNT GAMBIER

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Have the general practitioner obstetricians in Mount Gambier, who have been involved in the dispute with the Government, signed new indemnity insurance support agreements?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: This is another pleasing matter in that the dilemma whereby doctors in the South-East were the only ones who were not prepared to provide obstetric services, despite the recommendations of the Australian Medical Association, the Rural Doctors' Medical Association and the remaining 95 per cent of doctors in the country, has now been resolved, as I am sure the House realises. That has occurred because those doctors have agreed to return to the provision of obstetric services.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: In direct response to the question, the Deputy Leader, who interjects, and the member for Elizabeth might be interested to know that those same doctors, many of whom provided services until 30 June under the present agreement, had not signed an agreement for last year. The simple fact is that a number of them now say that they want to sign this agreement.

Ms Stevens: Have they signed it?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I will come to that. They want to backdate last year's signing basically so that they can get the subsidy that we also offered for last year, and we are happy to discuss that matter with them. I have in my possession a signed copy of a media release dated 28 June

1996 from the President of the South-East Medical Association, which states:

We will continue to provide obstetric services to the best of our ability.

I have in my hand 10 signed agreements, some of which are for option 2 and some for option 3. I will inform the member for Elizabeth when the remainder do their paperwork.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): Will the Minister for Infrastructure explain the relationship between the Salisbury council and the MFP, their common objectives, and what achievements have occurred so far between these two bodies? Certain media reports last week suggested that there is a campaign to discredit the MFP and the support that it has obtained from the Salisbury council.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am happy to respond to the honourable member's question regarding the Salisbury council and its consistent support of the MFP. In an objective way, the Salisbury council has committed \$4.73 million to infrastructure costs for urban development on the MFP site. Recently, a concerted attempt was made through a letter writing campaign in the Salisbury council area to discredit the council on the basis of its investment in the MFP alleging that this will take money away from the provision of schools, hospitals and jobs in that region. That is simply not true. Salisbury council has clearly identified that this project has the capacity to provide, after some seven years, a revenue stream to the council that will more than compensate for the \$4.73 million in seed funding to assist in the establishment of the proposed urban development. The Salisbury council is clearly well able to argue a case to its ratepayers.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I have no doubt that it will because, regarding the proposed urban development on site, the attraction of further commercial, industrial and hi-tech industries, coupled with jobs that will be created within the region through associated housing development, will generate for Salisbury council something that would not occur if it were not for the MFP catalyst.

The urban development proposal has yet to be considered by the MFP Board and subsequently Cabinet. That is likely to happen within the next month or six weeks, and it will be necessary for that project to be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee. In order to succeed, the urban development proposal will need to remain consistent with the MFP's charter of providing leading edge technological and environmental innovation. It is absolutely critical that this be provided in the proposal for urban development, because without that the project will not proceed. Support for the project, once it was explained in detail, has come from the Housing Industry Association which, following a presentation by the consortium, was impressed by what was proposed for that urban development. A number of other housing developers in Adelaide have since written to the Government to endorse the proposal contradicting what has been put forward by a small group of developers in South Australia.

I urge anyone who has not visited Technology Park and driven across to the Gillman area to do so. Letters from people who have participated in the educational tours through the Gillman site indicate that they have come away impressed with what MFP has achieved in terms of environmental remediation of that area and the model it will be in leading edge urban development built on that environmental

remediation. It will be one other demonstration of how Adelaide can be a smart city of the future.

DOCTORS, MOUNT GAMBIER

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Will the Premier now apologise for twice telling the House that South-East doctors had signed an indemnity insurance agreement with the Minister for Health? Last Thursday (4 July) the Premier said:

I also indicate something the member for Elizabeth did not make clear: the doctors have agreed to participate in the indemnity insurance support scheme put in place by the Minister for Health and they signed up last week.

The Premier then repeated this statement and said, 'They have signed up and agreed to participate.' Today's edition of the *Border Watch* quotes Dr Gale, on behalf of the doctors, as saying that none of the doctors had either received or signed such an agreement. The newspaper quoted Dr Gale as follows:

I think many of Mr Brown's comments have been misleading.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am delighted that the honourable member has put her foot right in it because she obviously did not bother to listen to what the Minister for Health just informed the House. As the honourable member said, I said that some of the South-East doctors—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—had signed up, and I hold in front of me 10 forms signed by South-East doctors.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Therefore, the front page of the South-East's *Border Watch* is entirely inaccurate. I assure the honourable member that, as she has quoted me, I will make sure that lawyers look at her quotes as well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I gave two assurances to the House: first, that South-East doctors had signed up, and I have proof because I have their signatures here. They signed in about the last week of June—which happens to be last week, when I last spoke about this in the House. Secondly, I have a press release from Dr David Senior, President of the South-East Medical Association, informing—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—the public that the doctors of the South-East Medical Association have become aware that it is widely thought they will stop obstetric services.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth has had a fair go.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We have here the President of the South-East Medical Association stating in a press release on 28 June that he wishes to assure the South-East public that obstetric services will not be withdrawn. In my answer to this House last week, I indicated three things: first, that the forms had been signed, and I was able to say that because I physically sighted 10 such forms; secondly, there is therefore ongoing obstetric help in Mount Gambier and surrounding districts, and that was confirmed by the President of the South-East Medical Association; and, thirdly, Dr Gale is again wrong in that the Minister for Health did visit Mount Gambier in April, he did meet with the board of the Mount Gambier Hospital, and he did meet with two of the doctors.

It would appear that Dr Gale, for some reason known only to himself, wishes to try to blackmail this Government using the obstetric services of Mount Gambier and the pregnant women of Mount Gambier who want to ensure that their babies can be delivered locally.

TOURISM, MARKETING SCHEMES

Mrs HALL (Coles): Will the Minister for Tourism inform the House of the opportunities and specific benefits that exist for the South Australian Tourism Commission participating in cooperative marketing schemes with the Federal tourism marketing body, the Australian Tourism Commission?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Partnership Australia is one of the most exciting tourism programs available not only to our commission but to all other commissions in other States. First, Partnership Australia is conducted on a one-for-one funding basis between the Commonwealth's Australian Tourism Commission and the State's Tourism Commission; secondly, the program is topped up by the private sector to the extent that, for every dollar spent on South Australian tourism nationally or internationally, we finish up with four times the number of dollars in advertising, promoting and marketing. Part of the program is to ensure that we brand Australia as part of the whole program.

It is very important for a small State, such as South Australia—the previous Government not having spent a great deal of money in its 10 years in office—to market its programs and its image, 'Come to Your Senses, Come to South Australia', the 'Sensational Adelaide' branding, and any other brandings, such as the Wine Capital of Australia, using this four-to-one funding through the Australian Tourism Commission's program, Partnership Australia.

It is one of the most progressive campaigns established by the Federal Government, and it is one in which we struggle each year to invest maximum dollars. As I said, for every \$1 million we spend nationally and internationally through the Partnership Australia program, we end up with \$4 million with which to promote the wine regions, all our excellent bed and breakfast facilities, the magnificent tourism products of Fleurieu Peninsula, the West Coast and the Coonawarra, which are quite fantastic regions in our State.

ADELAIDE 21 PROJECT

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier support a central recommendation of the Adelaide 21 report that a private company be established this year to take over control of the city council's planning and development powers, and to whom will the proposed company be accountable?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I gave an indication on Friday, when launching the Adelaide 21 Project, that the Government agreed that there should be a change in the City Council of Adelaide's governance of the city of Adelaide. The specific recommendations are yet to be presented to Cabinet. I indicated that we support a change in governance; and that we would introduce legislation to bring that change into effect by October, or the end of this year. The city of Adelaide has broad interests in representing the whole of South Australia: it has the interests of both the State and Federal Governments, and it has the interests of the City Council of Adelaide, as well as the interests of local residents and business people. But equally it has a much broader

interest because people will judge the whole of South Australia by their first impressions of the city. Therefore, it is very important that the people making decisions in terms of the governance of the city of Adelaide—that is, the city square—clearly reflect the broader interests of the State to ensure that the development that should occur in the city of Adelaide does occur.

Interestingly, yesterday I received many telephone calls very strongly supporting my call for a change in the governance of the city of Adelaide. About 25 telephone calls were in favour with one call against, and the one telephone call against came from the Mitcham council—not surprisingly. The important issue is that we are looking at the need for a structural change in the representation of the governance of the city of Adelaide. I stress the point that there are much wider interests than those just directly involved in the city of Adelaide at present—there are also the broader interests of the entire State. Equally the State Government is particularly concerned at the lack of progress in a number of key areas, and I highlight just one where the Government has been asking for action to be taken over the past 18 months, and that is the clean-up of Lake Torrens, where you have considerable sediment in Lake Torrens itself to the point where one could walk up to a half the way across it.

I know that the former Lord Mayor, Steve Condous, made sure that the lake was drained during winter, that the rubbish and debris was cleaned up, the plug put back in and the lake filled again in time for summer. The State Government has been trying to get the city council to do likewise for about 18 months. It is a disgrace at present. Initially, the council agreed to fund one-third of that, but now it has withdrawn that and said that it will agree to fund only 20 per cent, and that is only on condition that it can take possession of the silt and sell it. I highlight that the clean-up of Torrens Lake is the responsibility of the council. There are numerous other developments as well which have been put forward in the City of Adelaide and which have been blocked. Therefore, the State Government wants to make sure that the broader interests of the State are represented fairly in the governance of the city of Adelaide. The House can expect legislation to be introduced by the end of the year.

DEATHS IN CUSTODY

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): Will the Minister for Correctional Services provide the House with a response to claims by the Public Service Association that the recent tragic death of an inmate at Yatala Labour Prison may have been prevented if staff had been on duty?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before answering the question, can the Minister assure the House that there is no court action in relation to the matter?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: In relation to the Public Service Association, there is no court action. In relation to the death in custody, there is the Coroner's investigation.

The SPEAKER: The Minister will confine his remarks in a very narrow fashion.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I appreciate that, Mr Speaker, and I will ensure that I do so. I thank the honourable member for her question because I am sure that she, as well as me and other members, would have been concerned to hear the Public Service Association make such a statement. I was particularly disgusted to hear the statements made by the PSA on that occasion. Without doubt, the union stooped to one of

its lowest levels ever on 27 June 1996. Without so much as a single thought for the family of the victim—indeed, before the family of the victim could be advised of the incident—the PSA was on the airwaves in a disgusting attempt to politicise this tragedy. In normal circumstances I would not bother repeating the claims of a union such as this in this place. However, in this case it is absolutely necessary to highlight the behaviour of the union, and I suspect that some members opposite will be equally disgusted when they hear what the union did following this incident.

Shortly after the inmate's death, the PSA hit the airwaves and put out a press release stating, in part:

It has been reported that the prisoner who died last night had told civilian staff earlier in the day of his intention to commit suicide.

The release goes on:

Trained staff would have followed normal procedure, and taken the prisoner to a safe cell and kept him under observation. Had this procedure been followed, the suicide may have been prevented.

On channel 7 later that night, the PSA Secretary, Jan McMahon, was quoted as follows:

Had our members been there, there are strict procedures; the person is put in an observation unit where they can't hurt themselves, and they are observed regularly. That didn't happen.

So desperate was the union leader, so deplorable was her motive and so keen was she to politicise the tragedy that she did not even bother to check her facts. Her statement was wrong: usual prison staff were already back on duty. Several hours later the PSA media machine, on realising its mistake, again went into action, this time putting out another media release containing some correct information. In an embarrassing about face the union put out a statement which read, in part:

Investigations throughout the afternoon indicate that a custodial officer last night told prison management that the prisoner had said he was suicidal.

Contrary to the ramblings of the union earlier in the day and contrary to the reporting of some media outlets earlier in the day, the accommodation unit in which the inmate committed suicide was being manned by usual full-time custodial officers. Only one television news organisation, ABC News, accurately reported on the day's events with a reporter stating:

The union's been forced to withdraw some of its accusations over the death.

Later in the report the ABC journalist stated, again correctly:

Late this afternoon the union admitted it had made a mistake.

Sadly, had the PSA checked its facts with just one of its own members on the site, perhaps it would not have been so swift to direct blame for a tragedy on innocent staff. The union has the telephone numbers of my management in Correctional Services, my own number and that of my senior staff. Just one telephone call would have avoided this situation.

Any death in custody is a tragedy. It is a tragedy that should not have occurred. Of course, this death of a 36-year-old remandee is no different. As is normal procedure, a full departmental inquiry is being conducted, and its findings will be passed on to the Coroner, who will conduct an inquiry into the circumstances of the death. However, I wish to put on the record my condemnation of the PSA for the tactics it used, tactics which rate as the most appalling I have witnessed by any union leader. The time has come for the PSA Executive to take a hard look at itself and question whether the sinister tactics it has been so willing to employ really serve the best interests of the staff it is supposed to serve.

ADELAIDE CITY COUNCIL

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):

Does the Premier believe that the Lord Mayor is telling the truth when he says that the city council has received 758 development applications and rejected only 11 in the past year? Is the Lord Mayor telling the truth when he says that the Premier has never raised these concerns about the council's performance in his regular meetings with Mr Ninio?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I do not know exactly how many applications have been approved or rejected. I can indicate to the House that, if members pick up the *City Messenger* today, they will see that the central market project, although it has not yet reached application form, looks as if it will be well and truly shoved aside. I received a letter today from a city councillor who has come out very strongly supporting what I have said.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The letter reads:

Premier, you may have also read of my efforts to encourage structural reform of the council. The same members who could not wait to halt the needed progress of the Central Market, also couldn't wait to halt progress down any path which might lead to meaningful reform. My first attempt to promote investigation of the opportunities arising from structural reform was supported by only one other councillor. My second attempt in May this year was supported by only three other members.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have also received support from at least one other councillor—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the Leader of the Opposition to order for the last time.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have also received strong support from at least one other member of council. In terms of my discussions with the Lord Mayor, I have—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —discussed a number of these problems with him.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Lord Mayor has talked about the fact that a number of developments have been held up. We have talked about the development opposite the Royal Adelaide Hospital on North Terrace that has been held up. The Lord Mayor was present when I got all the developers in and had to crunch them in respect of the East End of Rundle Street. The Messenger reported that fact. The developers came in afterwards and said how much they appreciated the fact that I got in and resolved something that the council could not resolve.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Custance should not aid and abet the front bench and thus contravene Standing Orders.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have also—

The SPEAKER: I call the Leader of the Opposition to order for the last time.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —had discussions with the Lord Mayor about the long delay in upgrading Rundle Mall. Even though the State Government had given financial support for that last year, we have found out that the work has

only just started. I expressed my enormous frustration over the time it has taken to install the security cameras in Rundle Mall and Hindley Street.

At various meetings, I have systematically gone through my frustrations with the Adelaide City Council. There have been other issues as well. Without revealing the nature of the discussions any further, because I am not prepared to reveal other considerable aspects of the discussions, I highlight the fact that my frustrations with the lack of action by the city council have been known for a long time indeed, and the Lord Mayor has known that.

BRIGHTON-GLENELG COMMUNITY CENTRE

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Minister for Family and Community Services provide me with information on the current negotiations over the future of the Brighton and Glenelg Community Centre? Last year, the cities of Brighton and Glenelg were given two options for the continuation of the centre, after the existing centre at the Seaforth property at Somerton Park was declared surplus. One option was a portion of the current site, together with \$300 000 towards construction and new facilities; the second option was a substantial portion of the Mawson High School site, also with \$300 000 to develop the site to the needs of the community.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am pleased to be able to respond briefly to the member for Morphett. This matter has been going on for a long time, and I am pleased that we are able to address this issue. From the outset, the Government made a commitment to the Brighton-Glenelg community that a centre would continue, despite declaring surplus the current Seaforth property at Somerton Park. The Department for Family and Community Services has continued to incur significant expense for services such as gas, water, sewerage, electricity and general maintenance since the department made up its mind to sell the property more than a year ago.

The member for Morphett is certainly right: the two options were presented to the Brighton and Glenelg councils for the continuation of the centre. The option of a portion of the existing site was rejected. It has taken some time to sort through that issue. However, both councils have now given their support to the Mawson site. Resolution was delayed because Brighton feared that the acceptance of the Mawson site would use up its open space entitlements by accommodating buildings rather than green open space.

I am pleased to inform the House, particularly the member for Morphett, that the issue, subject to receiving formal advice, has now been resolved. A meeting was held last Friday between the council, the community centre and Treasury officials, where the council was told that it has sufficient open space credit to satisfy both the public needs for open space and the community centre. With this in mind, negotiations can now be finalised, and I hope that we will see the centre relocated by May next year. I hope that is the case because, as I said, it is an issue that has gone on for a long time and is very much in need of resolution.

BRIGHTON REST HOME

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Why were 20 elderly and intellectually disabled people locked out of their Brighton private rest home last week; why were their rooms ransacked; has the Minister called for an urgent explanation from the Brighton

council, as licensing authority; and is he satisfied that the requirements of the Supported Residential Facilities Act were met? The Act requires the Minister to promote the objects of the Act, which are to recognise and protect the rights of persons who reside in supported accommodation. The Act requires these people to be treated with dignity and respect, and to be afforded reasonable degrees of privacy. Where a licensee fails to comply with the provisions of the Act dealing with residents' rights, penalties may range up to a year in gaol or a fine of up to \$4 000.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: This is an important matter, and I have discussed it with my colleague, the Minister for the Ageing. The bottom line is that recently there was a dispute between the owner of the premises and the licensed operator, who has been identified in the media as Ms Sylvia Murray-Oates. That has resulted in some further irregularity in the management of the facility. That, indeed, prompted the council not to renew the operator's licence in the expectation that this would lead to a change in operator. The owner and the Brighton council made arrangements for the care of the 20 or so current residents. However, I am informed that Ms Murray-Oates proceeded to make other arrangements for the care of the residents which have compromised their dignity, choice and rights.

Unfortunately, as part of this, Ms Murray-Oates contacted the relatives of some residents and advised them to collect their relatives immediately and some other residents were taken to another supported residential facility. At that stage there was no notification to Brighton council or to the Supported Residential Facilities Unit. Despite that, some residents—appalling—were abandoned. Ms Murray-Oates informed the responsible disability agency on the afternoon of 4 July that it would have to find alternative accommodation for its clients.

Ms Murray-Oates also arranged for all furnishings and fittings in the facility to be removed during the afternoon of 4 July 1996. This was done without regard for the residents' possessions, which were strewn over the floors of the facility, and without regard for the emotional trauma experienced by residents returning from day activities to find their home in turmoil. Brighton council was able to assist the disability agency to find alternative accommodation for the abandoned residents, pending the licensing of a new manager and the refurbishment of the premises. The council has also attempted to trace the whereabouts of the other residents, moved by Ms Murray-Oates, but there is some lack of cooperation on that front. I find the actions of Ms Murray-Oates totally condemnable.

SOUTH-EAST SALINITY AND FLOOD MANAGEMENT SCHEME

Mr D.S. BAKER (MacKillop): Will the Minister for Primary Industries explain to the House the latest developments in the Upper South-East salinity and dry land flood management scheme, which he launched on Friday?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I would like to start by thanking the member for MacKillop for his work in developing and continuing to play such a major role in what will be a great project for the Upper South-East. Last week, we concluded negotiations with the Federal Government as to the guarantee of funding from the Commonwealth for the Upper South-East dry land salinity and flood management scheme. As members would know, the State Government had already guaranteed to match the Commonwealth's funding and, with the

community contribution, it brings the total cost to \$24 million.

As members also know, salinity is a major destructive force in the South-East, and more than \$9 million in farm gate value is lost through reduced stock carrying capacity and land degradation. The belief is that this project will halt that degradation within six to eight years and, therefore, increase land values and hence be an investment in our future. The area covered by the project is 618 000 hectares of which 37 per cent is affected by salinity. We are implementing the scheme that was developed during an extensive EIS process. It takes in environmental and historical issues and will be professional and cost effective.

The project is now ready to start. We have six years' funding of \$9 million from the State Government, which represents 40 per cent of the total. The Commonwealth will put in 40 per cent and the community 20 per cent. This is an investment for future generations. It gave me great pleasure on Friday to launch the scheme officially at Keilira near Kingston in the South-East. Again, I congratulate the member for MacKillop on his enthusiasm for the project and his assistance in working through the local issues.

O'HALLORAN HILL OPEN SPACE

Ms HURLEY (Napier): What steps is the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations taking to ensure that CSIRO land at O'Halloran Hill is maintained as open space for residents of the southern suburbs?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: The matter raised by the honourable member relates to the Federal Government rather than the State Government. However, I will take that question on notice and have an answer prepared for her.

HOUSING TRUST EASY-PAY SERVICE

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): My question—
Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

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

Mr CONDOUS: Will the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations inform the House whether the easy pay service for Housing Trust tenants, introduced in March, has been successful, and has the service reduced the level of trust debt?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I am delighted to advise the House that the easy pay service for Housing Trust tenants, which was introduced in March this year, has proved to be very successful. As members will be aware from my announcement at the time, the service allows trust tenants and others who owe a debt to the trust—for example, it could be a private rental bond or a debt from a previous tenancy—to make direct payments from their Department for Social Security entitlements to the trust. Many tenants have found this to be of valuable help to them in the way in which they spend their income. They have stated that quite often in the past, when they have been looking to pay off some of these debts, the money has gone. In this instance, they are saying that it is a form of control, the money is paid directly to the trust and they are able to manage their finances so much better.

As well as making rent payments easier, the service enables people to make regular payments to repay outstanding trust debts and current debts or to build up credit in their

current account to offset charges, such as maintenance or water usage. The service is free and voluntary and is available to recipients of all forms of regular income from Social Security.

Since the service became operational on 1 May this year, 16 400 tenants, which is not an insignificant number, have joined the easy pay scheme, and others are joining at the rate of 500 a fortnight. I think that shows only too clearly the way in which trust tenants appreciate the scheme that we have offered. Overdue tenant debt has already been reduced by 1.5 per cent in just two months to 1 July. We believe and are confident that the scheme, as well as being an asset to the tenants, will save the trust \$800 000 over the next three years.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Members will be aware of the substantial cuts that most labour market programs in South Australia have had to suffer of late because of Federal Government cuts. I want to concentrate on one of those programs—the Skillshare program—which, by the Liberal Government's own reckoning, is the most efficient of those labour market programs.

Skillshare delivers 25 per cent of the country's labour market programs for only 10 per cent of the total funding. Skillshare is the program that for many unemployed people is the first and most effective step from the dole queue to employment. In country areas the effect of the cuts is significant. Cuts affect them at the best of times. They have trouble attracting qualified staff to the country and cannot afford to lose them.

In respect of Northern Skillshare at Port Pirie, an area which recorded 12.4 per cent in last September's unemployment figures, three full-time staff, three part-time staff and 15 casual staff are being cut. Since July, they have assisted more than 224 clients undertaking courses. They related to me the case of a 36-year-old man who was unemployed for 18 years and who was able to obtain a job at the local high school with the help of Skillshare.

The Whyalla Employment Training Service has been forced to close. Even in the South-East, the Mount Gambier Skillshare points to the fact that it has been over-achieving in terms of every performance measure asked of it by the Government, yet the Government has cut the most cost effective labour market program and is hurting people who are least able to advocate for themselves.

In the western area of Adelaide, The Parks Enfield Skillshare, which trained 600 long-term unemployed people last year, will now be able to train only 200 long-term unemployed people. Another 50 positions will go from the Gilles Plains Skillshare. Nine of the 20 staff at The Parks Skillshare have now gone. They say that the cuts will mean a 50 per cent reduction in services. Their migrant literacy program is being slashed as well as their motor maintenance course.

The Grange Road Skillshare will now be able to service only 30 of their usual 88 clients per month. They used to employ 15 people: at least five of those are to go. Facing the

axe are the aged care and community services programs, the industrial sewing program and the retail sales program.

At Port Adelaide, 10 staff at the Port Employment Project, which is part of the Port Adelaide Central Mission, will lose their jobs. They will also sustain a 50 per cent reduction in services. Last year they trained more than 250 people, but they are saying that they will now have to cut the most expensive courses to run, which are the child care and aged care programs. Ironically, these are the programs with the highest employment rate success.

The Special Training Employment Program (STEP) in 1994 trained 220 people. It has had a 42 per cent success rate placing people in education, training and employment. It is having to sustain a cut of \$100 000 to its budget. It has been operating for 13 years. It started by helping outpatients at the Hillcrest Psychiatric Hospital and it is now at risk of closure. That is before I get to the programs in the high youth unemployment areas in the north and the south.

In the north, 1 000 people are to be cut from programs. The levels of service cannot be sustained. Those Skillshares have a placement success rate of 40 to 50 per cent. In the south there are cuts to the literacy program and several specialist courses. At Y-Train two workers have been retrenched. The Southern Fleurieu Skills Training Program has had \$3 000 per week cut from its budget. It will scrap the horticultural and industrial commercial cleaning programs. In all, a number of cuts right around the State will be felt by unemployed people who have been put on the scrap heap by the Liberal Government.

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): In Question Time this afternoon I asked the Minister for Family and Community Services a question about the future of the Brighton-Glenelg Community Centre at Somerton Park. It is probably one of the largest community centres in the metropolitan area and was built on the old Seaford Home site. In a busy week more than 1 000 people would use the centre, which conducts a range of activities including age recreational activities, child-care facilities, dancing classes and cooking; carpentry is no longer carried out there but was previously a very active part of the centre; and a Montessori school is also located there. Overall, the centre provides a very strong focal point for community involvement in the Glenelg and Brighton areas. Indeed, I imagine that the centre is also utilised by people from the City of Marion.

There has been a considerable amount of uncertainty over the future of the centre, a matter which goes well back to the life of the previous Government. I have been on the record for many years now as saying that the centre should remain on the Tarlton Street site. The Government has been examining proposals for the future of the site, and this has included selling the Tarlton Street site. Negotiation with respect to this is nothing new, because the previous Government also examined the option of selling the Tarlton Street site. There has always been a question mark hanging over the future of the centre. When a centre of this size has a question mark hanging over its future, it has an undesirable effect on the morale of people associated with the centre and on its ability to progress forward.

As a result, the administrators, the board and the users do not know what the future holds. As I explained in my question, last year the cities of Brighton and Glenelg were given two options for the continuation of the centre after the

existing centre at the Seaforth property at Somerton Park was declared surplus. One option was to set aside a section of the current site together with \$300 000 towards construction of new facilities, while the second option was to use a substantial part of the Mawson High School site, with \$300 000 to develop the site to cater to the needs of the community. The two councils and the board of the centre have had numerous discussions. From their final decision it was determined that the centre would move to the Mawson High School site, a decision about which I am not too excited, because I would have preferred that the property be developed by the councils at Tarlton Street. Although it is a backward step to move the centre to the Mawson High School site, I am delighted that the issue has been resolved.

The last hiccup involved the question of open space. About a month ago, considerable disquiet existed among the board, the centre and the users when it was discovered that the centre was to move to the Mawson High School site. Brighton council made an issue of not wanting to give up open space. I congratulate the Minister and his staff on resolving the issue and bringing it to a head. At least we now know that the centre will be located at Mawson High School, because that was clearly announced by the Minister for Family and Community Services in answer to my question.

Now that there is certainty about this matter, I hope that the Brighton and Glenelg councils and the board can start planning for the future. As I understand, it is intended that negotiations will be finalised and that the centre will relocate by May 1997. It is an excellent centre, which provides an enormous amount of pleasure for those who use it, and I hope that residents who use the facility at Somerton Park will travel to Mawson High School to take advantage of what will be a much larger centre. Only time will tell as to whether transport and other logistic encumbrances result in a drop-off in attendance. At least the Government has provided a centre, and I congratulate the Minister for that.

Mr BUCKBY (Light): Last year, I raised the issue of building licences in respect of a home builder within the Gawler area who had defaulted on a number of contracts. I raise this issue again not in relation to country site constructions but with respect to an experience that one of my constituents has encountered in the last few weeks with a person in the Gawler area whose organisation is advertising itself as pre-home buying inspections and advice consultants. My constituents engaged this particular person and received a written report on the condition of the home that they intended to purchase. As a result of the report, my constituents went ahead and purchased the home. After the cooling-off period they moved their furniture into the house only to discover that the weight of one cupboard resulted in the floor's sagging. Within a few days they realised that something was seriously wrong with the house.

They called in another person to advise them on the condition of the house and were told that the house had a very substantial and serious white ant problem, something that was not highlighted by the pre-inspection consultant's report at all: nothing whatsoever was said in his report. Subsequently, they found that the stumps, flooring and even the timber in the walls of the house were being invaded by white ants, which had been there for a considerable length of time. The owner has presented photographs of the house to me.

The ability of someone who holds a builder's licence and who purports to be a building inspector is seriously questioned when that person fails to note an infestation of white

ants. My constituents looked at what they might be able to do and contacted the Housing Industry Association. Unfortunately, they were told that the HIA could do nothing for them and that it was up to them to sue the consultant. They approached the consultant, who told them that he had no insurance whatsoever and that he would not be able to pay anything in the way of compensation. The house was not an expensive one: it cost \$58 000, but that is a lot of money for people who had saved a small amount of money and who, in this case, were able to put a deposit on their home rather than renting one.

The bill they now face to replace flooring and areas of timber in the walls, following the discovery of white ants, amounts to \$15 000. Given that there was no other way to solve the problem, they subsequently approached their bank to obtain finance. I am advised that they have now been refused finance by the bank. Due to the ineptness of a building consultant, they are left with a home which is riddled with white ants. They have no recourse upon that person who gave them the report and neither can they obtain finance to solve their problem. So, they are in somewhat of a dilemma. Last year, when I raised the issue of builders' licences and those people who are able to gain them, I seriously suggested that the legislation which enables people to gain builders' licences should be reviewed. This again highlights the fact that those people who have builders' licences and who purport to be experts in a building's condition and construction are not always so.

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): I support the work done at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital at Woodville and applaud the initiatives of both the Minister for Health and the Brown Government. Although not geographically situated in the electorate of Hanson, the hospital nevertheless is the catchment area for many constituents in my electorate and most electorates on the western side of Adelaide. Indeed, I had cause to go there some years ago and very much appreciate what they did for me. The hospital plays a very strategic role.

Much has been said about the QEH in recent months, and over the past couple of years there have been rumours of poor quality, privatisation, and so on. The truth of the matter is that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has always been and still is a world quality teaching hospital and a world-class institution which, under the present Brown Government and with the expertise of the South Australian Health Commission and its initiatives, continues to improve.

In a document released by the Minister for Health a number of very significant facts need to be highlighted. First, in the report of the South Australian Commission of Audit in April 1994 the Government was asked to consider the downgrading of the QEH from a major teaching hospital to a general community hospital of approximately 250 beds. However, the Brown Government, in its wisdom, has decided to retain the teaching referral status of the hospital and strengthen health services in the western area in a number of ways.

One such change is the creation of the North Western Adelaide Health Service with a single management and board structure to manage both the QEH and the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Another is the QEH development project which, commenced in January 1996, seeks the involvement and interest of the private sector in the redevelopment and management of QEH. United in that redevelopment, the South Australian Health Commission continues to make available funds to maintain and develop the current infra-

structure so that the hospital continues to operate as a major teaching hospital during the course of the development project.

The Brown Liberal Government and the local board have guaranteed a bright future for the QEH teaching hospital through a number of initiatives, and I believe that these, too, can be highlighted this afternoon. First, there is the development of a new psychiatric facility on the site at a cost of \$5.577 million; a new cardiac catheter laboratory is being constructed with anticipated construction commencing early this month at a cost of \$1.55 million; a new maintenance dialysis area and home dialysis clinic (budgeted at \$350 000) is being constructed and will be completed by the end of August 1996; approximately \$2 million will be expended on a critical care-allied health redevelopment; approximately \$1.5 million has been budgeted for the upgrade of clinical wards as an interim measure until the major redevelopment of QEH; and approximately \$150 000 will be spent on the relocation of ultrasound to within the radiology department and the upgrade of the radiology library and waiting area.

I believe these are tremendous initiatives, about which I could say much more, but I close by highlighting the fact that over \$550 000 has been provided for equipment upgrade or replacement. Special project funding from 1994 to 1997 included \$251 000 for pharmacy networks, \$213 000 for chronic care and \$71 000 for community management of chronic airways disease.

The QEH development project is predicated on the maintenance of the hospital as a major teaching and referral facility, and the interim capital investment during the period of the development project is to ensure that QEH is able to continue to deliver world quality health services. I applaud both the Minister and the Brown Government on their initiative.

Mr BASS (Florey): One of the businesses in my electorate brought an invitation to me the other day entitled the 'Business Labor Liaison Service', and I thought this was very interesting. I had a look at it and found that it is the Leader of the Opposition trying to up his standing in the community.

Mr Atkinson: And he has done that very well, hasn't he?

Mr BASS: Yes, he certainly has. He has decided to have a business Labor liaison meeting at the Universal wine bar in Adelaide. If you want to discuss the Business Labor Liaison Service with the Leader of the Opposition, you have to go to that wine bar.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr BASS: Well, that's right. However, in a document that accompanies it the Secretary of the SA Branch of the Labor Party states, 'It's important that business and Governments hear each other's views on issues and policies, because the decisions Governments make ultimately affect the whole community.' If you want to join, the document states, 'For an annual minimal contribution of \$500, you and your organisation can be part of the Business Labor Liaison Service.'

The business community in my area remembers what Labor did in South Australia: it remembers the tragedies, and it remembers that Labor caused people almost to lose confidence in South Australia. Members of the business community remember the State Bank, SGIC, Marineland, land tax, WorkCover, and compulsory uniform and unfair dismissal laws. Now the Labor Party is trying to extend an outstretched hand under the name of the Business Labor Liaison Service, with a small fee of \$500.

As I said, the meeting is to be held in a wine bar. Maybe this is a way of organising rent-a-crowd: you get a few people in and sit around in a restaurant and it looks like there is a big meeting. They are not game to have it in Trades Hall, because half a dozen people in Trades Hall would make the meeting look very small. The Labor Party is probably hoping that a lot of people will be drinking at the restaurant and, as I said, it will be rent-a-crowd. I understand that the area is quite large, so maybe it has an alcove or a window table where three or four can sit surrounded by the others in the wine bar. I am advised that there is a telephone box just down the road where the meeting could be held.

The Labor Party cannot be serious about meeting the business community in South Australia in such a place. I can tell members that the business community in South Australia has nothing but contempt for Labor in both South Australia and federally, and this was reflected in the recent elections. I have kept in touch with businesses in my electorate and I can tell members what businesses in South Australia want: they want decades of Liberal Governments in South Australia so that this State will have time to recover from the years of Labor mismanagement between 1982 and 1993. I can tell the Business Labor Liaison Service what South Australian businesses want and I can assure members opposite that I will not be paying \$500 to speak with the Leader of the Opposition, who was part of the Government which nearly destroyed South Australia.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):

Today the Brown Government has been further embarrassed over the handling of the SAMCOR sale, with the Treasurer being unable to explain why he did not act earlier to end the tender process because of a conflict of interest. Three weeks ago, before the Estimates Committee, the Treasurer admitted that he knew that SAMCOR General Manager, Des Lilley, had a job offer from the bidder, the Canadian firm Better Beef, while advising the Government on sale options.

On 19 June, he told Parliament that that would not taint the tender process and that the sale should proceed. Yesterday he stopped the sale process and today he described Mr Lilley's actions as inappropriate. It appears that the Treasurer knew of Mr Lilley's arrangements many weeks ago and that the Head of the Asset Management Task Force, Dr Sexton, was concerned about the matter. A letter from the Australian tenderer for SAMCOR to the Auditor-General revealed details of a meeting with Dr Sexton on 30 May 1996. It states:

During those discussions, Dr Sexton made the point he believed that the Hon. Stephen Baker was aware of Des Lilley's intentions early in the year. He also stated that he was most uncomfortable with the whole situation.

In other words, Dr Sexton was uncomfortable with this situation. If Dr Sexton was uncomfortable, why was nothing done? If the Treasurer knew about Mr Lilley's job offer months ago, why did he not act then? Why was Mr Lilley's action appropriate on 19 June and why was it inappropriate and why is he out of line today? Why was it only after the matter was raised by the Opposition during Estimates and subsequently with the Auditor-General that anything at all happened? The Treasurer also failed today to say whether Government personnel and representatives involved in asset sales had accepted gifts from bidders for those assets. That is an important issue. It is time for the Treasurer to start answering some of the hard questions about this asset sale.

I also want to talk about my meeting with the Prime Minister on Friday night. The Prime Minister was very courteous, and I discussed with him what had been put to me by workers at the Islington workshops of Australian National earlier in the day. The Deputy Leader and I met with workers at Islington. They were very disappointed because neither the Prime Minister nor the Premier of this State will meet with them to discuss face to face issues concerning their job security, the livelihood of their family, and so on. It is interesting that, although there had been blues with the previous Federal Government, at least Paul Keating, Kim Beazley, Laurie Brereton and other Transport Ministers have had the guts to listen to workers' views. Time and again, the workers at Islington have been restructured to the point where Australian National has become most competitive in terms of winning new contracts. However, it is interesting to note that when I put this to the Prime Minister he heard what I said but he made the point that difficult days and difficult decisions lay ahead.

I called on the Prime Minister to release the Brew report, which is the report into the future of Australian National. It looks at various options and makes recommendations to the Federal Government. Mr Howard received that report some weeks ago, but it has still not been made public. I made a submission to that inquiry as did the Port Augusta City Council, but the State Government of South Australia did not. There are 2 500 jobs involved. Where have the Premier of this State and the member for Stuart been in terms of raising the needs of people in Port Augusta? If Australian National goes, Port Augusta is in trouble—and we all know that.

In my discussions with the Prime Minister about the NCA cuts, he made no promises, but he told me that the Commonwealth is actively considering an appeal to the Full Court of the Federal Court over the decision by a Federal Court judge to nobble the powers of the NCA in its investigations into gangs. It is important that that appeal has been lodged. If it is unsuccessful, the Commonwealth should legislate to give the NCA the powers it needs.

DE FACTO RELATIONSHIPS BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's message—that it had disagreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

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

That the House of Assembly insist on its amendments.

The matter has been well debated in the House.

Motion carried.

STATE CLOTHING CORPORATION (WINDING-UP) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 June. Page 1701.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): The Opposition reluctantly supports the legislation. A few points need to be made about the fact that Whyalla has lost another industry. Although this may not have been the most profitable Government enterprise that the world has ever seen, the Government has a number of obligations to support regions, particularly those which

have been in serious long-term decline for about a quarter of a century—and Whyalla is one such region. Last week, the portrait of Tom Playford was hung in this Chamber. He was one of the great architects of Whyalla. Through the Playford Government and the demands of a wartime economy we saw the rapid development of the shipbuilding and steel industries in Whyalla. Some 30 years after that, we saw the decline of both those industries. The Fraser Government's decision of 1977 to have nothing more to do with ships meant a serious decline in work opportunities in Whyalla and the local economy.

Over the past 20 years since 1976 we have had the steel industry plan of 1984 and various other reductions in the steel industry work force in Whyalla to such an extent that in the past two years alone there has been a further loss of 900 jobs in that region. I am told that at its peak the State Clothing Corporation had about 40 employees. There is not a great deal that the Government can do in a number of these regions to stimulate the local economy. This was one opportunity that existed. This afternoon, we are simply dealing with the proceeds of an asset sale. As I understand it, this organisation has been totally gutted, the operation having closed last year. It is a shame in many respects that a local community such as Whyalla has not been given more support. Alas, the Bill before us today is the downstream legislation of a decision that has already been made. It has already been carried out, and the Bill is designed simply to make the necessary legislative changes.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): It gives me no pleasure to see this legislation before the Parliament. In effect, it represents the last rites of the State Clothing Corporation. The assets of the corporation have been transferred to the private sector. I think it is limping along. I do not know whether it has any future under the private owners. I sincerely hope it does, but that is yet to be seen. It has taken the Liberal Party 16 years to kill the State Clothing Corporation, and it has finally succeeded. It was an interesting 16 years. I thought that, in a way, the factory always had something of a cloud hanging over it because it was opened by the Hon. Dean Brown in his previous incarnation as Minister for Industrial Affairs. Every time I walked into the factory and saw his name on the wall I thought, 'Well, the factory is useful to workers but, with the name Dean Brown on the wall, there are bound to be some doubts about its future.' Of course, that thought proved to be correct. I do not believe that the State Clothing Corporation ever recovered from its initial set up, when the Liberal Party had control of it prior to its losing office in 1982.

The State Clothing Corporation was a baby of Don Dunstan, a former Premier who attempted, not just in this area but in other regions of the State, to create some job opportunities. This factory concentrated on sewing, which overwhelmingly is a female occupation, and whether that is right or wrong is not the issue—that is the way it is, unfortunately. A considerable number of females found work in the clothing factory, and for very many of them it provided the only income into their household; and it is very sad to see that income taken away. The Riverland, the South-East and other regional areas of the State also received large injections of money, certainly by Don Dunstan and the previous Labor Government and, prior to that, by the Playford and Steele Hall Governments.

For obvious reasons, the regional areas of South Australia have real problems in maintaining their populations. If the

Government believes in the viable regional areas of South Australia, it must do more than just talk about it. This Government—and not just the Government but the Government's supporters, including the backbenchers—really talks up a very good game about development in this State. The Premier is, without a doubt, the best I have ever heard at talking up his Government. I have heard nothing like it. There is also an inverse relationship to the amount of talk by the Premier and the decline of the State, and particularly the regions. Nevertheless, the Premier certainly talks up an excellent game—the best I have heard, and I have heard plenty of good ones.

Non-metropolitan South Australia is bleeding. Populations in almost all regions are declining. The Government talks about developing the regions, whilst at the same time its actions ensure that fewer people are employed in regional South Australia and therefore fewer people can live in regional South Australia. I must say that the Government does not discriminate: it attacks Liberal areas the same as it attacks Labor areas, and pulls out its employees. It is, as I say, the height of hypocrisy for the Government to shed crocodile tears about the constant bleeding of regional South Australia while doing everything it can to ensure that the bleeding continues and even accelerates. I have never understood why the Party room allows it.

Some comments have been made by the Premier over the past few days—in fact, over the past few weeks—about bringing migrants to South Australia; that South Australia does not get its share of migrants and therefore we must direct migrants to South Australia. The Prime Minister has picked up the call from the Premier of South Australia and is considering a scheme whereby migrants will be bonded to come to South Australia—and, I assume, regional South Australia—for a number of years, and if they do not comply with that requirement they will forfeit \$30 000. This is probably one of the most silly and fatuous schemes I have ever heard.

Apart from the civil liberties arguments, which are very strong, I cannot believe that Australia would tolerate citizens within Australia not being able to move freely throughout the country to live where they wished. I think that is an appalling concept. I wonder at the sheer stupidity of the Premier's call for people to come to South Australia and to regional South Australia when there is no work for them. What will they do? Are they to sit for two years on the dole in regional South Australia and then move to wherever they wish? I cannot see the purpose of it, particularly when, at the same time as these fatuous comments are being made, the Premier and his Government are doing everything to move out people who are already living in regional South Australia. It is a rather striking contradiction.

I should have thought that anyone who gives it a moment's thought would not open their mouth and demand that migrants come to South Australia, or to regional South Australia, when there is nothing for them to do. I have a far more liberal attitude to migration numbers in Australia than any Government, or even my Party. I believe that a wonderful opportunity has been lost in not taking advantage of the change that will take place in Hong Kong in 12 months. We could have done far more to attract some of those people to Australia.

I am not one who favours small migration programs—quite the opposite—but I believe it is silly to force migrants to settle in places where there is nothing for them to do. They must stay in these places on Government benefits before they

are eventually allowed to move, I suppose, to where they wish to live. It is nonsense for a Government to mouth these silly notions while at the same time it reduces its work force, whether it be ETSA workers, EWS workers, teachers, or school assistants. Every member in this place representing a non-metropolitan constituency knows what damage is being done and has been done over the past two to three years by this Government's programs.

I cannot see any point in opposing the Bill. As I stated earlier, to all intents and purposes the State Clothing Corporation has gone. The Liberals have triumphed. Thankfully, I was influential for a long time in ensuring that the forces of evil did not triumph with respect to the State Clothing Corporation. Whilst we had only 16 years, it was a good 16 years and, of course, members would know that the last 11 years were my responsibility. I feel that I accomplished something worthwhile. I believe that the Adelaide management of the State Clothing Corporation was, until the latter years, not as good as it could have been. I do not think there is any doubt about that. The workers on the ground were highly skilled and highly motivated, as was the local management; but, I am afraid, the bosses in Adelaide did not seem to care about the State Clothing Corporation as much as they should have.

This did change in the latter years, and I congratulate the Hon. Anne Levy, when she was Minister of State Services, and Bill Cossey, when he was CEO of State Services. What they achieved in the latter years of the corporation was worthwhile, but it was an example at the wrong end of the corporation's life as to what could have been achieved if people with the motivation of the Hon. Anne Levy and Bill Cossey had been there right from the start. Unfortunately, that was not the case. I would say to all the corporation's workers that they can hold their heads up high. They always delivered, in spite of some management decisions that must have seemed utterly incomprehensible to them. I do know that many of those women were dependent on the corporation and, since the factory closed, they have been in difficult circumstances indeed.

It is sad that the Bill is before us. I make an appeal to all members opposite who live outside the metropolitan area. I despair and have given up on members opposite who live in the metropolitan area, because they would not know about the problems of those of us who live outside the metropolitan area. Therefore, I appeal to all those members who live outside the metropolitan area, whether in Liberal electorates or the only Labor electorate outside the metropolitan area, to start defending State Government jobs in those areas. They can do it. Back benchers do have the numbers and can stop this Government doing what it is doing and damaging these country towns and provincial cities, depopulating the areas and forcing people into Adelaide or interstate for work. Back benchers in the Party room have an enormous obligation to control Ministers who, by and large, are city-based and have no interest outside the eastern suburbs of Adelaide. It is down to the back benchers in the Party room and, on behalf of all residents of South Australia who do not live in the metropolitan area, I appeal to those back benchers to do their job and stand up and defend their regions.

Mr BUCKBY (Light): First, I support the Bill and commend the Treasurer for his action. At the same time, I take note of what the members for Playford and Giles have said. Early in his speech the member for Playford referred to the diminishing number of opportunities available to the State

Clothing Corporation. He is right in saying that, because the restructuring of BHP and the shipyards had a significant effect on the corporation. Likewise, the member for Giles also cited investment in regional South Australia, which is an area where both local government and State Governments should be walking hand-in-hand to ensure that investment is directed towards country regions to make sure that not all people have to come to the city for their employment.

While saying that in one breath, we also have to remember that the previous Government quite rightly turned back a lot of tourism investment that was available in regional centres in terms of environmental aspects which were questionable. I refer to Wilpena Pound and Kangaroo Island. The previous Government had that on its books and, as a result of delays in development approvals, those sorts of projects were not agreed to and also the message to investors in South Australia was, 'Come here and you can expect a lot of time before you can get your project approved, if it ever is approved.'

The State Clothing Corporation shows one aspect of where Governments should not become involved in business. When I worked for the SA Centre for Economic Studies this was one business that I took a close look at. Because of the losses the corporation incurred over the last five or six years of its operation, something should have been done a long time ago. As the member for Giles said, it is probably because of his good work that nothing was done.

This issue shows a basic difference in philosophy between the two Parties in this House. The Labor Party looks to more Government involvement in supporting and maintaining industries, whereas the Liberal Party sees that as the role for private enterprise. That is the role for private enterprise, especially where continued losses have been made over a long period of years. Certainly, the Government should then look at itself and ask, 'As we are losing money in this enterprise, should we be involved in it or should we get out of the business and put it into private enterprise?' The right job is being done here. While I note that there are job losses in Whyalla, and it is sad that has happened, do we keep running a business that is constantly losing money? I do not believe we can. In this day and age we cannot justify that. Therefore, I believe that the Bill to close the corporation is the correct action and I commend the Treasurer for it.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I want to add a few words to those of the members for Playford and Giles in terms of regional development, although I will not take up much time of the House. As the shadow Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development—

The Hon. S.J. Baker: Is that right?

Mr CLARKE: Yes, as one of many hats. I have spent a considerable amount of time in rural South Australia, particularly in the Upper Spencer Gulf and the Riverland. One aspect that I have noted in discussions with local regional development boards is their despair at seeing jobs being eroded from their areas, particularly Government jobs, be they Federal or State Government employment. Such job losses have a major impact on private companies deciding whether they will come to regional areas in the first place or retain existing employment.

The member for Light says that what the member for Giles said about the State Clothing Corporation defines the difference between the two Parties, and that is probably right. Basically, in these areas it is only through the direct intervention of Government that we will achieve any gains whatsoever.

ever in employment. We will not get the private sector establishing companies and the like in areas which are not heavily populated and which are more distant from markets in the eastern States without major Government assistance.

Only last week we paid tribute to a former Premier, the late Sir Thomas Playford, who was a Government interventionist and who believed in using the Government to achieve certain ends, and I instance the establishment of the Whyalla steel works, General Motors-Holden's at Elizabeth, and the provision of the necessary infrastructure and the great schemes of the South Australian Housing Trust, which we still use to the present day in building and leasing back a whole range of factories to private industry. I recently visited the G.H. Michell's factory at Salisbury which opened in 1973. I noticed on a plaque that the factory was opened by a former great Premier of this State, Don Dunstan, and the General Manager pointed out that, if it had not been for the intervention of the State Government and the use of the Housing Trust in building and leasing back the factory to the private company—remembering that that private company does not have access to other shareholders' capital to establish its business—that factory could not have been built out at Salisbury and provide the employment that it currently provides.

Recently, in press announcements, we have seen the number of private banks that are closing branches. I note the ANZ looks like closing a number of country branches in South Australia where the old Bank of Adelaide had been heavily established. As a consequence of that, fewer children go along to schools, because the children of the bank workers are no longer there. As a result, the number of teachers on offer decreases and so the vicious spiral continues.

The workers in the Department of Road Transport—where there has been significant outsourcing of direct employment—who were direct daily paid employees of the Government, lived in and spent their pay packets in their local community. With the outsourcing of the road maintenance gangs and so on, those workers working for the private companies are based in Adelaide. They work two weeks, or whatever it is, up on the roads and live in camps, but they do not take their families with them, join in with the general community, or send their children to the local school because they are all back in Adelaide. Basically, other than buying a pie and a pasty at a local shop or the odd carton of beer at a local hotel, those workers from those private companies essentially spend their pay packets back in Adelaide rather than in the local community.

When I was in my travels, some of the local councils told me that they had a problem with this State Government's fetish of contracting out work rather than employing direct labour. And there was a very simple reason. I was in Berri at the time. They pointed out that all the council workers—bar one—lived within the district council of Berri area and paid rates. They also pointed out that their children all go to the school and they all contribute to the local community. If they outsource, as has been urged upon them by this Government, they will lose that labour. What will basically happen—and this is what happened with the Department of Road Transport—is that the workers will live in Adelaide and commute to do the work that is necessary on-site in the regional centres but will not spend their money in those regional areas, and so on.

It comes back to the fact that only Governments can energise and pull together the various threads of private industry to make a concerted effort to save regional South

Australia. South Australia, as a regional economy on its own, needs the great assistance of the national Government in making a determination as to whether this State is worth saving. Otherwise, contrary to what Prime Minister Howard wants to do with respect to migration, 1.3 million of us in South Australia will have to up stakes and move to Sydney, Canberra or Melbourne where there are employment opportunities. Federal Governments—both Labor and Liberal—have constantly cost us jobs in South Australia, as they have centralised work in the Eastern States rather than deciding that this State and decentralisation as an object are worth having and therefore reversing the flow of Government employment so that regional centres such as South Australia are supported to a greater extent.

I know it is a question of cost, and the State Government will always turn around and say, 'We don't have the resources to build up communities such as Whyalla, Port Pirie, Port Augusta and the like.' I am afraid we have to find the money, one way or another. We can find the money to offer a whole range of incentives to a number of companies about which this Premier and Deputy Premier have waxed lyrical over the past 2½ years. Again, I do not gainsay those particular jobs. I am concerned with how we get the best value for our dollars. If we had used some of the money that we spent on enticing industry into South Australia—and into Adelaide in particular—in centres such as Whyalla, Port Augusta or, indeed, other parts of rural South Australia, we might have had a bigger impact.

At the end of the day, will we be left with a State that basically ends a little north of Gepps Cross, because we have denuded the State above that line? Will all the infrastructure on which we have spent money over the past 150-odd years and which we have built up go to waste? Will we virtually turn the State into a modern desert where all our citizens live south of Gepps Cross? If that is the case, there will be an enormous waste of resources and talent. It will also be a dreadful indictment of this State, because we would basically lose our statehood and our right to determine our own affairs within our own Constitution, and we might as well make ourselves a supplicant of Victoria.

As I said at the commencement of the debate on this matter, essentially Governments must play this role; they are the only ones who can be the catalyst. Private industry will follow, but it will not lead, because its priorities are different from those of Government. It has private shareholders to consider and must look for the short-term reward. It is not interested in nation building, because that is not in its charter. I am not being overly critical of private enterprise for that, because that is not its role. That is the role of Government, and it is the role of Government to harness those energies and get on with the job of building the State rather than winding back Government and saying that everything it does is bad. We must recognise that it is Government and the role of the public sector.

Australia has just over 200 years of history. Given that over those 200 years our average population has been 3 million or fewer, given the huge disparity of distances, and given our tough terrain and the type of climate in which we have to live, we have still built ports, bridges, road, railways, modern telecommunications right around Australia, hospitals and schools—the whole gamut that private industry lives off. That has been done through the work of the public sector primarily, in consultation with the private sector, which provided the bodies to build a number of those pieces of infrastructure. However, it was the decision and the will of

Government to have these great national projects established and to raise the money for them. It also galvanised and organised the citizens of this country to achieve the high standard of living most of us in this country now enjoy. By all means, we should criticise the public sector when things go wrong, but we should not use it as an excuse to bash the public sector and to say that it does no good and that only the private sector can achieve these aims. Without an active, dynamic public sector, Australia would not be where it is today.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I thank members for their contribution. I reflect on the suggestion of the Deputy Leader and the members for Giles and Playford that we are winding back Government. Perhaps the Deputy Leader should remind the people of South Australia that the \$350 million that we were short in the budget deficit just happens to be the bills we faced as a result of the State Bank and SGIC. He well knows who was responsible for those two major failures when his Government was in power in this State. When he starts to talk to me about history, he should remind everyone of the damage his colleagues did to this State.

Irrespective of where the Government will take the State, the fact is that the flexibility to take it anywhere productive had been squashed and destroyed by the sheer incapacity and incapability of Government to operate effectively with due diligence in order to keep the books well and to make sure we have a future. That has to be judged. Most South Australians clearly understand that this Government came into power to fix up a hell of a mess and that there has been an enormous lack of discretion available to this Government as a result of the failures of Labor. We are slowly getting to the point where we can look to the future with more confidence than we could 2½ years ago. Therefore, when the honourable member talks about winding back Government, let us be well aware of where some of the prime problems that we face originated.

I should now like to comment on regional development. The member for Giles did not put forward the State Clothing Corporation as the epitome of a great regional development because he, other members and I recognise that it probably started as what seemed a good idea at the time but never performed to the heights that perhaps some people envisaged in the first place. If we are talking about regional development, what counts is the capacity of rural South Australia and those towns to be supportive of each other.

The member for Giles mentioned the State Clothing Corporation but failed to analyse what happened at Whyalla with the closure of the steelworks. We all recognise that the failure of regional Australia has been the result of two major causes. The first is that tariffs have supported regional economies and industries to an extent that perhaps nobody perceived at the time. The second is that, with all these subsidies and tariff barriers and extra assistance by the Government to make them work, nobody said, 'It is a competitive world and we have to adjust and be competitive to sustain our future.'

The restructuring that is continually needed (it is needed today just as much as it was yesterday) never occurred. One of the interesting reflections on Playford would be that he had a capacity not only to perceive that there was a future in industrialising the State, but during the late 1960s to say that restructuring again had to take place because the world was starting to become smaller with transport communications,

that we could no longer close the boundaries of the States and Australia and that we had to become competitive across the world. My lecturers in economics were saying to me in the late 1960s that the world had changed dramatically. That was when cheap Japanese cars were beginning to hit the marketplace. At least some people understood the great challenge that we faced. We could not continue to protect jobs in Whyalla because there was a subsidy of at least \$100 000 for every job there. We cannot sustain any economic activity in the long term with such an enormous subsidy. Somebody has to make decisions on those—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: That is what New South Wales and Victoria say about us: they say they're subsidising us.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The member for Giles is quite correct. They are still subsidising this State to the tune of about \$270 million a year, which is more than we would get on a per capita basis. Therefore, we are not sustaining ourselves in a way that every member would wish.

The real future lies in the strengths of the regional economies. We are already seeing the emergence of new industries which will serve many of the towns that have lain dormant for some time. I evidence the increased capacity of the mining industry to develop in this State not only mines but processing and value adding to an extent not seen for some time. Whether it be the future expansion of Roxby Downs, which has flowbacks into Port Augusta and Whyalla or whether it be having a strike such as Yumbarra providing not only mining jobs but a whole range of downstream jobs, many opportunities in the mining industry will evolve over the next decade with the right sort of management.

There will also be a number of jobs in aquaculture. The capacity to develop a fairly massive aquaculture industry is so underdeveloped it is not funny. If we look at what has happened in South-East Asia and the extent to which they have developed their industries in waters which are far less pristine than our own, we recognise that we have not touched the sides of developing industries which will see us well into the future.

Much the same goes for tourism. We can develop more exciting people movement than we have in the past. I do not lose faith in regional South Australia, but the days of Governments going in and providing non-competitive and non-economic jobs are over. We must make sure that these regions stand on their own feet. The Government has already supported regional development by maintaining the cross-subsidy in water and electricity which has prevailed since the days of Playford. In addition, concessions are available for new industries or for the expansion of existing industries in those areas. People may think that is not enough, but I do not draw that conclusion.

I simply point out that there are some wonderful opportunities, and they do not stop because the Government is not putting a large dollop of money into one particular area and saying, 'Let's build an uneconomic enterprise.' That is what happened with the State Clothing Corporation. It was a product of the 1970s, as were the frozen food factory and other enterprises. They were unfortunate because they missed the boat. The architects did not understand that the world was changing far more rapidly than they had envisaged, or perhaps they did not even think about the way in which the world was changing, and we were building diseconomies or uneconomic enterprises into the industrial fabric of this State.

The State Clothing Corporation survived for 16 years, as the member for Giles said. Perhaps due to his strong efforts it was not terminated earlier. I shall not reflect on his

contribution in that area, except to say that the Government cannot afford those levels of subsidy. If the Government is to make a contribution, it is by providing the infrastructure and perhaps showing people the way in areas which will count towards the future. This is the end of one small enterprise in the township of Whyalla. Its impact is minuscule compared with the loss of the shipbuilding industry, as members will clearly understand. I thank members for their support.

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

STATE LOTTERIES (UNCLAIMED PRIZES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 5 June. Page 1701.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I understand that the central tenet of this legislation is that unclaimed prize money, after 12 months, will revert to the commission and that, once in the commission, it will be paid into a fund called the unclaimed reserve and that is where it will reside except in circumstances about which I want to ask the Deputy Premier now rather than have a Committee stage.

From my understanding of the Bill, the commission may make an *ex gratia* payment to someone for good reasons. Obviously, at any time within 12 months a person may claim his or her money if they have legitimately won it and present the ticket. The question which emerges after those 12 months when the money is paid into the unclaimed reserve is what constitutes a good reason for that *ex gratia* payment. May we have some examples? For instance, do I understand that, because one person is paid, another will not necessarily be paid? What will or will not constitute a good reason?

The second question that emerges is: what is the limit on the unclaimed reserve? Is it two, five or seven years? What if someone seeks to claim their money from a 1996 lottery ticket 30 years in the future which, low and behold, has their nine numbers from the preceding Saturday night's draw? From my reading of the legislation there is no time scale on the unclaimed reserve. They are the two questions we are interested in. I will not take up the time of the House unnecessarily this afternoon, because we support the legislation.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I thank the honourable member for his support. One of the dilemmas that has arisen—and we have had a particularly interesting case with which we have been trying to deal for some two years—is what occurs when people who conceivably have won a prize—but who, for reasons best known to themselves, have lost the ticket—try to claim the prize. The current legislation provides that unless you have a ticket you cannot win the prize. That is a situation which has been examined on a number of occasions. The lottery has been in existence for 30 years. I understand that in order to collect a prize one has always been required to produce a ticket. The Government has rethought this requirement because of one particular case and one or two others that have come to our attention.

A particular circumstance arose where a person thought they had won a prize but they could not find the ticket. The winning sequence was the same sequence that had been submitted by the person over a long period. When that person went to check with the agency he was told, 'Well, I don't

think it was your winning ticket', and that was the end of the matter. So, no further effort was made by that person to find the missing ticket. It was not until some time later when this person had kept on saying, 'Look, they were my numbers; I know they were my numbers. I won that prize; they told me I had not won the prize but I really think I did win it', that this developed into somewhat of a saga.

What eventually transpired was that to all intents and purposes the person concerned did have the winning numbers. This was proved by looking at the person's behaviour and by ascertaining that this very large sum of money had not been won and, indeed, that the agent had misinformed him when the person said, 'I know it is my prize but I can't find my ticket.' We have reviewed the situation under which prizes can be claimed and believe that, if the circumstances are sufficient to give the Lotteries Commission full appreciation that a prize has been won in circumstances where the ticket is not available, it can use its discretion in terms of determining whether a prize should be paid.

This is a matter on which we have had legal advice. At one stage we thought it would be possible for an *ex gratia* payment to be made by the Treasurer. It was suggested that we should be able to make an *ex gratia* payment either through the Lotteries Commission or through the auspices of the Treasurer. However, the Crown Solicitor quite rightly said that that would be illegal, because the Act does not allow it to occur. We suspect that, if the matter did go to court, the fact that the person had been informed that he did not win the prize then stopped him from pursuing his lost ticket and therefore reduced his capacity to win that prize. So, we think that from the legal aspect, we may have had some difficulty explaining to a court why this person was not eligible to receive the prize which he had obviously won but for which he did not have a ticket.

As to the extent to which the prize pool can be made available, as the member for Playford quite rightly pointed out we are establishing a reserve, the unclaimed prizes reserve, in the Lotteries Fund for these contingencies. I understand that there will be a siphoning off of that money to ensure that there is sufficient money in the prize pool to meet any such contingencies. As the member for Playford would readily understand, the net distribution will be similar to that which currently prevails. We will place some money in that pool and then transfer it into the other areas. With respect to the amount held in the unclaimed prizes reserve by way of amounts transferred under subsection (2), 50 per cent of the amount derived from unclaimed prizes in sports, lotteries or special lotteries will, at intervals determined by the Treasurer, be paid into the Recreation and Sport Fund; and 50 per cent of the amount derived from unclaimed prizes in other lotteries will, at intervals determined by the Treasurer, be paid into the Hospitals Fund.

The balance of the reserve will be applied by the commission from time to time for the purposes of providing additional or increased prizes in a subsequent lottery or lotteries conducted by the commission; providing prizes in promotional lotteries conducted by the Commission; or making *ex gratia* payments under section 16D. As the honourable member would recognise, part of that money in unclaimed prizes is now used for boosting the commission's turnover. I do not think there is any special time limit that I have put on the fund. Frankly, I suspect that the number of people in this position will diminish as they use the Easiplay system and then provide their details to the distributor.

Therefore, if the prize is not claimed after three months they can seek a cheque or a cheque will be automatically sent out.

It is appropriate to insert a provision whereby someone can prove that they have purchased that particular ticket, the ticket has actually won but they have lost that ticket and, therefore, have been unable to collect the prize. There will have to be an enormous amount of diligence in any follow-up in this process, because there could be collusion between the distributor and the alleged prize winner. So, this matter will have to be considered very carefully. For example, I know that if a ticket is lost at the races a claim can be lodged. If that ticket has not been used or collected after a period, it can be claimed. This provides an element of fairness. It solves a problem that has been in the system for two years. It meets the equity issue more than adequately. It says that if you are a prize winner but, due to a circumstance beyond your control, you have not been able to collect that prize you now have the facility to do so. I commend the Bill to the House.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (WARD QUOTAS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 June. Page 1703.)

Ms HURLEY (Napier): This Bill deals with the quotas for ward boundaries for council elections. The Opposition wants to see no change whatsoever to the one vote-one value system for local government or any other tier of government, and we are opposed to any changes that might alter that representation. The Bill will allow amalgamating councils to have wards which differ by more than 10 per cent from other wards within the council for the transitional period only. Wary as we are of any change to the one vote-one value principle, we are aware that there is a problem. I received a letter from the Peterborough District Council outlining the difficulties that it will have when it amalgamates with the Peterborough City Council and its concerns about its level of representation in the amalgamated council.

I recognise that not only Peterborough but a number of other country councils in particular are going through quite an upheaval with regard to their amalgamation procedures and that some of the smaller councils are quite anxious about what will happen when they amalgamate. They are concerned about whether they will have sufficient representation when the amalgamation process has been completed. The Opposition has been helpful throughout the process of boundary reform where it has been supported by the community. I understand that amalgamations such as Peterborough and Warooka have the support of the community and that this transitional provision concerning the wards gives them some comfort in that, in the initial stages, they will have adequate representation on the new council.

We support this amendment strictly on the basis that it is a transitional provision during the first council term after amalgamation and signal that, in agreeing at this stage to support the Government's position, we would not be prepared to extend it beyond that period. We hope that few councils will see the necessity to take advantage of this amendment and that the Government will watch very carefully to ensure that it is not abused and that the normal one vote-one value procedures are adhered to.

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

I thank the Opposition for its support because, as the shadow Minister has quite rightly pointed out, it is a Bill which not only has the support of local government but was requested by local government. Because of the local government boundary reform process which we are currently undertaking, some councils feel that they would be seriously disadvantaged in the transition period if the 10 per cent requirement was retained as far as ward boundaries are concerned. I am delighted that the Opposition has indicated its support for the Bill, because it means that it has the support of the major players in the legislation—the Government, the Opposition and, in this case, the Local Government Association and local government itself.

The honourable member indicated that the Opposition would oppose any extension to the Bill. I can assure the honourable member that so would the Government. No way in the world are we looking for a permanent extension: we see it as a step which will provide assistance to some councils during the transitional period from the time the amalgamation occurs to when the new council is fully established. I can assure the shadow Minister that we are looking to only a few councils using the provisions of the Bill to assist them in that process. Not only do we appreciate the Opposition's support but I can assure the shadow Minister that we look at it in exactly the same way as the Opposition: we will not be looking for an extension, and neither do we expect that this facility will be used by many councils.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Formation, alteration or abolition of wards.'

Ms HURLEY: The Minister gave an assurance that the legislation would be used only during the transitional period. Can he again reassure me that it is just for that first period after the May 1997 local government elections?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I am pleased to be able to give that assurance: that is our sole intention in introducing this Bill.

Ms HURLEY: Which councils have indicated that it will assist them in the transitional amalgamation period?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: One council has already lodged a request, and that is the only council I am prepared to name—the District Council of Port Pirie. If the honourable member is aware of the background up there, she would know how delighted we all are that the City of Port Pirie and the district council have got together, because, 10 years ago, one would have said that they would be the last two councils in South Australia to get together. So, we were delighted to be able to provide this facility to that council.

At this stage no other council has put in a formal request. However, I have moved about rural areas talking with councils and I believe that other councils could be approaching us to provide this assistance. This could be the case where a council with a low number of ratepayers feels threatened and, because of the number of ratepayers in the council it is joining, its numbers could well and truly be diminished. At this stage there are no other formal applications, and I am expecting no more than a handful of requests from smaller councils which wish to utilise the intent of this Bill.

Ms HURLEY: Have any metropolitan councils indicated that they might need this assistance, and does the Minister believe that it would be appropriate for city councils?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: At this stage there have been no formal requests from any metropolitan council. The honourable member has asked a hypothetical question, and the only indication I can give is that I will consider any request that is put to me under this Bill. However, I would need to be convinced, as I was in the case of the District Council of Port Pirie, that such a step was necessary.

Mr VENNING: I refer to what the Minister just said about the amalgamation of the City of Port Pirie and the District Council of Port Pirie. This council area is not in my electorate—it is in the electorate of Frome—but I did serve on the council in that region. This action by the Government in relation to allowing flexibility in the setting of wards, in this case, will be very welcome. As the Minister said, the amalgamation of the Port Pirie City Council and the Port Pirie District Council has amazed all the locals. When you compare the huge city of Port Pirie with the small communities of Wandearah, Napperby and Warnertown, if it was not for this flexibility in the ward rules I am sure that there would be about only half a ward outside the City of Port Pirie.

I welcome this move because it will facilitate action which I think otherwise might not have happened. I anticipate that this procedure will be used in my electorate, particularly in the amalgamation of councils such as the District Council of Ridley Truro, which is a huge council with a very small population, with the Mannum council, which is a much smaller council with a larger population, and the isolated District Council of Morgan. I would be very surprised if that amalgamation process did not also use the flexibility that this Bill gives to draw up wards so that the communities involved will not be lost and swallowed up in the process.

The Government will go down in the history of this State as being able to facilitate a process that many governments have tried before but failed. This Government is succeeding. The process to date is going well. By Christmas, I think it will be found that 75 per cent of the councils in this State will have successfully amalgamated. One of the reasons for that is the flexibility that this Bill will provide. I congratulate the Opposition for accepting this Bill as a vehicle to bring about this process. I congratulate the Government and the Minister, and I support the Bill.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

FAIR TRADING (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

DE FACTO RELATIONSHIPS BILL

The Legislative Council requested a conference, at which it would be represented by five managers, on the House of Assembly's amendments.

The House of Assembly agreed to a conference, to be held in the Plaza Room at 6 p.m. tomorrow, at which it would be

represented by Messrs Atkinson, S.J. Baker and Caudell, Mrs Geraghty and Mrs Kotz.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to address two matters concerning my electorate, one of which involves a primary school and the other a university in the northern suburbs. First, I put before this House a matter of grave concern, and that is the health and well-being of over 430 children, 43 staff and numerous volunteers and parents from my electorate who attend and work at the Salisbury Downs Primary School. In April this year, the school's groundsperson noticed deposits of a fine, powdery and fibre dust in the gutters of some of the school buildings. On windy days it could be seen blowing around the schoolyard. Testing by SACON's Asbestos Management Unit confirmed that it was asbestos-contaminated dust. The gutters were vacuumed by specialist removalists to remove the most immediate health risk, but clearly this is no resolution of the problem currently confronting the school's community.

The roofs of this school are made of 20-year-old corrugated Deep 6 asbestos, and they are in the process of breaking down. One is already 12 months past its replacement date. The Salisbury Downs Primary School council wrote to the Minister for Education in May expressing its concern about this situation and requesting removal of the 3 000 square metres of asbestos roofing after being advised that the only effective method of dealing with this problem is total replacement. I understand that officers of the Education Department have also recommended to the Minister that, because of special circumstances at the Salisbury Downs Primary School, the roofing should be replaced now.

It seems, however, that despite the comparatively small cost involved in doing this, money is far more important to this Government, to be spent in marginal seat areas, than the health of northern suburbs' children. An amount of \$120 000 has been quoted as a ballpark figure to replace all existing asbestos roofing at the Salisbury Downs Primary School. This is minuscule when compared with the health and wellbeing of the children, staff and parents. It is simply unacceptable to everyone for the school to be told, 'Yes, the work should be done but funding is the problem.'

Funding was not a problem when the Government spent \$200 000 to change the name of the State Transport Authority to TransAdelaide or when it spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on the appalling SA Going All The Way campaign. The health of these children is much more important. To date, no response to the school council's correspondence has been forthcoming from the Minister other than acknowledging having received the letter and a statement issued to the Messenger Press in which the Minister, Rob Lucas, is reported to have said that inspections by Services SA's Asbestos Management Unit and other experts have found that the roofs were in 'medium condition and did not warrant immediate replacement.'

This statement, apparently given directly by the Minister to the journalist at Messenger Press, causes real concern amongst parents at the Salisbury Downs Primary School, because they have been continually assured that the deterio-

rating asbestos roofs posed minimal health risks. Now the Minister is stating that they are in 'medium condition'. What exactly does this mean? Have the roofs deteriorated even further, and is this the reason the school council is having so much difficulty in obtaining a copy of the latest asbestos report on the school? The Minister was further reported in the Messenger Press as saying:

We have to listen to what the experts say and, at this stage, they say that with monitoring and warning signs as long as we try to do it in the next three years it should be okay.

'It should be okay.' That is what the Minister for Education and Children's Services said about a health issue affecting children in my electorate. Well, 'it should be okay' is not good enough for me. When the Chairperson of the school council contacted the Minister's office last week to again query why it had not been provided with a copy of the latest asbestos report, she was advised, after some investigation, that the report was with the Director of Corporate Services and that the Minister's office would attempt to obtain a copy for her.

Does this mean that, when the Minister for Education and Children's Services made these statements to the Messenger Press, he had made a decision not to proceed immediately with the removal of this health risk to over 430 children without having actually read or even received a copy of the latest asbestos report? This school council has done everything it can to have this matter attended to and resolved in a completely professional and responsible manner. The council can only be commended for its handling of this potentially explosive situation. It has gone about this the right way. It has brought it to the attention of the department; it has consulted with the asbestos management experts; it has raised the issue directly with the Minister; and it has done its utmost to keep parents calm.

The Minister has failed to respond to the council's concerns either formally or informally other than through the local media, and then his response was, 'If we do it in the next three years, it should be okay.' His attitude is just another indication of the arrogance of the Brown Government and the contempt in which its Ministers hold the people of the northern suburbs. I know for a fact that, if this school was in a marginal Liberal seat, or over in the blue ribbon leafy green suburbs of the Premier's own electorate, or at least the area in which he lives, then this would be a priority replacement. They would not tolerate their children being exposed to this health risk; they would not tolerate a situation where the children in Liberal suburbs or in marginal seats were playing in areas directly adjacent to deteriorating asbestos, as is the case at Salisbury Downs.

The Education Department and the Minister have a responsibility to ensure that this school is a safe and healthy environment in which children can learn and staff can teach. Replacement in three years is not acceptable to the school council, it is not acceptable to parents in the area, it is not acceptable to me as the local member of Parliament, and it should not be acceptable to the Minister. The only acceptable response from the Minister should be priority removal of this dangerous asbestos roofing. I call on the Minister today to act immediately to ensure the safety of students, staff and parents of the Salisbury Downs Primary School.

I also want to talk about university issues in my electorate. As the person who wrote and put through the legislation and who negotiated to establish the University of South Australia, I know that we included the strongest access and equity provisions and equal opportunity provisions of any university

Act in this nation, and that Act had bipartisan support. I was very concerned in late 1993, just before the election, to be told that the university administration wanted to close the Salisbury campus. I wrote to the Vice-Chancellor and he told me that I was misinformed: he told me there were no plans to close down the Salisbury campus.

Later, I met with the Vice-Chancellor and the Chancellor. Again, I was given assurances that the university would have only the progressive removal of courses to the Levels—that the major thrust of the movement of students from award courses would be to the Levels campus, also in the Salisbury area. The university council decided to phase down progressively the courses available at the University of South Australia's Salisbury East campus only because the administration of the university gave an assurance that the nursing students would not be transferred to Adelaide or Underdale but to another campus in the Salisbury area. That is what students were told at public meetings.

I have copies of letters from the senior management of the university telling the Elizabeth council and others that they were misinformed to believe that nursing students would be moved elsewhere. It was, in fact, a gross dereliction of the duty of the university to accurately inform the students where they would be going. Now, students currently enrolled will be shifted into town. They were informed of that the day before their university exams. It has caused massive anguish. That information has been bitterly received by people in the northern suburbs who once again see a decision that is not based on access, equity or equal opportunity.

I am concerned that I was misled as a member of the university's council. I am concerned that the council of the university was misled, and I am very concerned that university students, some of them Mums with kids, must now trek to different parts of the city in order to complete their education. The closure and ring barking of the campus is a disgrace.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I refer to interactive multimedia which, for the benefit of members, is often written in shorthand as Im³, or IM3 on the superscription. Equally, if you have a personal communicator that is interactive in the mobile multimedia capacity, what do you have? It is a mobile video phone, and that, to my mind, represents the ultimate in the modern derivations of the Dick Tracy type technology that many members in this Chamber would remember seeing in the comic strip of their childhood. Certainly, I seem to remember odd bits of it, and it is now being referred to as virtual reality.

The significance of my remarks are that a caller can simply point their mobile telephone at anything the caller is trying to describe to someone and it will take the image and transmit it to the other party being called and appear on the screen, if necessary, on that mobile telephone. It is voice over picture. It is a more powerful concept than desktop video phones, which provide the caller only with the opportunity of seeing the face of the other party. There are many commercially attractive applications of the mobile video concept, such as mobile teleworking, mobile telemedicine, mobile telebanking, mobile teleshopping, mobile teleconferencing and, literally, mobile tele-education.

I believe we have a greater vision driving this concept into the future in interactive multimedia personal communications by considering them in three option categories, the first being interactive telebanking, where interactive mobile multimedia personal communications will replace all types of bankcard.

When you enter a PIN on that particular mode, the keyboard on the phone will be used. Shopping transactions can then automatically happen. The user's final bank balance, if they want it, can be checked on the telephone's display immediately after the transactions are completed.

The next category is interactive time keeping, where the time will be displayed on the corner of the screen of the mobile video phone and the time display will automatically change from daylight saving to whatever time during the course of the year and it will change during interstate or international travel. For instance, for international travel, time will automatically speed up or go backwards, according to where you pass, and that can be done by ge positioning systems interacting with the phone. When you make an international call, the time of the party called in the country called will be displayed as the number is dialled so that you do not cause yourself an embarrassment calling at the wrong time of the day.

There is then the interactive personal navigation (IPN) system where you can press a locate button on the keyboard and see the nearest road or street name in the location where you are standing. It essentially then becomes a smart handheld global positioning system. As a direct result of the efforts of the Premier, the Government and another Minister who has been outstanding in his contribution in this area, the Minister at the bench—that is, the Minister generally regarded as responsible for industrial and regional development in South Australia—we have now an agreement between two leading edge groups of people internationally. In the first instance, a Korean group signed with a local group; ANAM Computer Company in Korea was founded in 1956 and it is now the world's leading company in semiconductor assembly and total company turnover exceeds \$US30 billion annually.

It has developed a conventional mobile phone which uses as little as one-third of the power of any competing telephone because of the asynchronous design technique in its circuitry. For this proposal of the development of a mobile video phone, ANAM will be teaming up with the Korean Institute of Multimedia Technology, which has intellectual input from a number of Korean universities, the most significant institution being Chonnam University. Just over a week ago Professor Kim, Professor Choi and Mr Kwon, who is the Chief Executive Officer of ANAM semi-con, were here and signed an agreement with Adelaide University for the development of the mobile video phone. In Adelaide University is the Centre for High Performance Technologies and Systems (CHiPTEC), which was founded in 1987 and which is based in the Electrical and Electronic Engineering Department of the University of Adelaide. It is the world's leader in digital gallium arsenide circuit design and, in my opinion, it is Australia's leading centre in digital integrated circuit design.

It has a strong track record in both the industrial collaboration arena for commercialisation, notably the Britax-Rainsford and ISD work, and it has prestigious overseas connections with institutions such as Seoul National University in Korea, the Chinese Academy of Science in Beijing, EPFL in Switzerland and the University of Las Palmas in Spain. The CHiPTEC personnel who need recognition are: Derek Abbott, the image sensor designer who handles technology issues; Neil Burgess, the cryptographic and video compression technology expert and project leader; Doug Gray, in radio frequency technology; Michael Leibelt, who is the asynchronous design technology expert; and Andrew Parfitt, the radio frequency technology expert.

The benefits that come from this collaboration between these two leading edge institutions or corporations—or whatever we want to call them—that form this think tank are enormous. The key challenges in the development of the international multi-media personal communicator are in the making of the unit as a compact and practical one, keeping the power consumption down to a minimum. Moreover, the video information must be compressed for efficient transmission and to obscure sensitivity in any data, for instance, in telebanking information which must be kept private by cryptographic techniques, and all done in real time, in an instant, in nano seconds. To create the world's first practical mobile video phone with these functions requires the unique synergy among these teams—ANAM, Chonnam in Korea and the University of Adelaide.

The Korean group provides the manufacturing base and compact packaging technology for compact realisation of the unit and the Adelaide team provides both unique expertise for the imaging, cryptographic and compression functions. Both ANAM's and Adelaide's leading experience as asynchronous designers and radio frequency technologists will be a key factor in keeping the power consumption of the unit low enough for it to be practical. It is essential to have low power consumption for the mobile battery to have anything like a sensible and suitable life. The Adelaide group has the intellectual property rights for the basic patents but, from now on, they will be shared 50:50 between the Australian and Korean interests. ANAM is currently setting up a commercial entity, ASIC Design Centre, to be based here in Adelaide in conjunction with RADlogic, which is a local South Australian firm, and this will provide a focus for creating enormous numbers of jobs and great wealth coming into South Australia all as a direct consequence of the Premier's and the Government's vision.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 10 July at 2 p.m.