

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 25 July 1996

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

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MILE END ATHLETICS STADIUM

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the twenty-eighth report of the committee on the Mile End athletics stadium be noted.

The Office of Recreation, Sport and Racing proposes to build an athletics stadium at Mile End at an estimated cost of some \$8 million. It is proposed that the stadium be built on the old Mile End railway yard site, which requires extensive remediation—and that was reported to the House by this committee in March of this year. The Mile End railway yard site is comprised of two segments. The proposed athletics stadium is contained in the northern segment. Members familiar with the site would know that the Hilton bridges divide the site. To the north is the athletics stadium and to the south a future home for Netball South Australia will be developed. This site I refer to is north of the bridge, is 15 hectares and is bounded by Railway Terrace, the Australian National railway line and the Hilton and Bakewell Bridges.

Following a review of existing facilities for athletics competition at Olympic Sportsfield at Kensington, and after comparison with those facilities with international requirements, Athletics SA and the Office of Recreation, Sport and Racing determined that the alternative accommodation and facilities were required. Extensive community discussion took place within sporting circles and the community and various sites around Adelaide were examined. It was finally determined that the site at which we are looking today at Mile End was the most appropriate site. Other sites had advantages and disadvantages and an extensive study was made of the pros and cons of each site, but at the end of the day Mile End came up as the preferred option.

The Olympic Sportsfield is deficient in many respects, particularly in carparking and in track and field warm up areas, the latter being essential if we are to have international competition in South Australia. Members would have been following in the media over some years the actions of the Burnside Council and its desire to sell the Olympic Sportsfield site to Pembroke School. The ongoing negotiations for its subsequent sale to Pembroke precluded the opportunity for redevelopment and if anything made it difficult it was the issue hanging over the head of Athletics SA that at some time down the track Pembroke School would be a preferred purchaser of the site in the eyes of the Burnside Council.

The proposed new athletics stadium will be designed to provide for national and international competitions, senior athletics at club and State level, including club and state championships. There will be schools and Little Athletics having access to the site, which is also available for general training. Overall the proposed project will provide a national standard facility that is capable of expansion to full international standard in the future. In particular, the track and field facilities will be designed and constructed to meet the International Amateur Athletics Federation requirements and will be suitable for level 1 events. However, it should be

noted that additions to and upgrading of some stadium facilities will be required prior to an actual event being staged.

The facility will also provide headquarters accommodation for the Athletics SA organisation, which will be responsible for the stadium's operation and management. We are aware that agreements have been entered into with Athletics SA, and we believe that they are appropriate. The committee considers that the use of the greenfield site, which has been made available by the exit of railways in South Australia out to the northern suburbs, will provide far more flexibility in catering for this wide range of groups, and in particular enabling them to lay out a purpose-built stadium to suit, first, the amount of money that was available for the project and, secondly, the aims and objectives of the various user groups that have put up their hand and would like access to the site.

In addition, such a facility will allow Adelaide to host overseas teams preparing for the Sydney 2000 Olympics, and therein lies a major opportunity for generating some revenue back into that facility other than using it just for our own national and interstate events. In summary, the Public Works Committee strongly supports the proposal to construct an athletics stadium at Mile End and, pursuant to section 12(c) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, reports to Parliament that it recommends the proposed works.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: WEST BEACH RECREATION RESERVE (AIRPORT RUNWAY EXTENSION REDEVELOPMENT)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the twenty-ninth report of the committee on the West Beach Recreation Reserve (airport runway extension redevelopment) be noted.

The Urban Projects Authority proposes to undertake works on the West Beach Recreation Reserve at a cost of some \$6.985 million. This will be done in order to facilitate the future extension of the Adelaide International Airport and in particular the extension of the runway across Tapleys Hill Road into the existing West Beach Trust Reserve land. The works to be undertaken on West Beach Reserve will include site remediation; the realignment of the Patawalonga Creek, which currently runs through the reserve around the eastern edges of the golf course adjacent to Tapleys Hill Road; the relocation of the German Shepherd Dog Club of SA and the construction of 10 replacement holes for the Patawalonga South Golf Course. Those holes must be relocated to enable the earthworks for the extension of the runway and the navigation instruments to be placed on the western end of the proposed runway. The Urban Projects Authority is proposing to undertake these works in order to preserve existing recreational uses for the area which would otherwise have been lost with the Adelaide international runway extension project.

A major part of the redevelopment proposal involves the remediation of what was a former rubbish tip site, to allow it to be converted into fairways for the new golf course. This remediation will utilise treated sand and silt dredged from the Patawalonga to cap the site and assist with the mounding of the new holes. Members who have travelled along Tapleys Hill Road will be familiar with the site. Drying out under bird protection nets at the moment are many hundreds of thousands of cubic metres of sand and silt which have been dredged from the bottom of the Patawalonga. That material

is now almost ready to be redistributed over the old rubbish tip, which has been compacted and which is in preparation. Once this report is approved, work can proceed on the construction of those fairways. The proposed new golf course layout will provide an 18 hole facility of equal or superior standard to the existing golf course. Currently, this course caters for tourists to the area, local residents and members of the Westward Ho Golf Club, who share the facility with the public.

The new course will be more contoured and undulating than the existing one and will provide a mix of holes in a north-south and east-west alignment with the inclusion of the Patawalonga Creek, which will be realigned. It was interesting to note that those who gave evidence indicated that the layout of the new final course—several versions of the course were put forward during the taking of evidence—and the configuration in relation to the movement of the sun and weather conditions is the preferred option of golfers and the professional, who was involved in drawing up the course design. The Patawalonga Creek is currently polluted and unsightly and could pose future interference with the extension of the runway. Therefore, it is proposed to clean the creek and realign it for inclusion in the relocated segment of the golf course as an attractively landscaped water feature.

Both the committee and the UPA considered it was of paramount importance that users of the West Beach Recreation Reserve experienced minimal disruption as a result of the runway extension works. To ensure that this is the case, the redevelopment of the West Beach Recreation Reserve prior to the commencement of the airport runway extension is crucial. On that basis it is essential that this work gets under way, that the new fairways be constructed and are operational and that other users such as the dog club are relocated so that all current users are settled in their new homes, locations and club rooms prior to the West Beach Trust and the UPA resuming the land for the runway earthworks.

What is happening now will allow four new golf course holes to be operational prior to closure of the existing holes, and a new site for the dog club will be established prior to the closure of the existing premises. This will eliminate the risk of damage claims and community backlash that could occur if commercial operations were forced to close to make way for the runway extension work. Finally, the committee would like to stress that this report deals only with works on the West Beach Recreation Reserve land and will not pre-empt or in any way be affected by the runway extension or road realignment proposals which no doubt the committee will express a view on in future.

Furthermore, the proposed airport runway extension, together with the tunnel and diversion options for Tapleys Hill Road, are being assessed in the EIS and, as I said, will also be subject to future submissions to the Public Works Committee and no doubt our reports to the Parliament. I now refer to a section of the report under 'Consultation' on page 9. It refers to a submission received from Mr Henry Coles, President, Westward Ho Golf Club. I have to say that Mr Coles was a particularly good witness who gave the committee what he perceived to be the club's views on the need to relocate the driving range. I will read three or four paragraphs so that it is on the record for those people who do not have full access to the report, as follows:

The committee heard evidence from Mr Henry Coles, President of the Westward Ho Golf Club. Although the golf club supports the runway extension, it has reservations regarding the proposed layout

of the new golf holes. In particular, the Westward Ho Golf Club is concerned by:

1. The close proximity of two golf holes to Tapleys Hill Road and the associated danger of balls being hit onto the road by players.
2. The access roadway to the Kerry Elliss Driving Range passing through the course; and
3. The Kerry Elliss Driving Range remaining in its present location, as detailed in the proposed option (option F). The club considers the original option (option E), whereby the driving range would have been relocated, to be more suitable.

The committee also heard evidence from Mr Ron Shattock, Chief Executive, West Beach Trust, who raised concerns regarding the location of the Kerry Elliss Driving Range. The West Beach Trust believes that the driving range should be relocated closer to Tapleys Hill Road, making it more visible and allowing the land between it to be remediated. The committee considered carefully the evidence presented by both Mr Coles and Mr Shattock, and subsequently clarified several issues with the Urban Projects Authority.

The committee acknowledges that, although the West Beach Trust agrees to the proposed layout of the golf course, it has two concerns: first, that the total landfill site would not be rehabilitated; and, secondly, that future opportunities for income to the trust could be jeopardised by leaving the driving range where it is. The committee deliberated for some time and discussed the evidence presented by both Mr Shattock and Mr Coles. It understands the concerns of those two witnesses, but it also had to have regard to the fact that the West Beach Trust signed off and unanimously agreed to the project. In the transcript, Mr Shattock, who is the Chief Executive, said *inter alia*:

To start with the current plan, the total resolution of the board was the adopted option F—

so the board signed off and its total resolution was to agree to option F—

but it expressed concern to our Minister that the total landfill site would not be rehabilitated and future opportunities for income to the trust could be jeopardised by leaving the driving range where it is.

At that time, the Chairman of the West Beach Trust (Mr Julian Miles) was overseas. When he returned, I approached Mr Miles on behalf of the committee and asked whether, having in mind the reservations that were expressed by Mr Shattock, the board of the trust, under his chairmanship, would recommit the vote. His answer to me, which I relayed to my colleagues on the committee, was that it was not his intention to revisit that motion and put it back to the trust; therefore, the original motion stood, namely, that the board unanimously agreed with option F, regardless of the fact that it had some reservations.

It is fair to say that, knowing that the West Beach Trust board is made up of representatives of three councils—Henley and Grange, West Torrens and Glenelg—and also represents the user groups, the trust officially supports option F although it has some reservations about it. If members read the report, they will pick up that those reservations are expressed in the report. It is now a matter for the Government to negotiate the best outcome it can, based on the contents of the report.

There was an opportunity, on his return, for Mr Miles to take that resolution back to the trust board. He chose not to do that, so on the record is the board's unanimous agreement that option F proceed. The committee is happy to endorse the submissions from the UPA and to endorse the actions of the Government. Consequently, pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works

Committee reports to Parliament that it recommends that the proposed works proceed.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): As a member of the Public Works Committee I point out that after exhaustive examination, as detailed by the Presiding Member, which I will not repeat, the committee came to a conclusion without dissent in its view of what needs to be done. During the course of its deliberations, Mr Speaker, I want to acknowledge the role that you played in making it possible for the committee to come to a clearer understanding of why it was doing this work in examining this project and the benefits the project would bring to South Australia by facilitating, as you did, a visit to Cairns of two of the members of the committee: the Presiding Member and the member for Davenport. I was unable to go at the time the visit was scheduled and chose to go a little later at my own expense—three weeks ago, in fact. I had the good fortune of being able to see and take advice from the same people who met with the Presiding Member and the member for Davenport.

It is quaint that the City of Cairns in North Queensland found itself in very much the same situation as we now find ourselves in Adelaide, namely, that the runway it had for that region of Australia, which is potentially as productive as South Australia (if not already as productive as South Australia) was strangled by the fact that its international airport was inadequate in terms of the length of its runway to enable jumbos and other modern jet airliners to be able to land and, more particularly, take off fully laden.

The problem was not only the length of the runway but the constraints imposed on it by virtue of its location on the flood plain and estuary wetland of the Barron River; and the second if not equally important factor are the hills immediately south of the end of the runway. At one end the runway has the river and its wetlands all around, and the runway cannot be lengthened in the other direction because to do so, whilst it is physically possible on the ground, would be a ridiculous waste of money in that it would bring the runway too close to the hills over which the aircraft must be capable of rising after take off: being too close would make it dangerous. All this was pointed out to me.

At an earlier time the runway was made just a little over two metres too short and, at the time the contract was let for the extension of the runway, foolishly, or as an oversight, the terms of the tender specified an explicit extension of some hundreds of metres but did not include the additional three metres to round it out to 3 200 metres; so that it is now 3 197 point something metres long. Of course, the contractors refused to extend it and round it out to that particular length. Adelaide will come up with the same result in general terms, although we will not have this silly little aberration as occurs in the case of Cairns. I do not think that it is of any great moment to them.

It now means that Cairns can provide access to any of the world's commercial airliners, and will be able to do that for the foreseeable future—certainly for the life of all the infrastructure on that runway and its associated facilities for cargo and passenger handling as they are currently planned. There is no intention at present by any of the aircraft manufacturers to modify the structure and performance characteristics of their aircraft to require access to an airport with a longer runway than we are proposing to build here, or than has already been built at Cairns. Given that is the case, we are within fairly safe design constraints to proceed in the way in which the committee has recommended.

Whilst that evidence was not available or provided to the committee by any of the witnesses in South Australia, it was made clear to us when we visited Cairns, and if for no other reason then, it was important. I commend you, Mr Speaker, for having recognised its importance and made it possible for at least two members of the committee to obtain that evidence about the Cairns runway, and the other related factors of public interest, namely, what industries can therefore be developed—and that is not just simply the tourist industry—and why it is therefore in the public interest for us to engage in the work that the committee examined.

Let me refer to those other industries. Cairns can now expand its plantings of fresh fruit and vegetables suitable for export into the East Asia market and it is doing that quite rapidly. It is well placed climatically. Not only can it obtain tropical fruits from the wet coastal plains in the immediate vicinity, 100 kilometres or so in any direction, but also, and more importantly, it can produce the temperate species that grow at high altitude in tropical situations. Immediately adjacent to the west is the Atherton Tableland, a location which, by altitude, provides the temperate climate which is suitable to grow vegetables and fruits of the temperate species—some of them adaptations in varietal form from cool temperate species—and they can be sold into East Asia. They will no longer have to send their perishables to Brisbane or Sydney as they have been. Furthermore, it enables them to negotiate for direct landing rights on their airfield for airlines coming into Australia. That is exactly what we need in South Australia so that we can export our fresh fish, fruit and vegetables and other perishable products to East Asia markets. Without being able to do that, we cannot expand our employment base in this State as much as will otherwise be possible.

It is, therefore, a project of vital importance which should have been undertaken long ago. The public interest is not at risk in the least by our undertaking the work involved; the public interest is not disturbed. Aircraft of the future will not get noisier: they will get quieter. Aircraft of the future will not become more hazardous to the surroundings in which they land and take off: they will become safer not only because of structural and engineering design features of the aircraft but also because of airport and traffic management technologies.

There is now no reason why the Adelaide Airport cannot continue to serve the needs of the people of South Australia in expanding the number of tourists that visit this city and the amount of produce that we can export directly to those markets for the next 50 plus years. Any talk of moving it to any other site on the perimeter of the city is not only unnecessary but quite silly and stupid. It does not enhance public safety, advance public health or improve economic performance.

I mentioned the Atherton Tableland. The town of Karumba is on the edge of the Atherton Tableland not far from Barron River Falls (which have been made quieter because of a hydro-electric scheme dam which was built above them). In recent time a sky train cable car was built from just near the airport to the top of the rim of the tableland at Kuranda and that has rapidly increased the patronage of tourists through the town. We ought to do the same thing at Mount Lofty. It is a profitable. There is a benefit cost from that investment and the sooner we do the same thing through Waterfall Gully, Cleland Reserve and into Mount Lofty, with interpretive centres along the way, the better off we will be. It will generate not hundreds of thousands of dollars but

millions of dollars of revenue annually. I commend the committee for its report.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON WOMEN IN PARLIAMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Greig:

That the final report of the committee be noted.

(Continued from 11 July. Page 1938.)

Ms GREIG (Reynell): I thank all members who have contributed to the debate; I have listened with interest to all the comments and suggestions. One thing that has come through very clearly is that most members acknowledge fair representation in the Parliament of the South Australian community. We acknowledge that this reflection is determined at the ballot box, so it is important not only that both girls and boys gain an understanding of their country's system of Government but also that they have the right to stand for Parliament.

A number of members have highlighted the fact that we now have a larger proportion of members with younger families and the need for consideration to be given to facilities that can be provided to meet our somewhat unusual life and work style.

There was some criticism of the committee's interim recommendation for the family room being ignored and, in fairness to our Speaker, I should highlight for the record that this statement is untrue. I am aware that through you, Mr Speaker, and the President the building committee has spoken with the architects regarding our recommendation for a family room, and I believe the possibilities are being investigated.

Sitting hours is another issue that was brought to everyone's attention, and I am sure that, after the past two nights, more members may be thinking about what can possibly be achieved during the ridiculously early hours of the morning. I recall some member commenting to the *Advertiser* that sitting hours would not change until hell freezes over, so let us just hope that hell freezes over very quickly, because I am sure that some of us want to start working normal, decent hours and make proper decisions without being tired and being unsure of what is going on during the pre-dawn and post-dawn hours of the morning.

I am aware that the Minister for the Status of Women is very keen to see our recommendations implemented and will be working very closely with all other Government members to make sure that this proceeds. A number of changes will see this Parliament through into the next century. They will see the place become more friendly for women and more opportunities being made available.

Motion carried.

ARTS AWARDS

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I move:

That this House congratulates the Adelaide Festival Centre for the outstanding success achieved on Broadway with their production of *The King and I* in winning four Tony Awards for Best Revival of a Musical, Best Scenic Design, Best Costume Design and Best Performance by an Actress in a Musical.

I first draw attention to what has been achieved by what we all know—and if we do not know, we jolly well should—is an outstanding node of collegiate professionalism which we

have in our Adelaide Festival Centre theatrical productions group, that is, the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. Not only did it have those wins but also I draw the attention of members to the fact that there were also three Outer Critics Circle Awards, four Drama Best Awards and one FANY (Friends of New York) Award. *The King and I*, which is a coproduction with John Frost, had already won.

Those three Outer Critics Circle Awards prove that Australian artists and their technicians are amongst the best in the world and that, in the Festival Centre Trust, we have something of which can all be proud and whose praises we can sing whenever we have interstate and overseas visitors. Indeed, we ought to do it amongst members of the wider community locally. Those awards were for the sets of *The King and I*, and those sets were built in South Australia. The awards for Best Scenic Design are also awards for which the trust and its staff should be acknowledged.

If we look at the Tony Awards in general, we see that we were nominated for a number of them. We were nominated for the Best Lighting Design. Without winning, these nominations are an achievement in themselves. Apart from those that we won, we had nominations for the best lighting design, and that was by Nigel Levings. He was born in Adelaide, and he has worked on more than 280 productions, including operas, musicals and opera video. He has also worked on *West Side Story* and Baz Luhrman's production of *Midsummer Night's Dream* at the Edinburgh Festival.

We were nominated for Best Performance by a Leading Actor in a Musical, which was won by Lou Diamond Phillips. His credits include *Hamlet* and *Faustus*, but he is probably best known for his role as Richie Valens in the movie *La Bamba*. Joohee Choi was nominated for Best Performance by a Featured Actress in a Musical. The operatic roles included the *Marriage of Figaro* and *L'Elisir d'Amore*.

We were also nominated for Best Direction of a Musical. Christopher Renshaw has directed many hit revivals, including *Oklahoma* and *Hello, Dolly!*, and in the United Kingdom as well as *South Pacific* for Australia and Asia. He has directed operas all over the world, including *Eugene Onegin*, *Aida* and *Norma*.

In addition to those Tony Awards, the awards won by *The King and I* include three others. The Outer Critics Circle Awards are given by an organisation of writers in the New York theatre who write for out-of-town newspapers, other national publications and other media beyond Broadway itself. Eight nominations were received. Awards were won in the category of outstanding design, which includes: scenic design; costume design; and lighting design. In scenic design we can thank Brian Thomson for his excellent work; in costume design, Roger Kirk; and in lighting design, Nigel Levings. The award for outstanding debut of an actor went to Lou Diamond Phillips.

The second category to which I referred in my opening remarks is the FANY (Friends of New York Theatre) Awards. We received one award for outstanding costume design, again won by Roger Kirk. The third category is the Drama Desk Awards. These people are critics and theatre writers from many of the US publications including *Theatre Week* and *Back Stage*. Those awards were for: Musical Revival; Sets in a Musical (won by Brian Thomson); Costumes (won by Roger Kirk); and Director of a Musical (won by Christopher Renshaw).

We not only have those outstanding Tony Awards which were announced recently with great fanfare but those others which I have just mentioned. Let us look at those Tony

Awards, which include the Best Revival of a Musical—producers. That includes US producers Dodger Productions as well as our Adelaide Festival Centre Trust and John Frost, who was born in Adelaide but is now a Sydney-based producer. The Best Performance by a Leading Actress in a Musical went to Donna Murphy who received this year's award for her portrayal of Anna in *The King and I*. She had already received a Tony Award and a Drama Desk Award in 1994 for her portrayal of Fosca in Sondheim's *Passion*. Her Broadway credits include: *They're Playing our Song*, *The Human Comedy*, and *The Mystery of Edwin Drood*.

The next prize that we won was that of Best Scenic Design as a result of Brian Thomson's efforts. His credits include: *The Rocky Horror Show* (for Broadway and screen); *Jesus Christ Superstar*; *South Pacific*; and *Hello Dolly* in Australia as well as many productions for the Sydney Theatre Company and the Sydney Opera House. Roger Kirk won the award for Best Costume Design. Roger comes from Sydney and is one of Australia's foremost designers. His musical credits include: *The King and I*, *South Pacific*, *Aspects of Love*, and *West Side Story*.

We need to take off our hats to those people and, in my judgment, to applaud them loudly and let the world know that we are about excellence. It is not just excellence in things that are related purely and simply to producing food and building better bridges, railways, roads and buildings in which we either live or work. It is not only about excellence in R&D and discovering new things and inventing new ways of doing things that are more efficient, profitable and less polluting for the environment. It is not only about excellence in cleaning up our environment but about excellence in all our pursuits, in developing and expanding the dimensions of our culture that give a richness to our lives and diversity to the kind of people who live in our midst and enjoy life with us and in consequence of which we are all the better for it. For a population of a mere 1.7 million or thereabouts, in my judgment that is quite outstanding.

I commend this motion to all members. It enables us in this special area to acknowledge the excellence that has been achieved in our theatrical productions by our own local Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, the work that it has done, and the way in which it is now recognised elsewhere in the world for that work.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

BUSINESSWOMAN OF THE YEAR

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I move:

That this House congratulates South Australian Businesswoman of the Year, Mrs Pauline Rooney of Rooney's First National, and the winners of the four categories, namely, Private Sector Employing Over 100 Employees, Ms Pamela Lee, Business Analyst and Strategic Planning Facilitator for SGIC; the Public Sector, Ms Virginia Battye, Director, Para Institute of TAFE SA; Private Sector Company Employing Under 100 Employees, Dr Rosemary Brooks, St Ann's College Inc.; and all the finalists in each of the categories; and, further, commends Telstra and the category sponsors ANZ Bank, Qantas, Ausindustry and Yellow Pages for the invaluable contribution they make to the advancement of our knowledge of the outstanding contribution being made by women, not only to business and community advancement, but also to the improvement of prosperity in South Australia.

The motion draws attention to and details the outstanding contribution made by businesswomen to our community, the way in which that is recognised in the South Australian Businesswoman of the Year competition, and acknowledges

the efforts of Mrs Pauline Rooney of Rooney's First National who was the overall winner. I also commend the companies which make it possible, Telstra being the overall sponsor, and the category sponsors ANZ Bank, Qantas, Ausindustry and Yellow Pages for what they contribute. Without their invaluable contributions there would not be a competition. Therefore, it is important that we should acknowledge the role played by sponsors in enabling us to identify and applaud the efforts of outstanding members of the community in which we live. In this instance, they are the outstanding businesswomen in our community. They are outstanding not only because of what they have achieved, but because, in the process of achieving it, they make an enormous contribution to the expansion of available product in the form of goods and services in the economy, and they do it with excellence.

It is our role as a Government, and it should be our role as a Parliament, to reward excellence by acknowledging it wherever we find it. Indeed, we ought to do more than that: we ought to seek it out and, in the process, encourage each individual to achieve their best in the things that they feel most comfortable about and enjoy doing whether in their work or recreational lives.

At the moment we are all delighted with the efforts which are being made by members of our community at the Olympic Games. The businesswomen who have entered the Businesswoman of the Year competition and the thousands of women who work in businesses of all kinds and who are setting out to do their best with the rigour and determination that they must apply to their task are at least as beneficial in consequence and challenging in prospect as the efforts that athletes have to make to get into the finals of the Olympic Games, let alone win a medal.

I should point out what Telstra, as the sponsor on our behalf, is looking for when we set out to discover the best businesswoman of the year in each of the States and Territories and nationally. I commend to all members the fact that Sue Vardon won that award last year. She is outstanding in what she has done in Corrections one way or another. Whether we agree or disagree with her philosophical views about life in general or the way in which she approaches her work, there is no question but that she does it with diligence, rigour, determination and great energy. 'Rigour' is a word which is not well understood. It implies doing things which are rationally based on an accurate and valid analysis of factual information in making decisions about what needs to be done and in what order and what priority should be given to the inter-related efforts of those things which can be and are done in any given timeframe to achieve a particular goal. Therefore, we look for a woman with initiative and talent who is making a significant contribution in this way to her company or organisation and to the wider community.

Women should therefore be demonstrating significant achievements and skills in at least five of the following categories: effective communications and interpersonal skills; improving business performance or improving workplace performance; implementing or managing financial decisions; motivating and encouraging other women's careers; pursuing personal development and success; showing that they have a proven record in management and decision making; demonstrating that they have been implementing quality management procedures; and being involved in community activities. Of course, last year's winner is not eligible to be nominated again until after 1998 when it is possible to assess what they have done in those three years.

There are, as I said, several categories. There is the business owner's category, sponsored by the ANZ, which provides a VISA pay card with \$2 000 credit and, for the national winner, a VISA pay card with \$4 000 credit. In the private sector company category, with fewer than 100 employees, the prize for the winner is \$2 000 from Ausindustry for professional development programs or \$4 000 for the national winner. The private sector category with over 100 employees is sponsored by Qantas with \$2 000 worth of Qantas travel or \$4 000 of Qantas travel for the national winner. In the public sector category—that is, Government agencies—Yellow Pages will give \$2 000 towards personal business systems, or \$4 000 to the national winner of that section. In all categories, the overall Telstra Business Woman of the Year will also receive one night's accommodation courtesy of Telstra and travel to and from Melbourne for the finals with Qantas. They receive a number of other benefits.

The finalists in the business owner's category were as follows: Mary Costalos, the Presidential Director of Nutrimetics International; Elspeth Radford, Director of Saltbush Clothing Company, an outstanding clothing company indeed; Dr Judy Ford, Managing Director of Genetic Consulting and Testing Pty. Ltd.; Mary Silins, Managing Director of Laserline Supplies; Rosemary Darling, Managing Director of SAIF; Dianne McCann, Managing Director of Accelerated Business Pty. Ltd.; Barbara Derham of the Foreshore Motor Inn; Pauline Rooney of Rooney's First National; Joh Graney of Joh Graney First National Real Estate; and Deborah Miller, Managing Director of Varnet Australia Pty. Ltd. As we know, the winner of that section in South Australia, Pauline Rooney, went on to become the overall winner.

The public sector and Government finalists were: Judith McCann, who is the CEO of the South Australian Film Corporation; Christa Christaki, who is the Manager of the Community Relations Office in the Department of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs; Virginia Pattingale, who is an executive officer in the Eastern Enterprise Development Agency; Terri Whiting, who is from Commonwealth Department of Administrative Services and who is the Regional Manager for South Australia and Western Australia; Karin Puels, who is the General Manager of Foundation SA; Cathy Tunks, who is the Manager of the Employment Division in the Department for Employment, Training and Further Education and Training; Virginia Battye, who is the Director of the Para Institute of TAFE and who went on to win this section; and Janet Binder, who is the Manager of Organisational Development, City of Marion. I have known Virginia Battye for well over 30 years, and as the present Director of the Para Institute of TAFE she won in the public sector category.

Mr Venning: She used to live at Crystal Brook.

Mr LEWIS: And she was a prominent member of Rural Youth and I knew her brother at Urrbrae. Her career spans more than 20 years in TAFE and she was the first woman president of TAFE Staff Association in SAIT and the first woman to be appointed as a director within the Central Office of the Department for Employment, Training and Further Education.

Mr Venning: Never married! What a waste!

Mr LEWIS: Well, you might well say that, but you cannot have it all. I guess the children that never were will never know and the husband who does not exist will not know what he has missed out on. Notwithstanding that, I see her as an outstanding woman indeed.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I acknowledge the calls of 'Hear, hear!' from not only the member for Custance but also the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education who is justifiably proud of the people he employs, especially given the level of excellence they achieve, which is illustrated by Virginia's accomplishments in this instance. In the Private Sector category With More Than 100 employees, the finalists were: Dagmar Egan, who is the State Manager of Aspect Computing; Kathy Grieve, who is the Parent Education Coordinator of Calvary Hospital; and Pamela Lee, who is the Business Analyst and Strategic Planning Facilitator for SGIC. Pamela, as most members may know, went on to win in that category. As I said, she is the Business Analyst and Strategic Planning Facilitator. That position requires a great deal of rigour in the work which is involved. I will not bore members with what I mean by that—I have already defined what 'rigour' means—but she has to analyse risk in financial matters, understand actuarial reports, indeed contribute to their development and, on making those assessments, further, make judgments about what has to be done and recommendations in the business framework for SGIC.

In the private sector of less than 100 employees, the small businesses, we had a communications public relation manager of the Australian Hotels Association, Margo McGregor as a finalist, as well as Francene O'Connor, Business Development Manager of the RA&HS Society. I would like to wax eloquent about all these women, but time just will not allow me. Darrilyn Wood, who is the General Manager of Life Leisure Events Management Task; Philippa Menses, who is the Director of the National Trust; Cherie Panas, who is the Managing Director of Pro Paint 'n Panel; and Dr Rosemary Brooks, who is the principal of St Ann's College and who won that section.

So, overall a wide range of people have demonstrated that they have incredibly high competence. In the final analysis, Mrs Pauline Rooney was the winner. She is from the Riverland based real estate agency of the same name and is co-principal of that agency, which is the largest privately owned real estate company in South Australia. It is based at Berri, with five offices located throughout the Riverland, not only at Berri but also at Renmark, Loxton, Barmera and Waikerie. She is immediate past President (in other parts of her life) of the Real Estate Institute of South Australia and the first woman to be appointed as National Chairman of First National—one of Australia's largest and most successful real estate groups. Congratulations Pauline!

Debate adjourned.

INFORMATION TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I move:

That this House commends the Government and the Premier for the vision of a new era of excellence, especially in IT&T and applauds the work of the University of Adelaide Electronic Engineering Department of the Engineering Faculty on the one hand, and Mr Ralph Tobias and representatives of Chonnam and other Korean Universities along with ANNAM on the other, for concluding their agreement to produce leading edge technology to make the world's first mobile video phone utilising Gallium Arsenide and asymmetrical chip design technology; and further, refers the matter of the project to the Department of Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development and the Minister for Infrastructure to investigate and report on this project about its impact on the development of a critical mass in the IT&T and IM3 professions and associated technologies and possible benefits:cost to the South

Australian economy in the context of the Government's IT&T industry development policy before 1 October 1996.

I draw the attention of the House to and seek members support for what is happening in general in information telecommunications and technology in South Australia by referring to a particular instance of how we are succeeding in that endeavour, mapped out for us by our Premier shortly after he came to office. He made, in no uncertain terms, a strong commitment to the development of IT&T.

In this instance we find that we are leading the world in this most exciting area of information telecommunications and technology applications in our community. It is referred to as IMMMPC, which means interactive mobile multi-media personnel communications. On an earlier occasion I mentioned to the House that these personal communicators are being developed here in South Australia as a result of the arrangement that has been made between the Adelaide Electronic Engineering Department of the Engineering Faculty of the University of Adelaide on the one hand and ANNAM Computers and Chonnam University from Korea on the other. The facilitator in bringing all this together—I will set my wife and I quite separate and apart from all this—is Ralph Tobias. I acknowledge the enormous efforts and wisdom displayed by him in the negotiating and facilitating skills which he used to bring these parties together and conclude their agreement to produce this leading edge technology to make the world's very first mobile video telephone.

It is not just a mobile telephone but a mobile video phone which enables you to dial the number of another person who has in front of them a similar piece of technology, or an ordinary desk top telephone or another mobile with a small television screen on it. You point the lens aperture on your mobile phone at whatever it is you wish to discuss with the party you are calling and, as you speak, what you are pointing your mobile telephone at is transmitted like a television signal to the screen on the other mobile phone on the other side of the world. So, it is a mobile video phone, and it weighs no more than the current generation of mobile telephones (I note that the member for Elder, the Ministers at the bench and the Opposition have mobile phones. They are something less than 7 inches long, a couple of inches wide and less than an inch thick). That is what we are talking about, made possible by asymmetrical circuitry design in gallium arsenide chip technology.

We are all excited about the pentium computer presently at the leading edge of consumer product, but we are yet to get the benefits of the 256 bit chip, which many members have seen on my tie clip over the past few months. That is to be installed into personal computing, but they are all symmetrical design technologies. The asymmetrical design in circuitry and chip manufacture using gallium arsenide is what will make this miniaturisation possible.

This is a mobile video phone which, to my mind, represents the ultimate in the modern derivations of the Dick Tracy type technology that I am sure many members in the Chamber will remember seeing in the comic strip of that name some time in their childhood. Its significance is that the caller can simply point their mobile telephone at anything they are trying to describe to someone and it will digitise the image and transmit it to the other party wherever they may be in the world, and it will appear on the screen on the mobile telephone or at the desk of the other party. It is a more powerful concept than desktop video phones, which provide

the caller with the opportunity only of seeing the face of the other party. There are many other commercially attractive applications of the mobile video concept, such as mobile teleworking and mobile telemedicine.

Imagine for a moment the benefits that will have. Via satellite, it will be possible for somebody injured on, say, Heard Island, where there is no doctor, to be treated by a surgeon based in Adelaide, London, Tokyo or anywhere, if the injured person or someone with them simply dials up the number of the person to whom they wish to speak at the other end—the surgeon—and then, in the course of describing what has happened and the injuries as they see them, illustrates those injuries on the screen. Then, the surgeon can simply say, 'Do this and let me watch you do it; go ahead.' He may tell them, 'Hey, do not do it that way: follow my instructions.' That will have incredible benefit not only in saving lives but also in fixing problems where there is mechanical breakdown of a vital piece of equipment in some remote location. Where there is no-one immediately present who can fix the piece of equipment, they can nonetheless buy this satellite connection of the technology I am describing and get access to a person who can tell them exactly what to do after fault diagnosis has been completed.

In addition, there is mobile tele-conferencing and literally mobile tele-education. To my mind, it is amazing. We can get a clearer understanding of this concept of interactive multi-media personal communication by considering three option categories. As to mobile tele-banking, there is no question that forgeries are just a thing of the past with this technology. You will be able to satisfy the bank and the bank's computer that you are who you claim to be. Mobile tele-banking, in my judgment, will replace all types of credit cards. When you enter your PIN in a particular secure mode through the keyboard, you will be able to do your transaction. You will get your final bank balance, if you want it, and in any case you can immediately check anything you want about your records on your display without it being possible for anyone else to know anything about it. You cannot scan the transmissions from one of these units and expect to be able to pick it up and find out who is asking what about whom or which.

The great benefits that will then come from mobile timekeeping include always being able to see the time regardless of where you are on the surface of the earth in the corner of your screen. It will be the time at that location and it will be automatically adjusted through the satellite technology for any change there may be for daylight saving in that given location. That is acknowledging that the same computing power as makes the communications possible will be used to hook into the geo positioning systems (GPS) that are available to let you know exactly where you are. You will know where you are standing on the surface of the earth—literally—and be able to tell anyone anywhere at any time of the day where that is.

The greater benefit is that, if you think you are lost, all you will have to do is dial up that service and it will not only tell you exactly where you are in terms of latitude and longitude but it will give you the name of the nearest street or carriage-way on which you are standing in a city or the roadway on which you are standing out in the country, whether it be a highway, a freeway or whatever, and tell you how far it is and in which direction to the nearest intersection with what other carriageway, roadway or substantial public feature you are located near.

To my mind, we are at the beginning of an exciting era in our development and the interactive personal navigation that

I have referred to will require people to simply press the locate button on the keyboard and get that information. It becomes a smart hand-held global positioning system. It is very clever indeed and we in South Australia are at the very cutting edge of the development of this technology in our University of Adelaide. We are doing that collaboratively with ANAM Computer Company in Korea, Chonam University and other Korean universities, where excellence in chip manufacture has shifted across the Pacific from Silicone Valley right through the Japanese-Taiwan axis into Korea. Because we do not have the critical mass of market or population size in Adelaide, we have not been able to develop to that extent commercially, but we do have the academic expertise, brilliance and commitment to excellence in our universities, particularly here in our University of Adelaide. I believe we should acknowledge the strong track record in the industrial collaboration arena for commercialisation, notably the Britax Rainsford and ISD work that was done by CHiPTEC here in Adelaide. They are contributors to this digital gallium arsenide circuit design with which they have worked.

We need to acknowledge what Derek Abbott, Neil Burgess (the cryptographic and video compression technology expert, who is the project leader), Doug Gray in radio frequency technology, Michael Leibel (the asynchronous design technology expert) and Andrew Parfitt (the radio frequency technology expert) will achieve for the benefit of humanity from within the precincts of the Adelaide University as a consequence of this outstanding contracted arrangement between these collaborating elements made available to all of us around the world. Full credit to all of them. I commend the motion to the House as the means by which we can applaud what they are doing and encourage others to follow in the same pathway using the same commitment to excellence as their guiding underlying value.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): I move:

That this House endorses the recommendations made to the Government by the Youth Unemployment Task Force released by the Premier on 11 July 1996 and recognising the causes and long-term development of the same, supports full community consultation and then on the basis of this consultation, supports the implementation of the recommendations via policy and resources to improve the employment prospects for the youth of South Australia.

The youth employment task force was appointed by the Premier in November 1995 in conjunction with the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, and I wish to place on record thanks to all those committee members who gave up considerable time and effort to put forward this report.

The committee was asked to identify the underlying causes of youth unemployment in South Australia, assess the reasons why youth unemployment in South Australia appears to be higher than in other States even though our overall unemployment is similar, document and appraise existing Commonwealth and State youth employment and training initiatives in South Australia, and identify successful interstate and international approaches to youth unemployment.

As of February 1996, the number of 15 to 20 year olds registered at the DSS in the various regions were as follows: southern metropolitan area, 3 269; eastern metropolitan area,

2 235; western metropolitan area, 3 029; and northern metropolitan area, 3 064. Full-time employment expressed for all age groups has increased by 8 per cent since 1970, but full-time employment for 15 to 19 year olds has decreased 74 per cent since 1970. There has been a movement of 5.6 per cent of young males to 48.9 per cent from full-time to part-time work, and the corresponding figure for females is 5.6 per cent to 67.6 per cent since 1970.

The high unemployment level for young South Australians is a shared responsibility among State and Federal Governments, local government, the business community, the unions and the individuals themselves. State and Federal Governments have a key role to play in setting a positive climate to encourage business expansion and export, to encourage growth in the economy and thus the job market, and to set an example by their own microeconomic reforms. Businesses share in the responsibility by being willing and able to train. Local government has a key role to play, especially through regional and metropolitan development boards. Small business, in particular, will play a major role in the solution, with 149 000 small retailers as potential employers. Currently, 73 900 of those are non-employers.

There is a fundamental requirement for acceptance of changed expectation of the young unemployed in both the wage they expect to receive as comparatively non-productive, untrained new employees and the expectation of the level at which they might begin work in any enterprise. We will need a more realistic approach to both these issues to reach a solution. Retailing employs more than 15 000 of the 15 to 20 year olds, followed by manufacturing at 6 000 and hospitality at 4 000. Throughout Australia, only 1.1 per cent of 15 to 19 year olds are self-employed.

Youth unemployment is higher in Adelaide compared with the regions of South Australia, and there is a stark difference between the level of male unemployed in Adelaide and those in regional South Australia. Slow economic growth has meant that labour demands have not kept up with the labour supply. Inappropriate education and training have provided mismatches of skills and needs. One of the strengths of this committee's report is that it concentrated largely on talking to business. Indeed, it is businesses that will employ, and hence reduce the unemployment levels. According to the brief, the committee had to identify the reasons why businesses were not employing and ask what they wanted changed.

Comments from the business sector are as follows: young people need to be competent for work; and they need to be equipped with life skills, literacy and numeracy skills and practical day-to-day skills of communication and problem solving and be technology wise. Employers believe that merit measures need to be included in the assessment of money used in preparing young people for the job market, and believe that those who have been prepared to do more to become 'job ready' should have easier access to public subsidy schemes.

The business sector believes that wage subsidy programs should not be expanded, but should be balanced by introducing training wages. The basis of this comment is two-fold: first, it should not be assumed that all long-term unemployed people have an equal desire to work, and therefore a merit principle rather than a welfare principle should apply; and, secondly, that a training wage indicates that a young person is untrained, less productive and being supported to learn and improve themselves in that line of work. A young person becomes more employable and is able to compete more adequately for adult positions, and have salaries topped up by

the Government where the training wage is insufficient. The thrust is then away from the subsidy emphasis and towards a wage emphasis.

It has also been suggested that the level of unemployment benefits should be examined in comparison to the figure being paid for wages, and that low income workers would benefit from a range of concessions given to the unemployed, such as the health care card, while training is occurring.

Businesses indicated that they experienced greater risk in employing young people with few references and little experience who are competing with adults on similar wages. Young people have no proven work skills, so it becomes a question of whom they know if they are successful in getting work. Many businesses refer to the inadequacy of school-based programs, a lack of work ethic, and a poor school-to-work transition.

The education system needs to mould the young person's expectation of unrealistic levels at the first job and needs to concentrate on the 'getting a start somewhere' attitude. One recommendation is to raise the school leaving age incrementally to 17 years by the year 2000. If members think carefully, I am sure they could think of an example of a 15 year old whom they know who has left school in year 9. This has come about because of the extra time spent in the R2 and primary school. Year 9, 15 year olds will have very little chance of finding work. The committee has agreed that raising the school age alone is not a solution, but needs to be linked to nationally accredited vocational education programs within schools, focusing on local industry and business content, building up both an awareness of the work types available and the skills base in those areas.

Young people need clear and accurate career information and an opportunity to shop around, while usually financially secure at home, to allow them to develop personal links and networks at that time. In turn, businesses need to make work experience more rewarding and more relevant. The program needs to be regimented to a syllabus standard with assessments. The task force further recommends support of job search schemes, as are taking place at Christies Beach, Morphett Vale and Willunga High Schools, to catch those young people who leave school, either before aged 15 or around the 15 year age group. Also, the curriculum needs to be made more relevant to those students.

The second area that the business sector identified as preventing further employment was the burden on employers. Businesses claim that compulsory superannuation, lack of a training wage, fear of boom-bust Government policies, unfair dismissal laws, equal opportunity laws, sexual harassment laws and payroll tax are all disincentives to further employment. Businesses have recognised that sustainable economic growth is the key to employment. Any further taxes on businesses would be a disincentive, as would a jobs levy. The positive push from the business sector were improved net exports, growth and investment.

There was some argument that the \$9.67 billion spent on income support and labour programs would have been more beneficially spent on export enhancement and investment programs. There was also argument that unemployment could support people to work for the dole doing community service work and major infrastructure work, such as railways and pipelines. Areas of the State have a cost disadvantage for business, so there are minimum wage disadvantages compared with other localities. Firms need to be able to organise their work in a more productive and flexible way, requiring

that the work force have an ability to negotiate on a one to one basis with their employer.

In relation to payroll tax, the task force has recommended that the gradual introduction of the tax should occur for young employees because they are not immediately fully productive, and that needs to be reflected in the lower salary. Changes made to the State's industrial relations legislation have eased some impediments. However, the task force has recommended increased numbers of traineeships and increased number of industries participating therein. Schemes such as the Southern Regions Skill and Enterprise Centre at Lonsdale, which has operated since 1993 and which is a Federal-State and industry facility, provides world-class facilities for training in computers, welding and metal fabrication and increases dramatically skilled workers for industry or apprenticeships.

KickStart has proved to be one of the most effective employment and training programs run in Australia, with an employment outcome of 70 per cent. Brokerage schemes are recommended for expansion where group training schemes offer skills and transition to work programs. Brokers can effectively break down the red tape for the participating companies and, in turn, have skilled workers prepared for their work place.

On-costs for business in employing workers is one of the major deterrents. Many businesses said that it is too expensive to employ, particularly the large number of small businesses that will play a vital role in overcoming the unemployment level. A 21 year old employee incurs on-costs of 28.8 per cent for WorkCover, superannuation, payroll tax (if it is paid) and leave loading (which is a particular burden for small enterprises).

In relation to business, it is recommended that the availability of training wage provisions and probationary periods should be extended for many of the reasons that I raised earlier. The constant availability of Government funds to subsidise short-term work placements decreases the unemployment numbers temporarily but does nothing to improve full-time work. All that happens is that business becomes dependent on the Government for short-term subsidies. So many different schemes are available that it is questionable whether businesses have any idea about all of them, and very little accountability is made to the outcomes.

It is recommended that moneys be redistributed to regional growth and stimulation of local community brokerage schemes and improved infrastructure and job creation in growth areas of information technology, horticulture, hospitality, tourism and new industries in areas experiencing the greatest youth numbers and unemployment. Devolution of decision making about funding particular work programs to the local level has been seen as very useful. It was suggested that unfair dismissal laws have a 12 months moratorium after employing a new young person, or a system of dismissal which needed to be simplified in the first 12 months.

Flexibility is important in the quick movement of funds to areas of need. Young people should not have to wait 12 months to qualify. It is necessary for us to lobby DEET to change the eligibility criteria. A restructuring of the Department of Social Security funding for job seekers was suggested to financially reward jobless through each phase. Many young people have had bad experiences with CES and try to avoid it, so the brokerage scheme was suggested as being more user friendly. Employment program funds can be

pooled in the brokerage system to pay the salaries of those who register.

The CES has been accused of discouraging young people from accepting short contracts because of the added paperwork. Industry networking and clustering is encouraged, especially in areas of potential industry growth. The task force was particularly critical of many of the Federal Labor market programs and strongly suggests that money should be allocated to an outcome target against which the success of the program is measured. It was also stressed, however, that the Government must continue those programs that have been successful.

In summary, the current unemployment levels are unacceptable and have been building up for many years. Unemployment has a demoralising effect on the individual, the economic consequence of lost production and decreased demand, and long-term social consequences. The task force wants wide public consultation on the recommendations, and I encourage all sections of the community to implement the areas applicable to them. I look forward to the real work of implementing the recommendations as soon as possible. Finally, it must be remembered by young people that there is a future. If Federal, State and local government and businesses work together we will achieve a very positive outcome for the youth of South Australia.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I wish to comment on the release of the Youth Employment Task Force report. Members will not be surprised to hear me say, as I have been saying quite often and quite publicly, that I, particularly, was extremely disappointed in the Premier's long-awaited Youth Employment Task Force report because, for all the hype and all the build up that was given to that report, it contains very little evidence of any real commitment to addressing South Australia's youth unemployment problem. The Premier very publicly promised that there would be special budget provisions for 'major new initiatives to tackle youth unemployment'. The report certainly does not contain any of those.

The report contains much description of the problem but, given the Premier's statements that his Government will not pick up any funding for any of the labour market programs that have been cut by the Federal Government, I ask the question: just how does he plan to get young unemployed people into work? I ask that question within the context of this basic fact: that, despite all the rhetoric, all the words about creation of jobs for young people and commitment to young people, the basic fact remains that in this State in December 1993 when the Liberal Government came to office we had a youth unemployment rate of 36.9 per cent; today the latest figures show that in June 1996 the youth unemployment rate is 37 per cent, higher than the level when the Liberals took office 2½ years ago.

Ironically, the report devotes quite a lot of space to a very long list of federally funded labour market programs, the majority of which have been cut by the Federal Government. The Landcare Environment Action program (LEAP); the Jobskill program and the New Work Opportunities program have all had their funding cut by 80 per cent. The Skillshare program and the New Enterprise Incentive program have had their funding reduced by 33 per cent. Jobtrain and the Special Intervention program (SIP) have been cut by 50 per cent. These are all programs cut by the Federal Government but featuring prominently in the Youth Employment Task Force's report.

Premier Brown has been embarrassed by the Opposition's revealing that important funding commitments that were in the original task force draft report were removed from the final report. The Leader of the Opposition revealed that earlier drafts of the report included several key recommendations which would have gone a long way toward actually doing something about youth unemployment in this State but which were taken out before the printing of the final report. These included recommendations such as the establishment of a central fund to assist in improving school retention rates; the creation of youth employment demonstration projects; the establishment of a Government subsidy scheme to assist in the raising of venture capital; and the inclusion in Government contracts, such as the EDS and the water contracts, of clauses identifying short and medium term youth employment strategies.

They are good ideals, good things to aim for, but recommendations that were cut by the Government from its report. The report was long overdue. It was built up by the Premier, who took ownership of the issue. He said that it was the most important issue that his Government would tackle—and where are all the recommendations of substance? They were dropped by the Premier. Of course, when asked by the Opposition why this was the case, the Premier said that he had not had anything to do with those changes and that it was all up to the task force. He quickly tried to blame somebody else yet again. He said:

I did not sit on the task force, so I cannot answer for it.

I remind the House that these are the long awaited recommendations of the Premier's task force on which he built up so much expectation within the community, within the business community and amongst young people of the State, all of whom are disappointed with the outcome of the Government's task force.

Is there any inconsistency in that approach? Given the State Government's record in slashing funding for TAFE and schools, it has to be said that it is time for the Brown Government to take some responsibility for governing this State and for this most critical, important and tragic youth unemployment problem. I note that one of the key recommendations—in fact, it was the only recommendation that featured prominently in the media reporting of the report—was support for the Opposition's call to raise the school leaving age. Indeed, we all know that a Bill has been introduced by the shadow Education Minister in the Upper House to raise the school leaving age, the age at which young people leave school or TAFE, to 16 years. I trust that the Government will support that move. In light of comments by the education Minister in opposing such a move, it will be interesting to see whether the Government does move to implement that important concept.

As I said, any plans that are to be addressed on behalf of young jobless people have been dealt a very severe blow by what has already been announced by the Federal Government in cuts to funding for labour market programs—almost every single labour market program—and the indication of more cuts to come in the August Federal budget. What was the response of the State Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education to all the calls by the Opposition to take a strong stance and to tell the Federal Government that cuts to labour markets programs, universities and so on are not acceptable? All the Minister could say was that it was not his role to complain to the Federal Government and that people should take their queries directly to that area. It took him

weeks and he had to be dragged kicking and screaming before he would say anything at all in protest to the Federal Government. That is a disgrace by a Minister responsible for employment in a State which has such a high youth unemployment rates.

What has been the Federal Government's response to the crisis we have and the lack of effort we make in training and further education for our young people? The Prime Minister's response is to give up and to decide that it is okay to cut out all this funding from training programs and, instead, to import skilled labour through an expansion of immigration laws. That is his only response.

My final point should shame the Government. A report commissioned by the Government has on the front cover of one of the two documents of that report, a statement—a single quote—which says, 'We can't have a life without working.' How insensitive to send such a message of condemnation to the unemployed young people of this State.

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

Mr BASS secured the adjournment of the debate.

DIESEL FUEL REBATE

Mr VENNING (Custance): I move:

That this House is opposed to the possible removal by the Federal Government of the national diesel fuel rebate scheme.

The national diesel fuel rebate scheme affects South Australia in many ways, particularly our primary industries which include farming and mining, fishing and forestry. The total amount returned to these industries after buying their fuel is approximately \$75 million, which includes \$36 million for agriculture and \$26 million for mining. As we heard the Minister say yesterday in this House during Question Time, the Commonwealth Government is considering the abolition of the diesel fuel rebate scheme for the mining and farming sectors. That concerns me greatly. I only hope that these rumours that we are hearing are just that: rumours. I could not think of anything that would be more damaging if that occurred right now.

As at June 1996, the diesel fuel rebate for primary industry was 31.5¢ per litre. The diesel fuel rebate is not intended to be a subsidy for primary industry. One of the major reasons for the diesel excise it is to fund public road expenditure. The rebate for mining applies as a concession for the use of diesel on off-road machinery. It includes generators for the generating of electricity in remote areas. So, that is a legitimate means of recognising that diesel fuel used on mine sites should not incur this tax, especially in respect of the generation of electricity. I do not need to remind members what the mining industry in South Australia contributes to the State economy, but I will.

I remind the House that approximately 12 per cent of our Gross State Product is earned from mining. Mining is responsible for 46 000 jobs in South Australia or 7.9 per cent of total State employment, and that is rising rapidly: by the end of the year it will be nearly 10 per cent, particularly when the Western Mining venture takes place. Mining provides a wages income of \$1.1 billion (8.7 per cent of the State's wages and salary income). It provides \$2 million in exploration and mining leases; \$6.8 million in payroll tax; \$77.9 million in petroleum franchises; and \$1.9 million in survey services. The mining industry in Australia also contributes in this Australia-wide tax: 6.4 per cent of national GDP; 63 per cent of commodity exports; 50 per cent of Australia's merchandise exports (\$30 billion); \$8 billion from mining products, which are counted as manufacturers; and 40 per cent of Australia's total exports of goods and services.

The diesel excise is currently rebated, that is, returned to the user, by the Commonwealth Government under the following categories: category 1, mining operations; categories 2 to 6, other (power for residential requirements, hospital or nursing care, homes for the aged); category 7, agriculture; category 8, fishing; and category 9, forestry. I refer to a table which lists the rebates paid from the Commonwealth Government's Australian Customs Service (ACS) to South Australian organisations and individuals for diesel fuel rebate claims (categories of mining and power generation only). I seek leave to have this purely statistical table inserted in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Year	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95
Category 1. No. of mining rebate claims	887	893	931	965
Outlays	\$18 018 999	\$19 089 580	\$20 240 778	\$30 302 340
Category 2-6. No. of power generation rebate claims	565	564	552	490
Outlays	\$608 469	\$599 414	\$668 357	\$561 487
Total outlays for all categories	\$55 959 041	\$56 427 167	\$62 887 100	\$80 560 409

Mr VENNING: The outlays show that over \$30 million (1994-95) of total outlays of \$80.5 million for all categories of claims were provided to the mining industry (and \$560 000 in rebates for domestic power generation). There were changes to clauses in the eligibility of mining claims for 1995-96 (from 1 July 1995 quarrying claims were ruled out), but ACS has indicated that outlays of a similar magnitude to 1994-95 are expected.

The South Australian Exploration Initiative (SAEI), which has been so successful and which was launched in 1992, involves a \$20 million investment by the State Government on airborne geophysical surveying, bedrock identification and deep drilling along with the preparation of geological

databases. I was privileged to be at Santos last Friday where we saw deep drilling. The well that we observed was down to 10 000 feet, which is very deep. However, many of the areas identified by the SAEI are in remote parts of the State. Therefore, benefits from the State's expenditure will remain dependent on the Commonwealth Government's retaining existing commitments, particularly via this excise.

An example of the impacts of changes to the diesel fuel rebate scheme on regional areas of South Australia are the opal field townships, as the member for Ridley will be aware. In 1994-95 more than \$500 000 in outlays was provided for rebates for diesel fuel to operators in the opal fields of Coober Pedy. Abolition of the scheme will heavily impact on those

operators and rural townships, such as Coober Pedy, associated with mining operations. In large operations, such as Olympic Dam, BHP and ETSA Leigh Creek, there will be a loss of international competitiveness for the key export industries as those operators will be unable to pass on costs, and changes to the rebate will have to be absorbed.

I now move to the farming industry, with which I am very familiar. In 1994-95 South Australian farmers used an estimated 122 million litres of distillate valued at approximately \$80 million directly on farm production. An estimated further 12 million litres were used on-road in farm trucks and other diesel-powered vehicles. Therefore, a total of \$38 million was recovered in rebates for on-farm use. That is a massive amount when worked out per unit per capita in relation to South Australian farmers.

In addition, on average, an estimated 10 per cent of farm production costs are associated with getting produce to market by road transport. As a result of the rebate scheme, which allows farmers to claim back Federal excise paid on distillate used on-farm, increases in excise do not directly translate into on-farm costs. However, the costs of transporting farm inputs to the farm and produce to markets are not similarly protected. They pay the full on-road costs, as they should.

Several taxation principles are involved. Most major agricultural exporting nations provide fuel tax exemption for farm production, so a unilateral reduction of the excise rebate in Australia would severely damage the international competitiveness of the farm sector, and I am very much aware of that. Therefore, the diesel rebate is critical to the ongoing viability of agriculture, especially the cropping industries, for keeping us internationally competitive. The agricultural sector is one of our largest export earners. Any tax policy that pushes up the costs of exports adds to Australia's current account deficit and growing foreign debt.

The reduction of the rebate would represent approximately 15 per cent of the forecast net value of production of the farm sector, which is \$3.9 billion in 1995-96. A reduction of income of this magnitude could not be absorbed without producing widespread financial difficulty, business failure, disruption to the rural economy and unemployment. Particularly at this moment when our rural industries are recovering, it would really be a body blow to see a Federal Government employ this impost.

Some environmental issues are involved also. The removal of the reduction of the fuel excise rebate could be expected in turn to reduce Australia's agricultural exports, leading to an increased production of these products by rival less efficient producing countries, requiring equivalent if not greater volumes of fuel consumption. The production of greenhouse gases from the use of fossil fuels would, therefore, by this mechanism simply be exported to other countries.

This motion is consistent with the motion I will move shortly which appears next on the Notice Paper, relating to a user-pays system. It is directed at those who use the roads and those who do not, and the degree to which payment is made. I hope that the House will support this motion. I certainly do appreciate the support the Minister has given me, especially as a result of the question I asked in this House yesterday, which was probably out of order twice, although the Opposition did not object. I was pleased that the House allowed the question and the Minister was able to provide the vital statistics. Certainly now is not the time for any Federal Government to be considering taking away the fuel rebate

system that so many vital industries for this State are relying on. Our industries are rising from a period of financial stress and they must be allowed at least the next two to three years to get on their feet again. We do not need any government, State or Federal, Labor or Liberal, to provide imposts that would negate that. I hope that the House will support the motion.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I want to tell the member for Culance that we were well aware of the fact that his questions were out of order yesterday, but on a topic as important as this, we will not split hairs—although there are not all that many hairs left to split, on either my head or that of the member for Culance.

Mr Leggett: He has a bald wig!

Mr QUIRKE: Don't start that. I will support this motion. It is eminently sensible and good. For years I have listened to the cries from the wilderness of the bush. I did think that, when the member for Culance's crowd were elected in Canberra, maybe the bush would start to realise where their bread is really buttered, and it did not take very long. The number of schemes for the bush that have been cancelled by the Canberra mates of the member for Culance has been absolutely astounding. We would never have gotten away with it. We never even tried it.

We accepted the necessity for a whole range of rural assistance packages. We did that here in State politics and, above all else, it was done where it was important, at the Federal level. In fact, Bob Collins steered packages through there that gave hundreds of millions of dollars in rural assistance, and we were told that it was never enough, and they were right. It never was enough. We were told that, once the Coalition came to power, they would be increased and we would be on the road to lollipop land. Well, unfortunately, the reality did not quite match the rhetoric. In fact, in the first days of the Howard Government we saw the ending of a whole range of these packages. Then we had the gun law debate. Then we had a few other things. Mr Howard is about as sensitive to the bush and its concerns, particularly to his rural constituents, as any city person who is absolutely self-centred and says that no-one ought to get anything out there unless it can be justified.

I welcome this motion. I will go into my Caucus and support this motion because it is sensible. Let us not have any doubt about to whom this rebate and the motion are directed. This motion is directed specifically at protecting those important constituents of the member for Culance. It is not for some of the industries around Adelaide—the honourable member dressed that up. I have no quarrel with his argument—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: How many in Playford?

Mr QUIRKE: Very few. A number of people in Playford are affected, including a mate of mine who services farm equipment. He is the service manager of one of these firms. He knows the difference between when the bush is going well and when the bush is not going well, and his company is very pleased with what happened last year. He is very pleased when there is a good rural season. When I was talking to him recently, I said that I hoped that this year would be a good season as well because it has many downstream benefits, which people in the city do not understand. If this proceeds at the Federal level, it will be a very miserable slap in the face to what is arguably the most important constituency for the Coalition Parties.

I tell the member for Custance two things. First, I will support this motion in Caucus. I believe that he will get the support of the Labor Party because it has always supported these measures—members of the Labor Party never suggested getting rid of them. Secondly, the honourable member will have to do something about his Federal colleagues on this issue because, if they are ripping away the heartland bread and butter issues such as this from the bush, when the next terrible times come—for example, when the drought comes, when we have the sorts of cyclical problems with which the bush has always had to cope—I do not know whether there will be a Bob Collins giving out a few hundred million dollars. Perhaps it is not much, but it kept many people afloat. The way in which Canberra is operating now demonstrates that it does not care about the bush at all. With those few remarks, and I am sure other members will say it—

Members interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: I must say that I have now found two other persons who are packing my cases for me, and obviously they are the ones referred to in the *Bulletin* who will not miss me.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: I must say to the member for Ridley that it would be nice for either of us to have a career change in the very near future, but I must disappoint the House, because I do not think it will be me. At the end of the day, I will support this resolution in our Caucus and, when it is before the House again, I am sure that the Labor Party will do what it has always done; that is, stand up for the right position, particularly in the bush, on this question.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I commend the good sense of the member for Custance for bringing this proposition before the House and equally the member for Playford in the way in which he has supported it, although I note that his reasons appear to be a little wide of the mark, even if they achieve the right result. It needs to be remembered that fuel tax was imposed originally by the Commonwealth to give it, so it said, sufficient funds to maintain the roads network—whether that is surfaces or other things associated with it does not matter. Those funds so obtained were originally in a dedicated fund. However, for rational, efficient handling of the money so obtained, the decision was made to pay it into general revenue and an assurance was given at the time that it did not matter, that it would always be earmarked and that it would always be spent on roads. If you can trust the Feds on anything at all, you can trust them to the extent that what they say is not what they intend to do, and the reasons they give are not really the reasons they have for doing whatever it is they propose.

I have found Governments of both political persuasions over the past 30-odd years that I have been dealing with them in Canberra to be no different in that respect. Ministers are far too busy to pay sufficient attention to the recommendations being given to them by the public servants and find themselves not exactly telling lies but saying one thing and giving reasons for doing it on the basis of the recommendation they have from their senior bureaucrats only to find that down the track the direction they thought they were taking is changed by the advice of the bureaucracy and they go in a tangential direction, if not a different one altogether. This fuel tax has been no different: it goes into general revenue and is a convenient source of funds.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: No, I want Governments to be more honest about the way in which they dispose of revenue that they

have raised for explicit purposes in the first instance. They change the reasons for which they collect it and the purposes to which they apply it, and this is a classic illustration of that. This levy was intended to be collected on fuel to finance the cost of roads. It was never intended to be general revenue, but the Government has got hooked on other expenditure programs which are fuzzy, wuzzy, warm and feel good but which have nothing to do with the consumption of energy in society and the way in which any tax on it ought to be applied. No matter that we may wish to damp down demand and thereby reduce consumption of fuel—fossil fuel in particular—as a commodity so that we reduce the contribution to greenhouse gases: that is not the reason why this tax was introduced, and a dedicated tax for that purpose ought to be introduced and changed by statute and not by regulation. We want to leave that aside altogether as it is not part of the argument.

It was never intended that energy for getting work done on farms would be taxed in this way. We have never had a tax on chaff. At the time this tax was introduced we had horses as the main source of energy—beasts of burden for locomotion on farms—the engines of getting work done. There is horsepower and manpower, with a few women thrown in. Now it has changed completely. The Government is hooked on the revenue and is not prepared to forgo it. The Labor Party increased the charges and decided that it would collect it and, if you do not apply for it and get it back and get the form exactly right, you will not get it back. That is as crook as hell. A continuing exemption ought to be provided to primary producers. The means by which that can be done is already in place in Western Australia in the way in which it proceeds on this proposition.

I commend the member for Custance for his proposition in this instance. This House has to protect the interests of the industries in this State upon which the State depends, acknowledged as they were by the comments made by the member for Playford. Those industries in this instance are primary industries and there are downstream consequences for the rest of the community if we destroy their viability. There is no sound, rational, logical or even politically expedient reason for taxing the fuel used on farms to put it into general revenue, thereby destroying the viability of the farms which convert sunshine and water and the fertility of the soils into marketable product to which we can either add value or sell directly on the world market and get thereby a substantial contribution to our balance of payments. Goodness knows, we have enough problems with our balance of payments now, and anything at all we do that detracts from our ability to address that balance of payments problem in the economy has to be avoided.

The fuel rebate scheme ought to be converted into a fuel tax exemption scheme, as it used to be. That is the view I take, and any contemplation the current Government has that it is doing a favour to farmers by not putting this tax on the fuel they use is convoluted. It is muddle-headed; it is upside down. In the original context of the meaning of the words, it is political buggery, and it ought not to be taken lying down—or in any other stance. We cannot allow any Government to contemplate such a stupid tax in the end consequence to us all, regardless of whether we are farmers or anyone else in the community. It will have enormous detrimental consequences, by reducing the benefits of the multipliers in the economy which are generated by primary industry, that is, mining and agriculture, but in particular the agricultural product. I

commend the member for Culance on bringing the motion to the House and the Opposition on supporting it.

Mrs PENFOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

NATIONAL TRANSPORT CHARGES

Mr VENNING: I move:

That this House:

(a) notes that the national transport charges for heavy vehicles introduced from 1 July 1996 inherently disadvantage the agriculture industry due to the lower than average distance travelled by vehicles used in this industry;

(b) considers that a fuel only charge for heavy vehicles would remove this inequity in the charging scheme, improve cash flows and reduce administration charges for the agriculture sector and move closer to a user pays system; and

(c) requests this motion be forwarded to the National Road Transport Commission as the basis for an investigation of a fuel based charging system Australia wide.

This subject is in a similar vein as the last. I have a lot of difficulty with this as a matter of principle. I spoke on this subject when I first entered this Parliament in 1990, and again in 1991. The current state of our road infrastructure is not good, but certainly under this Government it is improving. We inherited a very serious road problem in December 1993, but I am confident that by the year 2005 we will have put our road infrastructure back to a level that we can say is acceptable. The previous Government continually cut budget allocations to roads. In 1980 the Tonkin Government put in place a specific fuel levy to be spent on roads—and it was. Ever since that time, subsequent Labor Governments did not increase that level of funding, even though the fuel levy receipts went up since 1980 by almost 75 per cent. In fact, at the end it got down so that less than 20 per cent of the money that was collected through the fuel bowsers was actually spent on roads. Every year they were in office those Governments spent proportionately less on our roads, and that was an absolute disgrace—a fact that they cannot deny.

I always try to be positive and, every time I drive on the dual carriageway that the previous Labor Government built from Port Wakefield to Adelaide, I give that Government the accolade that it did give something for our road dollar. But the rest of the infrastructure I see as I drive around the State is an absolute disgrace. Our road infrastructure has been a ticking time bomb. Our assets have been depreciating. About 50 per cent of our roads are way past their original design life. We should have been replacing our roads at approximately 300 kilometres per year in that time, but in fact it was more like 30 to 50 kilometres. It was obvious, and blind Freddy would know what would eventually happen. We reached a stage where our road assets were beyond repair, and the efforts to remedy the problems were far beyond the capacity or resources of our State to address that, because we had not done it year by year.

I want the House to consider the road infrastructure in the Barossa Valley—many members have been there recently—and in the Mid-North, particularly the roads around Clare and, more particularly, the highway from Tarlee to Clare, which is an absolute disgrace and should have been replaced 25 years ago. It is a major highway and tourist link and an important part of the economy of this State. Thankfully, this Government is being much more responsible and is spending on our roads a much higher percentage of the fuel levies that are collected.

I remind the House, as I have done on many past occasions, that the Morgan to Burra Road is completed up to The

Gums, which is half way. I am pleased that this project is half completed and is ahead of schedule, and I pay the Minister the highest tribute for that, because the people living there are so pleased. Also, the Blyth to Brinkworth Road has been sealed, the last seven kilometres having been left for 10 years.

I also welcome the Minister's announcement on the study of the Barossa road infrastructure, and I hope that in the next few years we will see plans and then the provision of a decent road infrastructure so that heavy vehicle transports can get into our wineries to load and unload in this vital industry. In many areas B doubles have to stop outside the Valley, break their units in half and take them through individually. What a huge cost and disincentive that is to our most successful industry. I refer particularly to the larger wineries such as Penfolds and Orlando. This situation is a disgrace.

The history of road funding in South Australia has not been good. Indeed, as I said, it has been a disgrace. At best, it has been most irresponsible and short-sighted. The bottom line is that a user-pays system should always be incorporated. That is the appropriate principle that we should use regarding who should pay and who should maintain our roads. No-one in this House should disagree with that.

The scheme we have had in South Australia and Australia generally has not reflected a true user-pays system, either before we went to national standard charging on 1 July or after it, with the existing charging regime now in place. We have always charged road users a fairly high fee, namely, a static registration charge. This fee has never taken into account how many kilometres vehicles travel on the roads—either grandma's 1960 Morris Minor that has never left Angaston compared to an Adelaide 24-hour taxi. Apart from considering the number of cylinders a vehicle had, they pay the same amount, and such a system is completely wrong.

The same comparison applies between your farm truck, Sir, which could do as little as 2 000 or 3 000 kilometres a year, and trucks that are doing huge kilometres. Farmers often own old former freight company vehicles that have been bought second-hand from freight companies. That vehicle is being compared to a vehicle which is owned by a national freight company and which is driven across Australia non-stop. Such trucks are hardly stopped long enough for an oil change. They are never cold and it is quite common for them to be driven 250 000 kilometres a year. Why then would the registration charge on those vehicles be the same as the charge for a farm truck doing only 2 000 or 3 000 kilometres?

That is what happens. The same registration charge applies, but what sort of message is that sending to Australian road users? I have spoken to the Minister at length about this and she agrees with me. I know that she has already put this case to the National Road Transport Commission, but the other States, particularly the Eastern States, have vetoed the idea, although I do not know why. This principle would apply only to heavy vehicles because they do the most damage, and the disparity in levying the cost is the greatest.

Since the Australian national standard was introduced on 1 July, we have seen some large increases in the registration of farm trucks. You, Sir, would be well aware, as would other country members, that some of our constituents are saying that the costs for their trailers have increased from \$50 to \$500, which is a massive increase. This Government has tried to soften the blow by introducing seasonal registrations, and that has been greatly appreciated. However, it is still a hassle when a farmer has to make an unscheduled or emergency trip in a vehicle that is not registered for that quarter of the year. It is happening, and all we are doing is encouraging farmers

to break the law. I would not do that because the risks are too high even to contemplate.

Although we have tried to soften the blow, the bottom line is that the registration fee is too high on a vehicle that is not used on the road system very much. A far better and more acceptable way to go would be to have 12 months' cover at a reasonable fee. I acknowledge that this Government has kept in place the primary producers' registration concession. I am grateful for that because it softens the blow, but the costs are very high and they do not reflect road use.

I remind the House that the concession was in great jeopardy under previous Labor Governments, particularly when the member for Giles, as Minister, tried to take it off. I was involved in a deadlock conference of the Houses, in which he refused to budge, so the Bill lapsed. He refused to acknowledge that there should be a primary industry registration concession. He was directly opposed to that measure, and I appreciate its still being in place because it is a great help to primary producers.

As my motion states, this system inherently disadvantages agriculture industry because of the lower than average distance travelled by vehicles used in that industry. I also consider that a fuel-only charge for heavy vehicles would remove this inequity in the charging system and improve cash flows. Rather than pay a heavy registration fee up front, heavy vehicle users could pay as they go, and that would be better for cash flow. My proposition would reduce administration charges for the agriculture sector and move much closer to a user-pays system.

This Government has been responsible in giving high priority to our State's assets, and it believes in fairness and equity when apportioning who pays for services. We have to be consistent and we must send the right message to our road users and road consumers: as you use, so shall you pay—via a levy on every litre of fuel, usually diesel, that goes into the truck.

Consumers have in the past had every reason not to trust any Government with respect to fuel taxes, and the previous Labor Government was the epitome of that. Every year it took more money but it gave not a cent more back. We are tarred with the same brush—they do not trust us, either. However, I tell the people that, while I am in the House, I will insist that the Government of which I am a member is honest and straight, and that we will return these fees to the roads. We will not be like Labor Governments and use the fuel bowsers as tax collectors for general revenue. This Government can be trusted, and the budget figures will show that we will spend the money that is collected in this manner.

The most important factor is to get a big reduction in registration levies. I am not asking for one sector of the community to pay more than another. However, the figure for truck registration should reduce from \$4 000 to about \$500 per truck, and that will mean that there will be some winners. That shortfall will be met by the fuel levy. That will be quite easy to calculate. We should be able to plan for it to be budget neutral, and it can then be adjusted to raise money for our road infrastructure. Any shortfall can be calculated and compensated for by the levy.

I urge support for the motion. This is basically a common-sense motion. We must try to put in place principles where the user pays. I will be surprised if any member of this House cannot agree with this proposition because it is common-sense. People should be encouraged to pay as they go. If people are not using their motor vehicles, why should they be paying for road damage? If a person's car is out of action,

why should people pay registration fees. Yes, we need registration fees; yes, we need levies to pay for administration costs, but we do not need these huge imposts. I hope members will support this motion.

Mr QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I move:

That this House recognises the achievement of gold medals at Atlanta by 24 year old Olympic trap shooter Michael Diamond, notes the dedication of this shooter to his sport and congratulates him on his wonderful achievement. Further, this House recognises and congratulates the other members of the shooting team at Atlanta and in particular Russell Mark who obtained a gold medal in double trap and Deserie Huddleston who won a bronze medal in the women's double trap.

Russell Mark has won Australia's second gold medal and, as I understand it—

Mr Bass: With a catapult?

Mr QUIRKE: No, I believe he used a shotgun. He used a legally provided shotgun and a shotgun that will still be legal after the Bill is passed. The shooting team has done Australia proud. Deserie Huddleston won a bronze medal in the women's double trap. As I understand it, she was in equal second place but, in the shoot off, unfortunately missed out on a silver medal. I welcome these people and their commitment to their sport. I have been looking for an opportunity to congratulate a shooting team of this type because I believe the community, particularly over the past three months since the terrible tragedy in Tasmania and with the help of the Prime Minister and some of his advisers, have singled out a group of people in this country—and a much larger group than I think the Prime Minister realises—for a particularly difficult time.

We can feel genuinely proud, not only in this House but across the whole country, because Australia's medal tally at this stage would have been very poor if it were not for the shooting team. I have shot as, Mr Speaker, have you—although you have a greater interest in clay and trap shooting than I—and I think you will verify that it is an expensive and intense sport. In most instances these people have done it, largely, at their own expense. A number of sports have put their hands out and received Government assistance but it has not been politically correct to give much assistance, if any, to shooters in this country, whether they be pistol shooters, trap shooters or any of the other shooting disciplines that compete at Olympic Games, Commonwealth Games or other national events.

I was listening a moment ago when the member for Peake said that these people are true amateurs. The member for Peake is absolutely correct. We have sent shooters to Olympic Games, as long as I have been involved in various sports, and to my knowledge they have never come home with the bacon until now. They have won a number of medals at Commonwealth Games, particularly the Commonwealth Games in Brisbane in 1982. In fact, South Australians at that stage, I believe, won two gold medals and a number of silver and bronze medals in the pistol and rifle shooting sections.

We have a talented and dedicated team of which we are all proud. The Olympic Games will continue for another couple of weeks and one would hope that we will be in receipt of more gold medals in many other sports. One would hope that the Australian medal tally will rise dramatically in

all categories and that our performance in Atlanta will match that in Barcelona.

It is very important for us to do well in all sports disciplines at Atlanta because this will be the basis of our move to the next Olympic Games which be the most significant for this country for many years. The Sydney Olympic Games and our present activities will be something on which we will focus for many years. For the shooting team to win Olympic gold medals, to have this sort of experience, to have people of—I am trying not to use the word 'calibre'—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford has the call and on this subject he needs no help.

Mr QUIRKE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am trying to think of a come back but I can't at this stage. People of this calibre need to be congratulated and told that the community values what they have done. I believe that this is a 'shot in the arm' for all firearms owners in this country who have done the right thing and who have been involved in their sport on weekends and other recreation times. They pay for it themselves; they do not ask for subsidies. The events at Atlanta have made it crystal clear to the community that we can take some pride in our shooters.

I would hope that this will stimulate debate within the community, not a healthier debate but a different debate about the role of shooting as a sport in our community. A number of members in this place will support that debate in the community. It is an important message that we need to give to the community. As a consequence, I move this motion.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

LEGIONNAIRE'S DISEASE

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Health): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Following a statement by St Andrew's Hospital yesterday, I inform the House of the death of a second person suffering from legionnaire's disease. I extend the sympathy of the Government and the House to the family and friends. There has been a suggestion that advice issued by the Health Commission in relation to the incident could have avoided this death. I am advised that this is simply not the case. The woman involved was admitted to hospital on 12 July 1996. The suspicion that an outbreak may be imminent arose only when a second case was notified to the Public and Environmental Health Service on 19 July 1996. Sporadic cases of legionnaire's disease are not unusual. In South Australia, the Health Commission has received an annual average of 20 notifications of legionnaire's disease over the past five years. There have also been suggestions that there are another three cases of legionnaire's disease.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart will not interject. Leave has been given.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am also advised that this is not the case. Three workers at the hotel have shown positive antibody tests for *legionella*. The Public and Environmental Health Service's advice is that up to 30 per cent of the general community also have some antibodies of *legionella* and do not have the disease. These workers have not developed the disease. Obviously, their health status will

be monitored and I will keep the House informed of developments related to the management of the incident.

OLYMPIC GAMES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is appropriate that this Government, the House and the people of South Australia publicly acknowledge the overnight success in Atlanta of our equestrian team and, in particular, the courage of our two gold medallists Gillian Rolton and Wendy Schaeffer. Their success is the more remarkable given that both riders have travelled a bumpy road to Atlanta. Rolton, as we know, won gold at the Barcelona Olympics four years ago. However, prior to earlier winning the Australian Three Day Championship in Lochinvar on her horse Peppermint Grove, she had a number of hurdles to overcome. She fell and sustained an injury to her leg during one of the lead-up competitions and received medical treatment. She also had mechanical troubles with her truck, which is used to tow the horse float and, with finances running low, was forced to live out of the back of her truck in the lead up to the competition.

Rolton said that, apart from the financial constraints, she did not want to leave Peppermint Grove alone at any time. History records that she forged her way into the Australian team for Atlanta. It takes a great deal of mental toughness and a strong belief in your own ability to overcome these adversities. It is the same courage that showed at the Olympic Games in Atlanta over the past 24 hours. A member of the Three Day Event team, along with South Australian teammate Wendy Schaeffer of Hahndorf, Phillip Dutton of Nyngan, New South Wales and Australian flag bearer Andrew Hoy, Rolton rode with two cracked ribs, a broken collar bone and a cracked shoulder to finish the cross country course, thus ensuring that her team could advance through to the final round. Remarkably, she declined pain killing drugs when having her shoulder reset, simply because she wanted to be available to compete in the final round for her country, if necessary.

Wendy Schaeffer, too, had a rough ride to Atlanta. She sustained a broken leg two months prior to the Atlanta games and it was considered doubtful at the time whether she would be able to take her place in the team. But ride she did, and her performance over the three days of competition was absolutely inspirational. In particular, I highlight the fact that she had the highest score of any individual competitor in the event. It is the dedication and determination in pursuit of excellence that is shared by these two wonderful South Australian Olympic gold medal champions.

I should also mention the recent international achievement of another South Australian sportsman, Patrick Jonker. Patrick finished twelfth overall in the prestigious Tour de France. This is a magnificent achievement and is a lead up to the Atlanta Games where he will contest the road race. Patrick's result in the Tour de France will boost his confidence in the lead-up to Atlanta. When the race started, Jonker gave himself no chance of finishing because of bronchial problems he had contracted. Jonker is the first South Australian to ride in the Tour de France, and only one other Australian has placed higher—the legendary Phil Anderson.

Mr Speaker, we salute the courage and achievements of all South Australian sportsmen and sportswomen on the international sporting stage and continue to wish all our

athletes every success for the remainder of the Olympic Games.

QUESTION TIME

LEGIONNAIRE'S DISEASE

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): When was the Minister for Health first made aware of the outbreak of legionnaire's disease at Kangaroo Island, and was the Minister consulted on the programs of public notification before the Health Commission issued a media statement on the evening of Friday 19 July?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I was contacted in my electorate office sometime between 5 and 5.30 p.m. on Friday. I am unable to give a more definitive time than that—it was late Friday afternoon. As to whether I was consulted about public notification, I can inform the House that I was consulted about the fact that the Public and Environmental Health division intended to issue a public warning which, I believe, was very appropriate.

If one looks at the history of diseases such as legionnaire's disease, it quite interesting to review the *Hansard* of 11 February 1986. What the then Health Minister (Hon. John Cornwall) had to say in the other place is reported in *Hansard* of 11 February 1986, and I assure the House that it makes very interesting reading if members would like to read the entire report. The most important part reads as follows:

On the same day as that consultative meeting, 24 January—
Interestingly, that was 9 days after the first notification to the Public and Environmental Health division, as opposed to about three or four hours after we were first told—

Mr FOLEY: That's 10 years ago.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart should not interject.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: He's blaming John Cornwall!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Giles.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: No, I am not blaming John Cornwall. It is very interesting that the member for Giles should say that.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: No, it is interesting that he should say that because I have a few quotes from the *Hansard* of 17 November 1988, when he was Minister for Health, in relation to legionnaire's disease. The Hon. John Cornwall continues:

On the same day as that consultative meeting, 24 January, I was advised of the outbreak and immediately canvassed the desirability of making a public announcement. The Acting Director of the Public Health Service (Dr Chris Baker) provided written advice that a public statement should not be made at that time. Dr Baker's reasons were that the Public Health Service was still awaiting environmental microbiological results which would not be available for a week, that the outbreak was of short duration, and it would be more helpful to the community to provide a comprehensive picture once further details from interviews had been obtained. My advice was that a full and exhaustive statement should be made when the detail from all the investigations and the environmental microbiology testing was available—and that is advice which I am following today.

Quite clearly, that indicates that, when faced with an outbreak of *legionella*, the previous Labor Party Minister for Health did what is completely appropriate in the circumstances, and that is to take the advice of the experts. The answer to the specific question whether I was consulted is that I was consulted that a public notification was to be made and I fully supported that. It is interesting when we talk about that public

notification, as I have identified to the House, regarding the guests of the hotel who had been contacted subsequent to the microbiological examination being determined and specified, the last advice I had, which was yesterday—I have not received advice on the results to this question—identified that those people had already noted from the public warnings that they needed to go to their doctors if symptoms were extant. In essence, the answer to the question is: I was notified late on Friday afternoon and I was notified that a media statement was to be put out.

STATE ECONOMY

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): Will the Premier provide the House with an outline of the key features of the economic and business environment in South Australia and say whether these key features form part of the economic report released today by the Centre for Economic Studies?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The South Australian Centre for Economic Studies released its quarterly report, and what fascinates me is that its report is reading more and more like a journal put out by a political Party or a political group than in terms of solid economic content. It is the lack of economic content and the increasing use of political statements—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hart has been warned for the second time.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —that I find rather interesting. I pick up a couple of points. First, the report criticises the fact that the Government put an extra \$150 million into health and education in the budget. I have no difficulty in standing up and defending that whatsoever. The Government sees education as a top priority in this State. We spend more on education *per capita* than any other State in Australia and we will continue to do so.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The Leader of the Opposition continually talks about the behaviour of members of Parliament. I suggest to the Leader that those sorts of comments are unhelpful and unwise and I do not want a repetition.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I point out that this Government gives a high priority to education and will continue to spend above the national average. We currently spend the highest *per capita* of any State in Australia. I have no difficulty in defending that, particularly when the extra money which we put into education out of poker machines is money to give information technology training and infrastructure within the schools. This ensures that our students of tomorrow are information technology literate. In dealing with the extra money for the health area, if that goes into putting additional patients or additional admissions into the hospitals and reducing the hospital waiting lists, this Government supports that. Again, that is money that has come out of the poker machines.

Another problem I generally have with what the Centre for Economic Studies has put down is that it has now criticised the Government for not going far enough with debt reduction. We put down a proposal before the election, which was a four year program. We have achieved those objectives within just 2½ years. Incidentally, the centre at the time came out and supported what we said. In fact, it even went further and said it was a very difficult ask that we had put down for ourselves but they were very commendable objectives. We have achieved those objectives not in four years but in 2½ years.

Now the centre turns around and says we should have gone further.

We also had Mr Walsh on the Audit Commission, and that commission came down with recommendations as to what the Government should do to reduce the budget deficit. We have gone further than the objectives that were put down and now, because we are exceeding those objectives, once again the centre has asked us to go further. I put to the centre that, if we as good economic managers achieve our targets, why should it keep moving the goal posts every time?

I also note that the centre has criticised the lack of effort to produce a more competitive, low cost environment here in South Australia. It seems to have completely ignored the recent independent study by Arthur Anderson that showed that, to make the same item in South Australia compared with Melbourne or Sydney, South Australia had a cost advantage of about 20 to 25 per cent. When it came to delivering a service, the cost advantage was 50 per cent compared with Sydney.

The centre quoted some WorkCover costs and did a comparison between the States on WorkCover premium rates. The trouble is that it used 1993-94 figures. They were the figures that applied under the former Government, not our Government; so if it had any criticism in that area, it was in fact a criticism of the previous Government. I point out that there has been a significant shift since 1993-94, and I would urge the centre to go back and do its comparison again on WorkCover costs between the States, because I think it would find a different figure today.

I also point out that the centre seemed to comment on the fact that South Australia had the highest economic growth rate in Australia, at 4.7 per cent. It puts that down to the fact that there had been a significant improvement in the agricultural sector. I have two comments to pass there. First, it claimed that all the economic growth had come out of the agricultural sector. The Government's own figures suggest that only 1.5 per cent of the 4.7 per cent economic growth came out of the agricultural sector.

Secondly, I point out that it has highlighted that we should not be too optimistic, because there has been an increase in agricultural prices. I highlight the fact that the main boost has been in grain prices, and the forecast of grain authorities around the world is that those higher prices will remain for at least the next two to three years. I do not see why, every time we get an increase in agricultural commodities, the centre should try to discount the good news that comes out of that yet, at other times, when there is a decline in international prices, it wants to turn around and take that as the norm. There appears to be some inconsistency.

Equally, the report does not pick up aspects that I think are important, namely, the major new investments at places such as Olympic Dam and the Cooper Basin gas field, the expansion of Holden's and Mitsubishi, and the very considerable expansion in the area of exports. In particular, South Australia is now doing better than every other State of Australia in its manufacturing exports. The elaborately manufactured goods in this State have gone up substantially further than in any other State in Australia, and that shows the commitment this Government is making.

I must pick up one other very interesting point. The centre states that the primary emphasis for business is no longer largely on low costs but on the environment, and it goes on to talk about entrepreneurship. However, in another part of its longer report, it states that business must be given a level of taxation, regulation and service that preferably gives them

an edge on their competition and leads them to establish in this State. On the one hand it is saying that a low cost environment is not important, while on the other hand it is saying it is important. I can say we have produced the most competitive cost environment for business anywhere in the whole of Australia. Look at the reduction, in real terms, in electricity costs and water costs. Look at the extent to which per capita taxation in South Australia is 21 per cent less than Victoria and 23 per cent less than New South Wales. I just wonder when the centre is going to pick up some of these basic figures and start concentrating on the facts.

LEGIONNAIRE'S DISEASE

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. What more important things did Dr Kirke, the Director of Public Health, have to do other than warn people who were at risk of contracting legionnaire's disease from the Ozone Hotel? Yesterday, Dr Kirke said that the Health Commission could not contact all guests and eliminate all possibilities because 'it is unreasonable from a point of view of cost benefit'. Dr Kirke added, 'We can go chasing our tails and chasing hypothetical examples for ever but we have got more important things to do.' Just what is more important than people's lives?

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

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair spoke to the Leader yesterday and the day before. He has asked an important question and I suggest that it is not in his interests for there to be any interruptions from him.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: This is a classic example of the Leader of the Opposition, for the moment, attempting to make political capital out of something that he does not understand. Let me be quite clear about this. The people who ought to make public health decisions are public health experts. There is simply no doubt about the fact that the most important thing to do in a potential outbreak such as this is to isolate where the infection is and to eradicate it. That is exactly what the Health Commission was doing, and indeed did, as I indicated in a previous ministerial statement, with the closure of the pool and its pasteurisation by turning up the hot water system to 70° Centigrade. That is exactly what was done and that is exactly what is the most appropriate public health measure. The Leader of the Opposition clearly does not understand—and I do not blame him for that because he has no public health qualification, as opposed to the people who do—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:—because his question implied (I forget the exact phraseology) that we should have contacted people who were at risk of contracting the disease. The simple fact is that the people who came in contact with that infection were already at risk of contracting a disease at some stage in the future, up to two weeks after the contact. There is no urgency or immediacy with those people. The urgency and the immediacy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader for the second time.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The urgency and the immediacy in any outbreak such as this, which is exactly

what happened in 1986, when John Cornwall was Minister, and in 1988, when the member for Giles was the Minister, is to isolate the infection and stop it infecting anybody else. That is the most important thing to do and that is exactly what happened in this instance. It had nothing to do with any political decision or interference. It is according to protocols that are accepted as standard public health procedures.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth has been continually interjecting. I suggest to her that, if she wishes to participate this afternoon, there should not be one word from her.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Ridley is in the same position.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: There are clearly two important things; first, stopping anyone else at some stage in the future being exposed to the infection and, secondly, dealing with those people who may have contracted it and who may develop symptoms up to two weeks later. That is why the public health priority, according to recognised protocols, is to stop or contain the source of infection, and that was done.

TOURISM AWARDS

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Will the Premier inform the House of the recipients of the prestigious 1996 Yellow Pages South Australian Tourism Awards? I understand that the Premier presented the South Australian Tourism Awards which showcase not only the best of the State's tourist attractions but also highlight the excellent food, wines and entertainment our State has to offer.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I was at the South Australian Tourism Awards last night and I would like to commend all the winners. There were 27 different categories including a couple of new categories. In particular, this year there was a category for wineries which reflects the push of the State Government in terms of wine tourism in this State. I appreciate the tremendous effort put in by various tourist associations, families and other commercial groups throughout the State and congratulate them on the way they present their tourist facilities and operations within this State. I thought that last night was a real tribute to the commitment of people and individuals.

It was very much a regional affair. I must compliment the South-East which took out the majority of awards last night, and I congratulate the various groups in the South-East that were so successful. One thing that came through was the important role of the TAFE college in the South-East. The TAFE college became involved with a range of tourist attractions and operators in the South-East and formally trained them. As a result, those tourist operators have been successful in winning awards.

I am also pleased to say that the support of the State Government was applauded last night. People appreciate the fact that the State Government has increased the tourism budget from \$19 million (when we came to Government) to \$39 million in the latest budget. It shows the extent to which this Government has made a huge commitment. The Leader of the Opposition, the former Minister for Tourism, frankly neglected tourism in this State. We had very little to no investment at all in major tourism infrastructure; none of the major tourist developments, such as Warrina, took place. I am delighted to say that this Government has recognised the need

to extend the runway; we are looking at putting in new airport terminal facilities; we have attracted investment to Warrina and Granite Island and, at the same time, we have put together new packages, such as wine tourism, which will be very successful. This State Government has given a new impetus to the tourism industry in South Australia and last night's awards reflected that.

LEGIONNAIRE'S DISEASE

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Minister for Health agree that guests who had stayed at the Ozone Hotel did not want early advice of the legionnaire's outbreak? Yesterday, Dr Kirke, the Director of Public Health, said that, of the 100 guests so far contacted, 'None have said they would have liked to have known earlier.' The Opposition has been contacted by a guest who stayed at the hotel on Friday 19 July and Saturday 20 July. The guest was not informed by the hotel of the outbreak and, although she heard the news report of the Health Commission's media release on Saturday evening at the Ozone Hotel, this did not identify where the outbreak had occurred. The guest, who was asthmatic and has twice suffered from pneumonia, has told the Opposition that she is outraged that she was not warned by the Health Commission of the outbreak as she would not have continued to stay at the Ozone Hotel.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The exact timing I would have to look at, but the most important thing to acknowledge is that the alleged source of infection at that time—I think the Leader said it was the 19th—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The 19th and the 20th, okay. The fact is that it was the 19th. The pool had already been closed on the 17th, so that was two days before the person was there. The air-conditioning tower had been pasteurised by turning—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Wait a minute; I am coming to that. The air-conditioning tower had been pasteurised by turning the water to 70°. According to the best public and environmental health tenets, my information is that once that has been done people in the hotel and its environs, and anywhere else, had no greater risk of contracting the disease than people do now, anywhere. That is a fact. Even though he is trying to score political points, the Leader must acknowledge the fact that 30 per cent of people in the community have anti-bodies to this disease. That means that they have previously come into contact with the bug and that their immune system has reacted to an extent that it has made anti-bodies. In other words, it is a bug that is in a lot of places. Therefore, once the pool—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Because there was no greater risk then than at any other time, because the pool had been closed two days earlier and the air-conditioning—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Because the water in the air-conditioning tower had been heated. The information that I have been given is that the hotel was told that once that had been done there was no greater risk of staying there than at any other hotel.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I know that the member for Elizabeth and the Leader of the Opposition do not want to acknowledge that, but that is fact. There is no political spin on that at all. That is what I have been told: that there was no greater exposure or risk at that time. In a previous question I was asked about protocols, so it is particularly interesting to look at Appendix 2 of a New South Wales document which details the investigation of a *legionella* outbreak. Let us look at what New South Wales does. Under the heading 'Identified Populations at an Elevated Risk of Infection', the first sentence is absolutely crucial. It states:

When the source and mode of transmission have been confirmed. . .

In other words, the first thing you do is determine the source and the mode of transmission and then take action. As I indicated in answer to a previous question, the protocol of ensuring that nobody else is exposed to the risk as the first ultimate priority is accepted according to protocols everywhere in relation to this disease.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): In relation to Adelaide Airport, can the Minister for Infrastructure report to the House the state of negotiations with airline carriers and say when Adelaide can expect a new airport terminal building? Several weeks ago a concept plan for a new Adelaide Airport terminal was released and put in the *Advertiser*. I know that the South Australian public are waiting expectantly and patiently for progress on this development.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: As has previously been advised to the House and publicly, the upgrading of Adelaide Airport is one of the Government's key infrastructure policy initiatives. It is vital to the State's economy. It provides facilities for international flights which not only support our tourism industry but also provide a much needed export air freight capacity and contribute to the international image of South Australia. The days when fully laden Jumbo jets, because of hot winds and the like, were unable to take off with a full cargo load and had to go via Perth to refuel rather than being able to get to Singapore, KL and Hong Kong are in the past, thankfully.

Through agitation, debate and argument at Federal Government level, agreed to by the former Federal Government and now supported by the current Federal Government, we will see a 572 metre runway extension and the diversion of Tapleys Hill Road, the cost of which will be approximately \$47 million, which will allow maximum payload flights to major Asian ports. An environmental impact statement on the runway extension has been released for public consultation by the Premier and the Minister for Transport, and it is expected that that project will be completed in June 1998.

In concert with this, the South Australian Government has also developed a proposal for a new, integrated domestic and international terminal. We have two good tin sheds at Adelaide Airport that have been upgraded from time to time. They do not fit the image of South Australia as a sophisticated manufacturing society, a substantial R&D component and a city and State of the future. Therefore, given the window of opportunity whereby Qantas and Ansett, under their lease agreements, had to submit arrangements for upgrading the domestic terminal facilities by 30 June this year and to have that infrastructure completed by December 1997, the State Government opened negotiations with both Qantas and

Ansett to provide an integrated domestic and international terminal in South Australia.

We are proposing a project with a cost of between \$150 million and \$170 million. The initial sketch plan indicates that it will provide some 13 aerobridges: 10 domestic, one swing gate and two international. An integrated terminal will overcome the inefficiency of the present split facilities and will also provide an opportunity to maximise retail revenue to the new operator of the airport. That makes a clearly more valuable asset for South Australia, and a greater and more valuable asset for the Commonwealth Government in its current proposed leasing arrangements. We need to have a terminal facility worthy of this city in line with international gateways elsewhere.

Negotiations opened some six months ago or more with both Qantas and Ansett, and I am pleased to say that, in a truly cooperative spirit, Qantas and Ansett have been working with the Department of Manufacturing Industry for some time and have agreed in principle to the model being proposed by the South Australian Government. Armed with that agreement in principle from Qantas and Ansett, we then took up the matter with the Chair of the Federal Airports Corporation (Barry Murphy) to seek FAC support for fast tracking this proposal, given the time lines that are currently in the leasing agreements applying to the domestic terminal.

The Federal Airports Corporation has also given in-principle support and is now prepared to fast track the extensive design plans that have been negotiated with Qantas and Ansett over the past three months, in particular. Hopefully, within the next 90 days we will reach a position where final agreement will be reached with Qantas and Ansett and signed off with the FAC to progress to building this new domestic/international integrated facility at Adelaide Airport through the establishment of heads of agreement.

Simultaneously with the Federal Airports Corporation proposal to lease these airports, and following the lobbying by the Premier and the Minister for Transport, Adelaide will be in the first tranche of airports to be released, going on the market from September 1996 through to September 1997. Whilst the Commonwealth is responsible for these negotiations, the State Government has a significant interest in the new operator. In a proactive sense, rather than simply waiting for the Commonwealth process to come about, we have been lobbying and presenting the design, plans, concept, discussions and the agreement with Qantas, Ansett and FAC to any potential operator at Adelaide Airport, so that we can move this forward and get sooner rather than later a new integrated domestic/international terminal that will benefit the State of South Australia, what it is and purports to be in the next century.

LEGIONNAIRE'S DISEASE

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Following the Minister for Health's confirmation today that he was consulted last Friday afternoon, why did the media statement issued on the evening of Friday 19 July, warning people who had visited Kingscote of the legionnaire's outbreak, fail to identify the Ozone Hotel? A woman who had stayed at the hotel implicated in this outbreak was told by a public health official on Monday morning that the media were being used as a means to notify former guests. On Monday Dr Kirke, the Director of Public Health, refused to tell the media the name of the hotel.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The upward inflection is fantastic. The member for Elizabeth is selectively choosing

to 'amnesia' the facts. The fact is, as I identified in my ministerial statement yesterday (and I am happy to obtain a copy for the honourable member), that, while there was suspicion about the Ozone Hotel, there was not a definitive microbiological diagnosis until after Monday. The member for Elizabeth knows that. She knows that that was in my statement and she knows that that is the simple fact of the matter; that it was not definitively tied to the Ozone Hotel until that microbiological—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart has taken it upon himself to completely ignore the directions of the Chair. I suggest to him and other members that, as the Opposition is asking these important questions, I would be of the view that it wants to hear the answer. It is clear to the Chair that certain people just want to disrupt the Minister. If that is what they want to do, they will have ample opportunity to see that other actions take place.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: In reminding members opposite of the fact that the diagnosis was not made definitively on Monday, I also remind them of the protocol that comes from another State, which happens to be governed by a Party of their political persuasion, which says that, when the source and mode of transmission have been confirmed, persons at an elevated risk of exposure must be identified and appropriate preventive control measures implemented. This must include interventions such as cleaning air-conditioning systems etc., which had been done already, and then preventive measures such as immunisation of people before exposure to infectious agents, and so on.

That clearly sets out a time frame whereby these things ought to happen. The simple fact is that the diagnosis of the exact source of this infection had not been made. I would liken the attempts of the Opposition to have us identify willy-nilly where this outbreak may have occurred, without full confirmation and to the detriment of that particular business, to a very similar episode unrelated to this sort of incident where the Leader of the Opposition delighted in naming a hotel in Adelaide and supplying incorrect information in relation to the episode. I was contacted several days after that by the owner who indicated—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:—that there had been a great decline in his perfectly legitimate business. That is a pity. The fact is that, the minute the diagnosis was made, appropriate steps to identify where the infection had been isolated were taken.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would suggest to the Deputy Leader and others that, if they are asking a series of important questions, it would appear to the Chair that they are not interested in the answers, because they just continue to want to talk over people. I suggest to the Deputy Leader and his colleagues, or anyone else, that they do not do it again.

EYRE PENINSULA DROUGHT

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Primary Industries please update the situation regarding drought exceptional circumstances on Eyre Peninsula? The Federal Minister for Primary Industries and Energy has revoked drought exceptional circumstances for all areas of

Eyre Peninsula, yet some parts of the region are still in need of good rain.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thank the member for Flinders for both her question and her ongoing interest in the issue. As members would be aware, unfortunately some parts of the State have still not had the rains to enable a recovery from the drought. In November last year, a submission was forwarded from South Australia to the Rural Adjustment Scheme Advisory Council recommending the revocation of a large proportion of the drought exceptional circumstances area on Eyre Peninsula as these areas had enjoyed favourable seasonal conditions during 1995.

The submission also recommended that the 26 hundreds on the upper and western part of Eyre Peninsula, in which farmers had suffered their third successive drought in 1995, should not be revoked. However, the Federal Minister for Primary Industries and Energy recently did revoke all areas of drought exceptional circumstances on Eyre Peninsula. Given the continuing dry conditions on parts of Eyre Peninsula, I wrote to Minister Anderson asking him to review that decision for the 26 hundreds in the upper and western parts of Eyre Peninsula. He has since written back saying that the decision stands.

I have now reconvened PISA's Adverse Events Committee to look at the situation across South Australia. We recognise that, as well as those 26 hundreds already mentioned, there is another area in the north central part of Eyre Peninsula that should be looked at for drought exceptional circumstances, and there is also a section in the Upper North, and parts of the pastoral area, which needs to be investigated where some farmers are facing another poor seasonal outlook.

The Adverse Events Committee, which looks at areas across the State, at the end of September will compile a crop yield estimate. If the season again fails for those regions—and we all hope that it does not—we will be well positioned to compile a submission to the Federal Government for drought assistance on a regional basis. We are presently starting to do the homework so that, if we have regions in trouble, a submission can be lodged as quickly as possible. Seasonal conditions in the State have improved remarkably in the past two months. However, there are still a few regions that are now highly unlikely to have a viable season.

LEGIONNAIRE'S DISEASE

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. What action did the Health Commission take in the case of a woman who contracted legionnaire's disease, confirmed on 20 June, having visited four spa display centres on the previous Sunday? The Opposition has been contacted by the family of a woman who remains in hospital after contracting legionnaire's disease and twice suffering total respiratory failure. The woman had visited four spa sales centres on the Sunday before she fell ill. The Health Commission interviewed the family on 25 June after tests confirmed that the patient had legionnaire's disease. Since then, there has been no contact from the Health Commission with the patient or the family.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I do not know the detail of the particular patient, and I would be more than delighted to receive that information. As I have indicated to the member for Elizabeth and the Leader of the Opposition, I am happy to provide them with any relevant briefing in this matter, and I would be more than happy to get information in relation to that. However, that was not the nub of the

question: the nub of the question was what action was taken after the woman's case was identified. The answer is that I will have to supply exact dates. Certainly, I know that the industry which supplies spa pools was circulated, and that occurred, I believe, middle to late last week, prior to the outbreak occurring. I will get the exact dates for the honourable member.

The reason that had occurred was that there had been seven sporadic cases of legionnaire's disease—as occurs, as I have identified, on a sporadic basis throughout Adelaide. On doing all the appropriate public health detective work in relation to that, it was found, from memory, that five out of those seven had used different but nevertheless spa pools. A decision had been taken to circularise the spa pool industry, reminding them of their responsibilities in relation to hygiene. I will supply the exact date and the circular to the member for Elizabeth. If she is indicating that the Health Commission was not taking appropriate action, once again she is wrong.

OZONE LEVELS

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources tell the House how many times the level of ozone in Adelaide's air has exceeded Australian National Health and Medical Research Council criteria in the past five years? Recent media statements have cast concern over the quality of Adelaide's air. Are there any results that can compare the quality of Adelaide's air with that of the Eastern States?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am pleased that the honourable member has raised the matter, because I too am concerned about the inaccurate statements that have been made on this subject in recent times. Adelaide's overall air quality is something of which this city and this State can be proud. It certainly contributes to a quality of life for which the city and the State are renowned. In fact, this Government has gone to considerable lengths in recent times and has invested large sums of money to help protect and improve air quality throughout South Australia, but particularly in the metropolitan area.

As a result of work by the Environment Protection Authority, the standards of emission from industry are now vastly improved from what they were a few years ago. The technological advances in air monitoring, in the equipment used and the expertise in this State, also provide us with an opportunity to develop Adelaide as a centre for excellence in the southern hemisphere in air quality monitoring and control.

I have previously told the House that the level of lead in Adelaide's air, for example, has fallen by nearly 80 per cent in the past 10 years. As far as the direct question goes, the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council ozone criteria have not been exceeded in Adelaide in the past five years. During the period 1990 to 1994, if we were to apply the most stringent World Health Organisation criteria, Adelaide exceeded that criteria on two occasions, compared with 72 occasions in Melbourne and 100 times in Sydney. The criteria were not exceeded in 1995, so we can easily see that it is far more healthy to live in Adelaide than in Melbourne or Sydney.

There are several factors behind Adelaide's superiority of air quality. These include satisfactory point source emission controls in industry, backyard burning regulations and more favourable meteorological conditions. To help maintain Adelaide's superiority, a network of air track monitoring stations is currently being established at sites determined as

a result of research carried out by the CSIRO. This research indicates the natural movement of ozone levels to the east and north-east of the city centre.

Air track units have been installed at Netley and Northfield, and two more will be installed at Gawler and Elizabeth in the near future. A mobile monitoring unit is also available and is being used extensively. The quality of Adelaide's air is something that gives South Australia a very healthy advantage, particularly over the Eastern States. It is also something that this Government is committed to protecting and maintaining. I think it is most disappointing when inaccurate information would suggest that that is not the case.

LEGIONNAIRE'S DISEASE

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Given that two people have died this week from legionnaire's disease, that there have been seven cases of legionnaire's disease this year, that of those five have been exposed to spa pools and that the Minister has just said that the industry was circularised, why was the public not warned?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am pleased that I have been asked that question, because it gives me an opportunity to detail more about what the Health Commission did some three weeks ago. Prior to doing that, I identify that in a previous answer I referred to cooling towers in water systems at the Ozone Hotel. I would like to correct the impression. It was not a cooling tower: it was a hot water system that had been pasteurised rather than a cooling tower, which is the normal source of *legionella*. That had been pasteurised by late Friday afternoon—I am not sure of the actual time.

In relation to the circular to which I alluded in the previous question and the present question of the member for Elizabeth, I have to hand a circular to councils and the spa pool industry dated 8 July. Clearly, I understand the political game of the Opposition. It is intending to demean the public health efforts of people in South Australia. I emphasise to the member for Elizabeth and the Leader of the Opposition that the South Australian Health Commission Public and Environmental Health Service on 8 July, when it realised that of these seven background cases, unrelated cases, five had been exposed, amongst a whole lot of other things, to spa pools, made the decision on 8 July to circularise the spa pool sales industry, in a memo from the executive director. At the same time, it circularised—and again I have a copy in my hand—chief executive officers and environmental health officers of councils. One particular area of the circular from the presiding member of the Public and Environmental Health Council states:

It is therefore requested that the spa pool outlets in your area be reviewed, and any operational units checked for adequate disinfection.

In other words, 11 days before the suspicion of these two cases being linked, completely appropriate preventive action had been taken.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am coming to that. The member for Elizabeth goes on to ask, 'Why was the public not warned?' The member for Elizabeth seems not to realise that there is a background risk of infection in these cases all day, every day. There is a simple background exposure to possibly hundreds or thousands of bugs, one of which is *legionella*. The reason I am able to say that is that 30 per cent of people in South Australia have antibodies. That means

that, if there are 69 members of Parliament in this House and the Upper House, probably 45 will have antibodies. We have been exposed to background infection of *legionella* at some time in the past without ever developing the disease. The question that the member for Elizabeth asked—‘Why was the public not warned about this background exposure?’—indicates her complete lack of knowledge about these matters and her complete failure to agree with what are the facts.

TEA TREE GULLY COUNCIL RATES

Mr BASS (Florey): Will the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations inform the House whether there is anything he can do to alleviate the concerns of some of the residents in the Tea Tree Gully council area who are facing massive increases in their council rates? The Tea Tree Gully council has recently been criticised by the residents within the council area in relation to changes to the system of rating from unimproved value to capital value. Some residents may receive an increase of over 100 per cent in their rates.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I thank the honourable member for his question and, as have the member for Newland and the member for Florey, we have received many representations from residents of the City of Tea Tree Gully in relation to the action the council has taken in changing its rating system from unimproved land values to improved capital values. As I said last week, I have no quarrel whatsoever with the fact that the council is changing the basis of its rating system. However, problems have arisen because, whereas the council previously had made very clear that it would phase in any such change over a period of four to five years, it made the decision to phase in this change over two years. As a result, some residents in the City of Tea Tree Gully, particularly in the Golden Grove development, will receive totally unreasonable rate increases if the council persists with its decision. We must remember that the north-eastern suburbs are dormitory suburbs. They are made up of families—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

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

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: —who are struggling financially to meet all the needs and demands placed upon them, and for them suddenly to find out that their rates will be increased so substantially is totally untenable. As a result, as local member I have made very clear to the council that I will be fighting totally on behalf of the residents—as are the member for Newland and the member for Florey—to have council meet its obligation and phase in this change over a period. Representatives from the council have spoken to me both as local member and as Minister on a number of occasions regarding this matter. They have stated that it is seeking my assistance in having section 174(a) waived. This section relates to the capping of rates. I pointed out to the council that it made the decision to change the rating system in the full knowledge that rates were to be capped in the coming years. However, council representatives have again been to see me indicating that they believe they would be able to overcome the problems they have encountered, if I were to consider that request.

I indicated to the council that I want it to look at all the possible actions it can take in terms of overcoming the problems which it has created—and there is no mistake about it that the council has created the problem. The council,

therefore, is duty bound to overcome that problem. The problem in which the council is now finding itself is that, just as initially there were tremendous complaints from residents who were to receive substantial increases, it is now beginning to receive complaints from other residents who are saying, ‘Wait a minute; if you do not do what you are saying, we will be penalised.’

When I have discussed this with the constituents in my electorate—and I assure members many have contacted me in relation to both increases and decreases—there has been absolutely no expression of concern by any of those ratepayers when I have put to them the suggestion of a four to five year phase in. They have said, ‘Fine; we can afford a 20 per cent increase.’ Others have said, ‘Yes, we can take the decrease over a slower period.’ The council is now well aware that ratepayers, both those being disadvantaged and those being advantaged, are prepared to accept the change over a phase-in period. I intend to work with the council to provide any assistance I can to help it meet a promise which it gave and which it now has to meet.

LEGIONNAIRE’S DISEASE

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. When was the Minister informed of the tragic death of the second victim of the current legionnaire’s disease outbreak?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: This is an interesting exercise, because it indicates many of the things that are appalling about the media in these sorts of instances. The most important thing which I think is of note (and I am looking for the person) was that I received unconfirmed media reports yesterday that the woman had died early on Wednesday morning. If members of the media choose to put themselves in the place of the relatives, family and friends of the woman, can they imagine how they felt when that was totally fallacious? It is a disgraceful attempt to ambulance-chase and sensationalise an unfortunate tragedy, and I think it is appalling that the media would do that.

When I heard that, I thought I needed to make appropriate inquiries. So, I made inquiries initially and found that those reports were incorrect and that in fact the woman was alive at the time I made my inquiries. Therefore, there was an element of suspicion in some of these reports. Some time around mid morning, my office received a press release from the hospital in which the woman was being treated, stating that the public wishes of the woman’s family were that her condition remain private and that no public comment would be made about the situation. Clearly, I acknowledged that there was a need to respect the family’s wishes for privacy at that stage.

Shortly before Question Time, unconfirmed reports of the woman’s death were again put to me and at that stage a Health Commission officer again stated that she had died. Again, I reiterate that at that stage I was operating on the premise that the family’s wishes for privacy were of utmost concern and that it was the prerogative of the hospital treating the woman to announce her death or otherwise. I believed and was confident that announcing the woman’s death, about which at that stage I had not received any written confirmation, would not have added in any way to the public health campaign in this *Legionella* issue.

The first public acknowledgment that I had of the woman’s death was that I was informed late in Question Time that a Labor Party media adviser was informing journalists

during Question Time of the woman's death. I assumed at that stage that a public announcement had been made and that the woman's family had agreed to publicity. Therefore, I was surprised when at 5.14 I received written notification from St Andrews Private Hospital that the patient had died of *Legionella* pneumonia. That notification was via a press release which was understood to have been circulated to Adelaide's media.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier share the views of his friend and colleague, the Minister for Infrastructure, that a GST should be introduced in Australia? In answer to a question at today's Centre for Economic Studies briefing, the Minister said he supported the introduction of a GST as soon as possible. Does the Premier share his colleague's views?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Leader of the Opposition has clearly just told a whopper of a lie.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader will resume his seat. The Chair will deal with the matter. I am surprised that the Deputy Leader does not apply himself to Standing Orders as quickly, when there are other breaches, as he has on this occasion. The Premier cannot use those words, and I ask that he withdraw the word 'lie', which is unparliamentary.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I apologise and withdraw the remark. I simply say that the Leader has obviously fabricated that question, and there is no point in answering a fabricated question.

MINI BUDGET

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Does the Premier agree with his former economic adviser, Professor Cliff Walsh, who said today that the State Government would have to bring down a mini budget—whether or not it is called that—because of cuts from the Federal Liberal Government in Canberra?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Cliff Walsh has never been on my staff, so I do not see how he can be my former economic adviser. My economic adviser sits on my staff, and Cliff Walsh has never done so. Certainly, on various occasions the Government has used the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies. I have already answered this question in the House. I do not know why the shadow Treasurer does not bother to pick up *Hansard*, read, or even listen from one day to the next. His own Leader asked whether there would be a mini budget after the Federal budget and I said 'No'. I stand by that.

BATTERY HENS

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister for Primary Industries investigate the possibility of outlawing the primitive and cruel practice of battery hen egg production in South Australia?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thank the honourable member for his question. The issue he has asked has not been raised with me in my time as Minister. I do not think the matter is contentious in the State at the moment, but I welcome his taking it up with me further if he so wishes.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources advise the House of his response to the D grade rating by the World Wide Fund for Nature over the State's performance in our national parks? The World Wide Fund for Nature last week released a report card, giving South Australia and Western Australia D grades for efforts in our national parks.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I thank the member for Newland for her question; again, it is a very good question and I was extremely disappointed with the rating that was handed down by this organisation, the World Wide Fund for Nature. I was particularly disappointed, because this is an organisation which I have personally supported strongly and which I think has a lot of support throughout Australia, so I was disappointed with the results that came forward. I am pleased to be able to respond to this rather puerile exercise by the World Wide Fund for Nature, because I believe it serves no constructive purpose. It fails to promote Australian parks and is compiled over a desk in Sydney. In fact, I do not think any of its assessments are based on on-ground research or field trips but rely on letter writing, questionnaires and telephone calls, so I do not see how it can be very accurate.

The report is a slight not just on South Australia but also on the huge energy and commitment by those who work in a voluntary capacity and professionally within our national parks. The report criticised South Australia for not significantly increasing the hectareage of national parks in this State. I point out the facts. The report fails to acknowledge that South Australia already has some 21 million hectares under the parks system. That is about 20 per cent of the State, or about 15 hectares of park for every man, woman and child.

I compare that 20 per cent of South Australia set aside for conservation with about 5 per cent set aside in New South Wales, 5 per cent in Queensland, 7 per cent in Western Australia and 16 per cent in Victoria. So, what we have seen is a report that penalises South Australia for setting the pace while rewarding those States which are now beginning to lift their game and which still have much to make up if they are to get anywhere near South Australia's 20 per cent. Indeed, they are learning from what has been achieved in South Australia.

The report also fails to acknowledge any increase in capital expenditure to improve parks infrastructure, any addition to the national parks or reserve system, and any involvement by the community in our parks. Particularly in South Australia, we are very fortunate with the support we have from volunteers in our parks system. In short, I suggest that this organisation has done absolutely nothing but malign some tremendous examples of world-class parks and experiences that it would be better to promote.

TAFE, TOURISM AWARDS

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education advise the House on the role played by TAFE in the 1996 South Australian Tourism Awards, which were announced last night?

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the Minister that the Premier has already referred to the contribution of TAFE.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your guidance. The role of TAFE in the tourism awards has been very significant. Adelaide Institute of TAFE marketing

students helped to put together many of the successful submissions, as follows: in the ATSIC tourism category, Camp Coorong; Mirror Image Vintage Touring Company; the Jam Factory-Lion Arts Centre; and the Flinders Ranges and Outback South Australia Tourism Association award. As the Premier indicated, in a very productive relationship between the South-East Institute of TAFE and the South-East Tourism Association, the students put together the submission for the people who were successful, and they received three commendations and won three categories. They were for general tourism services, motoring accommodation and superior accommodation: Aquifer Tours, Mount Gambier; Southgate Motel, Mount Gambier; and Colhurst House, Mount Gambier.

In addition, the Regency Hotel School and the International College of Hotel Management won outright the category of Industry Education. The awards booklet highlights that the alliance between those organisations has been outstanding in regard to advancing the education of people involved in hospitality and tourism. Once again, we can see how TAFE in South Australia, working with industry and the community, is able to assist in promoting this State. Well done to TAFE and well done to the winners of the awards.

DIESEL FUEL REBATE

Mr BUCKBY (Light): Will the Minister for Primary Industries advise the House of his reaction to claims that primary industries in South Australia are being subsidised by the diesel fuel rebate?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thank the member for Light. For various reasons, there have been discussions recently about the diesel fuel rebate. It is often suggested that it is a subsidy to primary production, but I should like to put a couple of points on the record that make it clear that it is not a subsidy. It is actually the refund of a tax that should not have been paid in the first place.

The diesel fuel excise was introduced to pay for roads. As these are offroad uses, it is not appropriate that they pay the tax. To South Australian agriculture, this is worth over \$35 million; the fishing industry pays \$9 million a year in a tax that should not be levied on it; and forestry pays \$2.5 million. The diesel fuel rebate is not a subsidy: it is the return of a tax that should not have been paid in the first place. Any removal of it would have an enormous effect on primary production in South Australia, because primary producers would need to find nearly \$50 million more to continue their operations, and that would be grossly unfair.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr De LAINE (Price): I raise again the question of the Government's intention to close The Parks High School at the end of this year. After the Premier criticised me during Question Time on 3 July for not keeping an appointment with the Minister for Education and Children's Services and not apologising for my non-attendance, he then accused me of making the issue political. I gave a personal explanation that same day, followed by a grievance speech the following day, to set the record straight. Despite my best efforts to explain

the situation in full, the Premier still does not understand or does not want to understand.

The Premier has since sent me a letter to invite me to reschedule a meeting with the Minister for Education. This letter was in response to one, which was dated 19 June, which I sent to the Premier informing him that a delegation from The Parks High School council led by me did not accept his invitation to meet with the Minister for Education. That meeting had been arranged by the Premier, not by me or the school council. I should like to quote in part from a letter sent to me by the Premier on 8 July, as follows:

As I indicated in Parliament on 3 July 1996, I am disappointed that you, as member for Price, chose not to meet the Minister for Education and Children's Services, the Hon. Robert Lucas MLC, on 25 June as had been arranged. This meeting would have presented a further opportunity for you and the appropriate representatives of the school to engage in some constructive dialogue with the Minister on your concerns. Your decision to take up this opportunity is obviously a matter for your own judgment. For my part, however, I express my complete confidence in the Minister and in his capacity to receive proper representations from you and the school community on the matter. I would invite you to reschedule a meeting time with the Minister.

The letter states, 'This meeting would have presented a further opportunity for you and the appropriate representatives of the school to engage in some constructive dialogue with the Minister on your concerns.' A further opportunity? What a joke! There has not even been a first opportunity. The review process was about investigating and reporting on the past and future role of The Parks High School and the local Parks community and not about a process of consultation.

In response to a question asked on 27 March this year by the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier said that he would consider meeting with representatives of the school community if a request was made by the school council through the local member. As the local member, on 6 May I sent a letter from the Chairman of the school council, together with a letter from me, requesting a meeting with the Premier at the school to discuss the proposed closure. There has been no discussion with the Minister for Education but, within Parliament, the Minister has shown himself to be absolutely intractable on this issue.

Because of the Minister's continued refusal to change his mind or even discuss other options for the school, the school council has understandably completely lost confidence in the Minister. This was explained to the Premier in the school council's letter to him; despite that, the Premier declined the invitation to meet with me and representatives of the school council and, instead, arranged a meeting with the Minister for Education.

I advised the Premier, with a copy going to the Minister for Education, in a letter of 19 June that his offer of a meeting with the Minister was unacceptable and a formal invitation in lieu of this was extended to the Premier and the Minister to visit the school to meet with representatives of the school council and me. I led a delegation from the Port Adelaide-Enfield council, comprising the Mayor and the City Manager, to discuss the closure with the Minister for Education on 21 June in the Minister's office.

In response to my further appeal at this time to the Minister to reconsider his decision to close the school, the Minister stated that no matter what I said or did or further information I provided to him he would not change his mind and the school would be closed at the end of this year. Because of this stubborn attitude, is it any wonder that the school council and I feel that it is an absolute waste of time

in seeking a meeting with him. That is why we sought a discussion with the Premier on the situation.

As far as I am concerned, all avenues have been exhausted with the pig-headed Minister for Education. Where else do we go—to the Premier, of course. I again ask the Premier to face up to his responsibilities as the Premier of this State and meet with the school delegation, and by all means bring the Minister for Education with him to inspect the school which the Government is so eager to close.

The Premier accused me and the ALP of playing politics with the issue of the school closure. This whole situation is not a Labor Party stunt and I am not playing politics. The only ones who seek to make the issue political are the Premier and the Government. I have too much respect for the school, the students, the staff and the families of students to use them as a political football.

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

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I understand that the member for Price referred to a Minister of the Crown as pig-headed, and I ask whether that is parliamentary.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has raised an issue and, whilst there is some doubt as to whether the term is strictly unparliamentary, I ask the member not to continue with that language in the House. Does he wish to reconsider his remark?

Mr De LAINE: No, I do not, Sir. He has proven over many years that he is pig-headed, so I will not withdraw the term.

Mr EVANS (Davenport): I wish to bring to the attention of the House the circumstances in which the use of mobile phones and similar equipment can cause explosions at petrol stations. This morning, on my way into Parliament, I filled up my car with petrol and at the same time was using my mobile phone, only to be warned by the console operator via the PA system that I should not use a mobile phone at the service station because it is potentially an explosive situation.

This surprised me, and I am sure it would surprise most mobile phone users. I checked with the console operator who confirmed that that is indeed correct and that some service stations have been asked to request customers not to use mobile phones. To seek further clarification I checked with the Mobil refinery, which advised me that its rules and regulations prevent mobile phones from being used within the refinery; and I was further advised that guidelines were being developed in-house for Mobil service stations statewide.

I then checked with Department of Industrial Relations officers, who also confirmed that this is the case and added that they believe that most of the mobile phones in use have the capacity to spark, which is of some concern. I then telephoned the Australian Institute of Petroleum in Sydney to determine what action is being taken on behalf of the Australian petroleum industry in this matter. The institute confirmed that it is drawing up a voluntary code and that it will try to warn drivers of this danger by erecting signs at service stations. The institute became aware of the problem as a result of UK research conducted by the United Kingdom Institute of Petroleum which had consultants prepare a report on this matter.

I understand that the problem occurs in a number of ways. If someone puts their phone down heavily and the battery moves, it has the capacity to spark; if they happen to drop the phone and the battery moves, it has the capacity to spark; or,

if they do what I often do, turn the phone on, realise that the battery is dead and change the battery while the phone is switched on, it has the capacity to spark. It is a serious concern, because I would suggest that many people use a mobile phone while filling up their car—that would not be an unusual circumstance.

I also understand that CB radios, and some service station operators believe two-way radios, present a danger in service stations. That is a concern for those people who use CB radios or who use two-way radios in their occupations. I understand that those radios also have the capacity to spark. Therefore, I bring this issue to the public's notice. I understand that there is some signage in some service stations. During the past four hours that I have been researching the topic, I have spoken to only one person who has seen the signs. The concern is that that person thought the warning was because the telephone upset the computers which provide the petrol pump reading. When you travel on a plane you are asked to not use a mobile phone because it upsets the navigational equipment, and this person assumed that it was not a safety issue but an issue about upsetting the meter readings in the petrol pumps.

The public's perception is that the present signage does not necessarily address the issue from a safety viewpoint and, therefore, the industry should review it. A further problem, and an unfortunate problem, is that there have been three deaths in Australia this year as a result of people using mobile phones at service stations. The deaths did not result from an explosion but because these people were walking from the pumps into the service station to pay for their petrol, talking on their mobile phone and not watching where they were going and, as a result, they were cleaned up by a car driving in for petrol. That is unfortunate and, as I understand, it has happened three times. Another possible benefit of a better public education program for this problem will be that deaths caused in that way will be avoided.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I rise to address a couple of points, one of which is the number of socialists on the other side of the House. During Question Time today and private members' business this morning I heard members of the Liberal Party being highly critical of the Commonwealth Government, their Howard Government, for cutting back on Government expenditure in a range of areas, including the fuel rebate that applies in rural areas.

In the lead up to the Federal election on 2 March, the Premier, all his Ministers and eager backbenchers told the public that the national deficit was far too large, that there had to be cut-backs, taxes must not be increased, charges must not be increased, and that there was too much sloth and wastefulness. They also said that, in so far as the Public Service was concerned, there was plenty of fat, hop into it. Just after the Federal election, the Premier said that the Prime Minister should get stuck into the Federal public servants to the extent that he did among his own State public servants, that is, reduce their number by 10 per cent which, in the Federal public sector area, equates to more than 30 000 jobs Australia wide. Many of those persons, of course, are employed in South Australia. Members may have sought to telephone Commonwealth offices today only to hear a recorded message saying that those public servants are out on strike in protest against the Government's cut-backs.

We have these agrarian socialists on the other side. It is not a pejorative term. I just wish they would be honest about it and say, 'Look, we do not mind socialism providing it

looks after our backyard, because we do not care too hoots about anybody else.' The Liberal Party in this State has been saying, 'Sack workers, cut benefits to those in most need, those least able to defend themselves, but protect the feather bedding in our area.' It just so happens that I agree with the criticisms that the member for Custance has made with respect to the Federal Government's plans for the fuel rebate. I also agree totally with the criticism that the Labor Party put forward concerning the DIFF program run by the Department of Foreign Affairs that was so useful in getting private industry into Asia and making a big impact on those nations and improving the relationship between Australian business and Asia. We have also seen the total gutting of the Regional Development Program run by the former Keating Government which impacts directly on regional South Australia.

As to the last point, not one single word or protest was raised by the State Government in respect of that. Again, unfortunately for regional South Australia, the rural rump of the Liberal Party is overwhelmed by its metropolitan marginal seats, and this State Liberal Government is only interested in its marginal metropolitan seats. It has forgotten the bush. I wish the rural rump in the Liberal Party were prepared to own up and say, 'Yes, we are agrarian socialists who believe in the redistribution of wealth; we believe in subsidies; and we believe in these things because we believe our people are entitled to receive a certain standard of living that is common across the board to all States and not just limited to the metropolitan area.'

That is economic heresy to the economic rationalists who run the Liberal Party, but as soon as one of your own areas of advantage, such as the fuel rebate scheme, is under threat you are up in arms. I wish you were up in arms over Telstra because, if Telstra is privatised, which is what your Party wants to do, it will totally destroy the telecommunications network which services much of regional South Australia.

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

Mr WADE (Elder): On Thursday 18 July I had the privilege of accepting from the Youth Governor, Emma Casey, eight Bills which had been debated by the Youth Parliament. It was a very pleasurable experience to represent the Hon. Bob Such, Minister for Youth Affairs, at this august gathering. In particular, I had the opportunity to see our youth in action as they debated a Bill and then took a conscience vote to pass or reject it.

I was greatly impressed by our young parliamentarians' maturity and clarity of argument. I think we all need an injection of youthful vitality at times to remind us that we will not only be leaving our State in good hands when our youth take upon themselves the mantle of power but that they will do so with a healthy depth of social obligation.

It has been said that if you are not a socialist at 20 you have no heart and that, if you are still a socialist at 30, you have no brain. I think that this Parliament has demonstrated the truth of this axiom on more than one occasion, especially our Opposition. I commend the YMCA which provided the administrative infrastructure for operating the statewide model for the Parliament on behalf of this Government. I congratulate the Youth Task Force which has been the power house of the organisation for this Youth Parliament. In particular, I acknowledge the months of dedicated effort of coordinators Alice Debats and Elizabeth Day: they have just reason to be proud of their fine effort.

For the 70 young participants, it was an experience I believe they will cherish for many years to come. I commend their outstanding achievement in participating in a long and gruelling exercise which culminated in two sitting days of debate on their eight Bills. These young people have shown a clear understanding of the parliamentary principles. They have gained hands-on experience in identifying a social issue, researching it and preparing a Bill according to parliamentary procedures. They debated each Bill and canvassed all the issues. Perhaps some of the them would now agree with that great German statesman, Otto von Bismarck, who said:

Laws are like sausages. It is better not to see them being made.

I remind my colleagues that those who follow us—these young people—are deeply committed to moulding a society that both protects the public good and enhances individual freedom, and they are following closer than some of us would like to think. Our young people's hard work is a credit to them, to their team, to their team facilitators and to their supporters.

What Bills did our young people research, debate and pass, for they reflect the views of our youth in this State? They passed the Youth Drug Control Act to reduce the amount of illegal drug dealing and use by young people. They passed a Pawnbrokers Act to reduce the exchange of stolen goods through pawnbrokers—and that, Sir, has a familiar ring. They passed the Youth Representation Act to allow people from 16 years of age to be elected to Parliament. They passed an Act to make gaming machines illegal in licensed premises. However, they did not give majority support to the provision of condom vending machines in secondary schools; raising the legal driving age to 18; introducing a curfew for young people under 15 years; or improving our education system through revised funding arrangements and quality assurance measures. The second YMCA Youth Parliament was a resounding success in promoting the voice of our youth in this State.

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

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I rise this afternoon to put on the public record concerns that I continue to have about Metro Meat, particularly with respect to its operation in Noarlunga. As a farmer I am well aware of the international meat crisis, particularly with beef, which is caused by President Clinton as he continues to attack our markets and subsidise his producers, given that he has an election later this year. Also, I know that recently Japan, with companies like Metro, after demanding more and more as regards quality assurance standards, has said that for its next order it will pay only 50 per cent of the price it paid previously.

I have been in contact with the management of Metro Meat ever since 500 people were laid off in March. At that time I was very concerned because, as a member representing a southern electorate, I was celebrating the creation of an additional 500 new jobs in the south—something of which our Government can be very proud—when we heard that 500 people were being laid off—temporarily, I trust. However, I accept the fact that, on a commercial basis, the company had no choice—but neither did the workers.

What has worried me ever since has been the lack of consultation that the company has had with the workers. Many of those workers have been very loyal to Metro. I also am loyal to Metro and place on the record the fact that I appreciate the commitment that the company has had to

South Australia for a long time. I trust that it will keep that commitment for many years to come, and I dearly want to see that commitment kept at Noarlunga where Metro has \$10 million worth of infrastructure in what is its flagship meat works.

At the end of the day employees are human beings and need to be treated as such. I was disappointed to hear that it took from the time those people were laid off, which was way back in March, until 1 July before there was any correspondence with any of the workers. How would you feel, Sir, if you had been laid off and you had a mortgage, car payment, young children that you had to feed and clothe and a wife sitting at home paranoid about your future and you were getting no indication whatsoever from the company you were working for as to your future? This is why I am critical of Metro, and I will continue to be unless I can see clear evidence that it will take steps to keep in touch with those families.

We are all suffering as a result; and I know that Metro is suffering financially. On this occasion I am happy to get right alongside the unions and work with them to try to get a fair go for the workers. I have been told by some of the executive, 'They can get other work in the meantime.' That is fine but, if they get other work in the meantime, under the award they have to come back, and it is eight months before any redundancy payments have to be made. Some of these people have been with the company for 25 or more years. If the worst scenario occurs and they become eligible for a redundancy payment, they would have to quit their new job to return to Metro, otherwise they would miss out on the benefits they justly deserve. What would you do, Sir, if you had been working at Metro for 25 years? Would you take on a job with another company and risk that? I think not.

I sincerely feel for these people and I urge the executives of Metro, whilst they work through these difficult times, to please keep in touch with the families. The stress levels are enormous. We saw what was happening with those on workers' compensation. They were being asked to come to work every day in appalling conditions, with no work to do. Why did Metro not capitalise on the time when the layoffs were occurring to rehabilitate and retrain those workers so that there could have been mutual benefit to the workers and to the company once Metro reopened?

I trust that we will have a good spring in this State and this country and that we will see, as quickly as possible, a return to reasonable beef prices. But there are other products within the livestock area that are doing all right at the moment, such as mutton and lamb. They have a chain down there which they could be operating, keeping some of the jobs going. Deer, ostrich and emu opportunities are expanding around the country, so there is an opportunity for diversification. There is an excellent transport company, Southern Transport at Willunga, which goes past there all the time and could cart the stock. I think it is time that Metro really works on letting the workers and the people of the southern area know the future of the Noarlunga Meatworks.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): All South Australians should be gravely concerned about the sheer arrogance and callousness of the Brown Government in dealing with the recent outbreak of legionnaire's disease in this State—not only that but the sheer ineptitude of its response. Legionnaire's disease is a deadly disease. The majority of recent cases of this disease have been associated with spa pools. The spa industry was then warned, local government authorities were warned,

but the general public was left out. Today in Parliament the Health Minister, in responding to questions from the Opposition, said that these matters are best left to the experts. The experts, he said, knew best how to deal with this problem. He seems to have forgotten that it is these same experts who managed the response to the Garibaldi HUS epidemic, and that a subsequent Coroner's report recommended a complete overhaul of public health crisis protocols.

As the Leader of the Opposition said, if the Minister will not kick backsides in the Health Commission, someone has to kick his. The Brown Government has been completely negligent in its handling of this latest outbreak of legionnaire's disease. I do not care what the experts say: it was the chief expert, the Director of Public Health (Dr Kerry Kirke), who gave the excuse that contacting recent past guests of the Ozone Hotel was 'too difficult', that it would 'create unnecessary panic' and that it was not cost effective. Yet, his staff all of a sudden have been working through the night to contact guests. In Parliament today the Health Minister then made the astonishing statement that the reason public health officials did not believe that contacting recent past guests of the Ozone Hotel was a priority was that 'they were already at risk and there was no urgency or immediacy with those people'.

We later asked why a recent past guest of the Ozone Hotel on Kangaroo Island, who had asthma and had suffered twice previously from pneumonia, did not know that it was the hotel in which she was staying that was implicated in the legionnaire's disease outbreak. She did not know this until she learned it from the media on Monday. I spoke with that young woman last night, and she was very angry. She and her partner arrived there at 8.15 on Friday 19 July for a holiday weekend. She said to me that, if she had known on Saturday, after the media releases from the Health Commission had gone out, they would have immediately left that hotel. And of course they would. All the guests would have left that hotel if they had known. But, of course, they did not know. The Health Minister said that she was not told because all precautions had been taken at the hotel to make sure that no guest was in danger. What she said to me on the phone last night was that no-one said anything to her or to her partner. All they knew was what was on a television news report that they saw in their room at the hotel and which referred to 'somewhere in Kingscote'. Of course, it was the very hotel where they were staying.

There are still too many unanswered questions about this matter. The Minister admitted in Parliament today that he knew of the process, he knew about the calling of an outbreak on the afternoon of Friday 19 July, and he approved it. It is his management of this crisis that must now be brought into serious question, just as it was his management of the last crisis last year with HUS. If he cannot kick backsides, the Premier of this State needs to kick his.

GALLANTRY

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I read an extract from a letter that I received on behalf of Senior Sergeant Christopher Voigt, which states:

We are instructed by Senior Sergeant Christopher Voigt. He was the senior officer at the Police Communications Centre on 2 April 1996. There was contact made to Police Communications by the Metropolitan Fire Service inquiring as to the use of the m.v. *Gallantry* in relation to an earlier rescue. There was a conversation between the MFS officer and our client, which was recorded. A recording of the communication has subsequently been made public, and you have made comments in relation to the communication. We understand that you have been reported to have made comments in reference to the communication between the two officers to the effect that:

They might have been drinking at the time, they might have been thinking of other things—who knows?

Our client's identity has been made well known by the release of the tape. Our client's voice is well known to many people both inside and outside of the South Australia Police and he has as a consequence been contacted by a number of people inquiring as to whether or not he had in fact been 'drunk' on the night. Although our client has been obliged to deny the claims he has been compromised in his ability to work. His work in the Communications Centre is work which involves a high degree of competence and efficiency and any suggestion that he was affected by alcohol is most prejudicial to him and his character.

There is further information in the letter, and I will table all the correspondence. I will read out my response, which was as follows:

I refer to your letter of 5 July 1996 in relation to this matter. You have indicated in your letter that Senior Sergeant Voigt, the senior officer at the Police Communications Centre on 2 April 1996, believes the following comments made by me in relation to the conversation between him and a Metropolitan Fire Service officer have defamed him:

They might have been drinking at the time, they might have been thinking of other things—who knows?

The existence of an audiotape of such a conversation was drawn to my attention by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Rann, in the House of Assembly on 2 July 1996. Mr Rann indicated to the House that he had been 'supplied with an audiotape of a conversation between a police communications sergeant and a fire service communications officer'. Mr Rann did not indicate whether the audiotape was a tape recording of a conversation made whilst the officers were on duty. I was provided with no details of the nature of the conversation (where and how it took place), nor of its authenticity. I had assumed, given the nature of the comments and the confidentiality of communication tapes, that the conversation took place in a casual non-work atmosphere. For confirmation of this assumption I refer you to *Hansard* records of that day when the question was asked.

And I quote from *Hansard* in relation to the fireboat *Gallantry*. The first question was asked by the Hon. Mike Rann, as follows:

My question is directed to the Minister for Police. Why was the fireboat *Gallantry* not called in by police to aid in the search and rescue of two men reported lost in Gulf St Vincent on 18 March this year? On that date a 29 year old . . . man died after a boat sank when it hit a reef in the gulf. As to a later incident, I have a transcript of taped phone calls between the Metropolitan Fire Service and the metropolitan police on 2 April referring to a search for two men in a fishing boat. The transcript states . . .

And I will not go through it all; I do not think that it does any credit to the people concerned, but members can well remember the incident. In response to the question, I said:

What an extraordinary performance before the House. It is almost like listening to a bar room conversation.

I further said:

The Leader of the Opposition decided that he had a question and he was going to ask it. I have already replied that I have not discussed the m.v. *Gallantry*. The Leader's further question has been poorly phrased. I had already discarded that as an issue. However, if the honourable member is saying, 'I have a tape: I rushed around and hid in a bar and this is what I heard,' that is fine, and he can use this Parliament for that purpose. However, if the honourable member is saying, 'There is an issue here as to why the m.v. *Gallantry* was not used on this occasion,' I am happy to receive a report back from the police. If that is what he wants, I am more than happy to receive

a report. I have not talked to the police about the disposition of the m.v. *Gallantry*.

My letter continued:

I felt it was very poor form that someone, for whatever purposes, had taped without knowledge of the individuals involved, a conversation which contained comments that may not have reflected positively on the individuals concerned.

Accordingly, when I made the statement which offended Senior Sergeant Voigt, I had no intention of implying that he and/or the MFS officer was on duty at the time. In no way did I intend to imply that either officer was drunk, or had been drinking on duty. I am now attempting to find out how a tape of this nature was produced from confidential communications and how it came into the hands of the Opposition. I cannot believe that your client would have been party to its production.

Should this letter be insufficient by way of explanation and apology for misinterpretation, I am more than happy to have it read into the parliamentary record. I would also welcome the opportunity to meet you and your client and explain the situation face to face.

That was my perfectly reasonable response. It is unfortunate that the particular officer has been subjected to such criticism as a result of this tape, illegally obtained, being used within the confines of this Parliament. Having also visited the communications centre and seen how efficiently it operates, and even knowing that there is no alcohol on the premises, I could not even have assumed that anyone had been drinking on duty. I said I would table the correspondence, because I agreed, if that was required, I would do so. I do feel for Sergeant Voigt. I believe that he has been misused and abused in the process, for whatever base means the Opposition was trying to achieve at the time.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: For any statements I have made that would have caused any difficulty to Sergeant Voigt under those circumstances, I do sincerely apologise. I table the correspondence.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE PULP AND PAPER MILL (HUNDREDS OF MAYURRA AND HINDMARSH)(COUNCIL RATES) AMENDMENT BILL

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

That the time for bringing up the report of the committee be extended to Thursday 1 August 1996.

Motion carried.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS ENTERPRISES (COMPETITION) BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 5, lines 18 to 23 (clause 12)—Leave out subclause (1) and insert new subclause as follows:

- (1) The prime objective of a Commissioner in carrying out an investigation and making a pricing recommendation is—
- (a) to achieve prices that reflect, in the Commissioner's opinion, the cost of efficient production and supply; and
 - (b) through that means to achieve efficient resource allocation,
- so far as that objective is consistent with explicitly identified and defined community service obligations imposed on the relevant GBE by Act of Parliament or by the Government.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

Motion carried.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (WARD QUOTAS) AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 1, lines 21 to 23 (clause 2)—Leave out all words in these lines after 'to take effect' in line 21 and insert 'on or before the date of the second general election of the council after the proposal takes effect or, if an earlier date is fixed by proclamation, on or before that date'.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

We accept the amendment made by the Legislative Council. All the other place has done is to tighten the wording to make it quite clear. The intent of the amendment is totally in line with the original intent of the Bill as it went through this House.

Ms HURLEY: I did appreciate that this gives effect to the Minister's undertakings about the nature of the Bill, but it is good to see the actual words in the legislation. I support the amendment.

Motion carried.

STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 4 July. Page 1878.)

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I support this Bill. Quite obviously, in my electorate I have a very strong SES presence. They are very valuable contributors to the community. I place on the record that these administrative changes are important, because they will effectively provide that, when dollars are spent with the SES, ultimately they will be spent more where it counts, and that is back on the ground delivering the necessary services.

This Bill puts into effect the Government's decision to separate SES control from the South Australian Police Department. This in itself reinforces the independent recognition that the SES deserves, and the Bill effectively provides for employees of the SES to be treated as a separate public service unit, called State Emergency Services SA, and that includes the volunteers. This has been provided, to some extent, by changes to the Public Sector Management Act, formally proclaimed on 6 June this year.

Importantly, the role and function of the SES has not changed. In fact, I believe its autonomy has been strengthened. Effectively it provides for administrative streamlining by separating formal control of SES staff from the Police Commissioner. I am pleased also that it formally clarifies who are members of the SES so that the SES can continue to be best and most effectively provided with administrative and support services from other agencies.

I place on the record that, in my electorate, I have five SES units operating out of Berri, Loxton, Blanchetown, Barmera and Renmark-Paringa as a joint operation, whilst services at Waikerie are effectively provided by the CFS. During the 1995-96 financial year, these units responded to more than 300 emergency incidents, totalling 5 277 documented operational hours of volunteer members' time. There is a total of 191 registered SES members in the Riverland division alone. They provide a very effective and very

valuable volunteer service which is involved in road accident rescue, storm damage, river operations and search and rescue programs.

I am also conscious of and acknowledge that the 1996-97 budget provides for an increase of approximately \$207 000 to SES services around the State. Although the specific delineation into my electorate of Chaffey has not been formalised, I believe from discussions and confirmation from the Minister that the SES operation in my area will see an increase in dollars. I am confident and pleased that, because these administrative changes will take this power and control from the Police Commissioner and put it into a separate administrative unit, SES services around the State, and particularly in my electorate, will have increased dollars spent on the ground in areas where they count and on those very valuable services to the local people and also to other people who obviously come into or travel through the area. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): The Opposition supports the legislation. We understand the necessities for change in this area. I have been consulted on it. The SES has spoken to me about this matter. The Minister has briefed me on the legislation. I understand the effect of this legislation will be to house the SES under administrative and industrial arrangements with which it feels more comfortable than the present regime. I must tell the member for Giles that this Minister did consult with me and I was happy with that. I wish there was a bit more of that around the place, and I commend the Minister for it.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: I know I am easily pleased. I easily roll over and I get tickled. We must debate this Bill seriously, because when disasters happen in South Australia, whether they be localised or more general, this is the front-line defence organisation, for example, the organisation which seals the roofs on some of our homes when storms cause terrible damage. We do not allow an enormous budget for this activity, but I can say, on behalf of all South Australians, that it is an excellent organisation that makes people feel much more comfortable in their homes when certain events take place. We commend the legislation to the House.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Emergency Services): I thank the members for Chaffey and Playford for supporting the Bill and for their remarks, and I particularly thank both members for their strong support of the State Emergency Service. It is pleasing in this place that there are some things that allow support to cross all political boundaries. I am grateful for the Opposition's support of this Bill. I commend it to the House.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (UNIVERSITY COUNCILS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 10 July. Page 1925.)

Ms WHITE (Taylor): The Opposition supports the second reading of the Bill, but signals that there are some important amendments which we will move in the Committee stage and which we believe need to be made in order to improve this legislation. The universities are State institu-

tions. This Bill amends each of the three State Acts which set up the South Australian universities, but only in ways which affect the councils of the three universities. During my consultations with various interested parties within the universities, amendments were suggested to address perceived problems with or inadequacies in other parts of the university Acts. The Labor Opposition has decided that it will support some amendments and one of the universities, Adelaide University, has distributed such proposals. I understand that the Minister today will give some undertaking to consider these. If the Minister indicates a commitment to consult with each of the universities in this regard, the Opposition is happy to confine its amendments to this Bill today to those clauses dealing only with university councils.

This Bill has arisen out of a review of university governance commissioned by the Minister in June 1995. That report entitled, 'Balancing Town and Gown', which was written by a task force headed by Professor Alan McGregor, was brought down in February 1996. The report recommends that the current general structure of the universities is appropriate and should be continued. It recommends changes to the size and the composition of those governing bodies. The Minister in his second reading explanation asserts that there is a need to ensure that university governance arrangements are appropriate into the future to guarantee that the universities' contribution to South Australia through excellence and teaching and research are not constrained for the want of effective Government structures. The Labor Opposition strongly supports this premise.

The Opposition also supports the idea that university councils' focus should be in governance rather than as managerial bodies. We believe that it is important for university governing bodies to act in an overseeing role, to concentrate on both the shorter and longer term views and to focus on the establishment of a considered strategic direction for their university. At this point, however, I flag to the Minister my intention to ask a question in the Committee stage about the removal of section 19 of the Flinders University Act. That section contains explicit powers of that particular university's council to manage its affairs and to appoint and dismiss staff. I will be asking for a guarantee from the Minister that the effect of the removal of that clause is not to diminish the powers of that council. The removal of such powers would not be supported by the Opposition.

The Government's move to reduce the size of the councils is not something to which the Opposition objects. We recognise that with large councils can come cumbersome and ineffective practices. However, we are of the opinion that size is far less important than the composition of those councils and that the procedures for appropriate and effective decision-making are within those councils. The Opposition will move amendments to this Bill which will effect a reduction in the size of the three councils to a total of 22 members. This will not change the current size of the University of South Australia council but will mean a significant reduction to the size of the Adelaide University and Flinders University councils which have memberships currently of 35 and 34.

However, it is in respect of the composition of those councils that the Government and the Opposition differ. The Labor Opposition will move amendments to the Government's Bill which will have the effect of increasing for each university the representation of academic staff on councils by one more member than the Bill proposes, by increasing the representation of students by an additional member and by replacing the two proposed co-opted members on each

council by two elected representatives of the South Australian Parliament.

Before I go on to highlight other amendments to be moved by the Opposition, I would like to explain briefly our opposition to this Bill's lack of representation of those three memberships. Our move to increase to three the number of academic staff on councils is because we support so strongly the aim of guaranteeing the university's contribution to South Australia through excellence in teaching, learning and research. This we believe requires the important and fundamental contribution by academic staff to determining the direction of the university, and is recognition by the Labor Party of the value of academics' contribution to the good governance of universities.

Faculty participation in the governance of universities is important. Under the Bill before us, the number of academic staff would decrease from eight members to two in the case of Adelaide and Flinders and from five to two in the case of the University of South Australia. I believe such a move, representing a significant reduction in the proportional representation of academic staff, to be a retrograde step. In fact, in the case of Flinders University and the University of South Australia, whose proposed two academic staff under this Bill would include the presiding officer of the academic senate or academic board, there would be only one other academic staff member outside senior management.

I refer to the words of the secretary of one of the campus branches of the National Tertiary Education Union expressed in a letter to me, where she notes that the move by the Government to reduce academic representation on university councils should be seen in the light of a managerialist system within one university at least. She explains that, in that university, all school boards, the academic board and all other committees in the university on which academics are represented are purely advisory and that decision making powers are held alone by heads of units and by senior management. She points out that the academics are by far the strongest group of staff within that university and are charged most directly with achieving its teaching and research goals. With only one academic outside senior management on the council, academic working staff would have less council representation than general staff. I note also that the Minister's own 'Town and Gown' report recommends three rather than two academic staff on university councils, and I would be interested to know what drove the Government to reject that recommendation in the drawing up of this legislation.

Some other very important points have been made in my consultations with academic staff and their union, the NTEU. The first is that reducing academic involvement in university governance is at odds with an industrial climate where management and staff are urged to work together for common goals and, secondly, such reduction in representation implies a devaluing of the wide range of talents within the universities. So, I cannot blame academic staff for their viewing this move as yet another hostile move by the Government against academics. In the view of the NTEU, universities make their reputation on the basis of the work of their academics.

It is unlikely that, by ignoring academics' views to the extent proposed in this legislation, either the reputation of our universities or the prosperity of our State will be enhanced. I would like to read a couple of short comments that I thought particularly relevant, made by Professor Robert E. Potter, who was an American professor who spent some time in an Australian university and whose views were expressed in a

paper published in the *Journal of Educational Administration* a little while ago—1983—titled ‘Faculty participation in university governance: Australia and the United States’. Professor Potter observes:

As a long-time faculty member of American universities, I have questioned the wisdom of having faculty members on the governing boards of the institutions where they are employed. I have been concerned with the problems of vested interests, which become increasingly keen with the advent of collective bargaining. And I have been disturbed by the spectre of the involvement of the board with administrative functions, a danger which might be promoted by the presence of students and faculty members on the board. However, the experience of having taught for a year in an Australian university and having visited and talked with academics in a number of Australian universities has caused me to have second thoughts. Although I disagree with the heavy concentration of power in the hands of the professors, who tend to be very conservative and oriented to preserving the *status quo*, I found the participation of faculty in the work of the council to result in generally well-considered decisions. I observed few of the problems of individual conflict of interest that I had anticipated. Perhaps it was the presence of several academics on the council which helped keep the council at the policy-making level rather than getting involved with administrative or executive activities.

Recognition by the Government that better academic representation than is proposed in this Bill is warranted would I believe help university councils better to perform two very important functions with which they are charged. The first is the resolution of academic, economic, disciplinary and even political problems and conflicts that are not resolved by the rest of the university structures. The second is the overall and special responsibility for directing the external relations of the university, as they are a forum for discussing and focusing on issues of common concern to the university and the wider community and formulating the university’s response to external issues.

This is where the proposed reduction in student participation is to be criticised. In the case of Flinders and Adelaide university councils, unless the Opposition’s amendments are passed, this Bill will produce a reduction from the current five student members to two student representatives on council. Let me make it emphatically clear. This reduction is clearly at odds with all other statements made by this Minister about promoting a greater voice for young people. There can be no greater hypocrisy than for this Liberal Government to reduce the relative representation of students—of young people—on council, in the case of Flinders and Adelaide Universities, from 15 per cent of the total council representation down to 10 per cent, on the bodies that more than any other in this State impact on the quality and availability of higher education for young people.

I sincerely hope that this move by the State Liberal Government is not aimed at decreasing students’ voice of protest. I sincerely hope that this move at this time by this Government is not to minimise the voice of protest against cuts to university funding, and I sincerely hope that it is not in response to its discomfort at the level of student and staff protest against the closure of the Salisbury campus of the University of South Australia, a move opposed by the Labor Opposition but condoned by the State Liberal Government.

Another amendment I have indicated that we will move is to maintain representation on the three councils of two members of Parliament. This would represent a decrease in the case of Flinders and Adelaide university councils, which currently have five members of Parliament represented on their councils. The link between the Government and the rest of the university community through the council is a most important one, and I have outlined already some of the

reasons why this is so, not the least of which is the very topical issue of Government funding for universities. Another reason why the link between the Government and, through elected representatives, the community is important is that it ensures that standards and priorities set by the council are relevant, both to Government and community expectations.

In deference to the Government’s aim to keep the total number of council members to a minimum, the Labor Opposition will move amendments to reinstate representation of two members of Parliament, one from each of the major Parties, in place of the two co-opted members included in the Bill. Under the past arrangement, the reason for having co-opted members on the council made sense, with external members being elected, because co-option could be used under those circumstances to compensate for the holes in the range of skills brought to council through the election process.

However, under the Bill, a majority of external members are to be selected rather than elected. Working on the assumption that people will always be co-opted because they hold particular skills, not because they happen to be someone’s mate, and that external members will be selected, rather than elected, according to guidelines specifying particular skills requirements, there is no need for additional members to be co-opted. It is my belief that, because of the skills they hold, individuals may be co-opted to subcommittees of the university councils but that they do not need to be voting members of the governing council.

The other major change in this Bill in the composition of university councils is the move away from approximately equal representation of internal and external members to one-third internal, two-thirds external membership. This move represents a shift away from a model based on the British ideal of academic freedom, self-recruitment and self-governance towards a more American, board of directors type of governance. The clear premise behind this move is that universities should be run more like businesses. While the Opposition does not assert one philosophy over the other in itself, it is important to recognise the historical reasons for both those systems of university governance.

The European model derives from a tradition that goes back to the birth of universities in medieval cathedrals, where the view developed that the accumulated wisdom and knowledge of well-qualified faculty, educated over many years, gives the right to and the duty of self-determination and has a role as a critic of society, a role that requires the freedom to pursue ideas and initiatives.

On the other hand, the American model derives from the establishment of universities such as Yale in 1701. That institution was founded because the more conservative members of the Congregational Church became disturbed at the liberal turn taken at Harvard at that time and decided to set up a university with an external board of trustees composed of reverent ministers of the gospel who would continue to control the board by appointing replacements from their own ranks. Indeed, most American universities in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were denominational, concerned more for the preservation of religious orthodoxy than the search for truth. When State universities began to appear, that orthodoxy took a more economic and social rather than religious form, and university governance fell to those who were active in business life.

The view of the Opposition is not to choose between those two models but to assert that a member of a university council provides a valuable contribution, not by virtue of who

they are or what professional or other background they have, but by their capacity, interest and willingness to contribute. It is all very well to say, as does the Town and Gown report commissioned by the Government, that heads of successful businesses make the best appointees. If they have little real interest and do not commit enough time and energy to their council work, they make worse appointments than the academic who thinks deeply about the business of council priorities. Likewise, though, the academic who does not keep abreast of modern application and community expectations of his or her teaching does not add the contribution of the member who brings his experience as an employer and identifies shortcomings of a university's graduates.

The Opposition does not choose between those models but, with this difference in mind, I will move amendments to include in the design of guidelines for and in the endorsement of the selection panels which the Government is setting up the appointment of external members to the university councils. We believe that this will enhance university councils by ensuring that people most likely to make a valuable contribution will be recruited.

The Opposition will move some other amendments such as the removal of the requirement for a maximum capping of eight years on terms of appointment, and, in the case of the amendment to the Adelaide University Act, the removal of the five-year exclusion term for former students and staff of that university. I will save the detail of the amendments for the Committee stage of the Bill.

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurana): I want to put on the record a letter that I received from the Vice-Chancellor of Flinders University, acting on behalf of Ian Chubb, with regard to a couple of issues that were raised at university council in relation to the draft Bill. Particular attention was drawn to recommendations that the university made with regard to the make-up of the council. The council has written to the Minister with regard to suggested changes. They also wrote to the Minister about the limiting of service to a maximum of eight years, which would make members ineligible for reappointment. Council asked for consideration to changes to that area and to section 19 of the principal Act, which is proposed to be repealed under the Bill, and on which council sought some concessions.

I have made contact with the Minister's office and with Flinders University Council. I was informed that the council has made this representation to the Minister's office, and I will put on the record part of the response that I received, as follows:

I have informed the Minister's office that I will circulate the attachment which contains our response to the draft proposals that affect this university. You will see that we prefer the proposal we put to the Minister in response to the report. I should say that his office has been cooperative and on last advice is seeking to accommodate our wishes.

They have also asked for changes to the other provisions to which I have referred, other than the make-up of the council. I really do not want to prolong this debate and make argument one way or another. However, as a representative of Flinders University Council, I have put on the record the responses that were discussed within council and I have referred to the contacts that have come to me, and I understand that the Minister has done what he can to alleviate their problems.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I speak to this Bill as a member of the University of Adelaide's Council, although my attendance at meetings would be the bare minimum to be able to call myself a member of the council. As a newly elected member of this place some 2½ years ago, when I was made aware of the committees that are available for members to serve on, I thought that I would like to play a role in the University of Adelaide.

Clearly, it is a very important university and a university held in extremely high regard throughout the country—as are the other two universities, I might add. I wanted to serve on the University of Adelaide Council because, in my early days as an Opposition backbencher, I thought that I would have the time available to assist in that university.

It was the only vote for a position within my Caucus that I have contested unopposed. I was duly elected by my colleagues to be one of the representatives from the Labor Party on the University of Adelaide Council. As I went to my first council meeting, I had certain thoughts about how the governance of the university would be undertaken. Given that the university has the pre-eminent school of management in South Australia, I assumed that it would be very well managed and capable of running a large business—and we are talking about one of the State's major businesses in terms of turnover.

When I walked in and saw about 35 people sitting around an extraordinarily large table, it was a little off-putting. I have served on many community boards (as we all do as MPs and active people within the community) but I have never seen an administrative body of such enormity. I duly took my place in the second row of seats (for those who are always late, as I am) and tried to follow the course of the meeting having read my minutes during the previous weekend.

I cast no aspersions and make no innuendo as to why this occurred, but I was running about three items behind the chancellor. That is no reflection on the chancellor—it is more a reflection on me. The Premier always calls me 'thick'—perhaps he is right. I had great difficulty following the issues at hand. Occasionally I was able to find the correct paper, but trying to compete with 35 other people for the attention of a chancellor is not an easy task, and therefore the ability to influence the outcome of the meeting or fully participate in rigorous debate is very difficult. That is more so when one is three items behind everybody else, but that could be a reflection on me and not the process. The governance of a university is an important job which requires maximum effort and attention from those who are given that task. It is vitally important that one is able to give items the attention they deserve, to do the homework, to do the reading and to understand the issues. I found—and still do—that the enormity of the council created difficulty in achieving productive outcomes. However, I must say that that view is not shared by a vast number on the council.

I have frequently made my views known to the council. I have never seen any large body of support for my view that there should be some reform on the council. I am prepared to acknowledge that my view may be that of a select few. I am not sure whether my view is shared by only a select few, but I have not had many allies when I have made my comments; in fact, I have had quite a number of detractors on the University of Adelaide Council when I have been outspoken. However, having put up with the Government every day in the House, I have learnt to cope with a little bit of chiding and criticism.

I commend the shadow Minister for her contribution. She covered the points very well. I do not want to dwell on the specifics of the Bill. The reality is that, in this rapidly changing world in which we live and the rapidly changing and flexible nature of all institutions (whether companies within the private sector, Government owned bodies or governments themselves), they must have the best available skills, structures and means with which to carry out the running of the organisation for which they are responsible.

The issue of the size of this board and the way in which members are selected is deservedly open to reform and scrutiny. Some members of the Adelaide University Council, as they said to me recently, will say, 'We are the pre-eminent university. So far we seem to have got everything right. If it is not broken, why are you trying to fix it?' The reality is that nothing stays constant. If we think that to date the performance of the Adelaide University has been good and, therefore, there is no need to reform it, that is a narrow view and one which does not sustain itself to any contemporary thinking about how major organisations should be run.

Despite the views of many, and the attitudes of quite a number of people, the University of Adelaide is a substantially taxpayer funded organisation. I understand that well in excess of 50 per cent of its funding comes from the taxpayer. With that comes a significant degree of responsibility to the taxpayer. It is not for the sole ownership of a select group within the community; it is there for the improvement of the community at large and it is a loan from the taxpayer to be re-invested in our community.

The government of the day has a number of obligations and rights which it must exercise over the universities. As protectors of the taxpayers' investment, we must ensure that the management structure of a university, in this case Adelaide University, is the best available. I would think that the university's turnover each year would amount to hundreds of millions of dollars. An organisation such as that cannot have a board of 35 directors. That is not a realistic size for a board. A university must have the best structure in place not only to safeguard the investment in purely financial terms but also to ensure that it caters for the very broad role required of it.

There has been much debate, particularly on the University of Adelaide Council, about the selection versus election issue. That is not a new debate or a debate that only the University of Adelaide is having. It is a debate which has been before governments in this State and nationally for a number of years. It is a debate that I think has largely been won by those who would argue, and have been successful in arguing, that an election process does not by definition or reality give you the best available skills you need. That is not to say that selection is perfect, either, but you cannot—

Mr Atkinson: How did we get here?

Mr FOLEY: I will come to that, because that was one of the examples put forward. This is a board of directors: it is the body responsible for a significant taxpayer investment, so you cannot be certain that, through an election process, you will get on that body the necessary skills to manage the business enterprise involved.

Mr Atkinson: Let's wind up elected Parliaments now.

Mr FOLEY: That is not an analogy at all.

The Hon. R.B. Such interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: This debate was had at the national level. I have used these analogies—and they were not particularly well accepted on the University of Adelaide Council—but there have been bodies, such as the old Wheat Corporation,

which was underwritten by the taxpayer to the tune of billions of dollars and which had an elected board. It was clearly considered by the Government and Opposition Parties in Canberra to be an inappropriate structure, and they moved towards a selection process.

It happened to the Wool Corporation and a whole raft of major Government controlled businesses, or businesses that are, at the end of the day, supported by the taxpayer. It has been an evolving style, an evolving reform. I do not see any reason why universities should be treated differently. In fact, they are being treated differently to the extent that we are not talking about the entire university council being selected: in the example of the Adelaide University, it is one-third, I think.

Ms White: Two-thirds.

Mr FOLEY: I apologise. But it still allows an election to take place. The arguments for this reform and restructure are very sound: it is simply to put in place a more flexible and appropriate structure for the 1990s and into the year 2000 and beyond. Clearly, the Government and the shadow Minister have much common ground on this, and the debate will attempt to resolve some of the points. It will be for the shadow Minister and the Minister to debate.

Having said that I believe that taxpayers' investments in the universities of our State and country need to be adequately safeguarded, that is not to say that our universities should be run by just business people. That is not what I am saying. There is a role for skilled people in areas of financial management and whatever, but there is also the very real need to ensure that we get the full breadth of community involvement, views and skills on that board. It cannot and should not be run by a group of elite, selected business people: quite the opposite. They have a role to play but we need to ensure that the broader community is involved in input into the university and that the university has the freedom and ability to go about its work.

Clearly the people on the University of Adelaide Council have been very committed to that structure and to the university, and my comments tonight are not a reflection on the skills and performance of people on that council: quite the opposite. For the university to have been run so well for so many years, to be one of the country's most important, valued and quality universities, I think is a tribute to the 34 people who are on the council—excluding me, because my contribution is nothing about which I can brag. To have survived that structure and made things as good as they are at the Adelaide University is a tribute to the skills and patience of those 34 people.

Some may consider this a bit of a chip on the shoulder from somebody who dropped out of school half way through fourth year, but I also make this plea on the public record, as I have done before, that the University of Adelaide does a lot through its Fairway program in opening up the university to non-traditional areas of influence. I know from my electorate and from where I grew up in Taperoo, Largs Bay and Semaphore—a very strong working class part of our city (and the area of my colleague the member for Spence, the shadow Minister, is demographically quite similar)—that more can be done.

We need to ensure that we are continually taking our universities to the community and that all communities across this State have an opportunity to access the very fine institutions that we have, not just Adelaide University but the other universities (but I can only really talk about Adelaide University as I am a member there). I do not think we do

enough, as universities or perhaps even as Governments, to ensure that we open up these universities to young South Australians in these areas. I do not think I knew that Adelaide University existed until I was about 20.

I am not just talking about a bit of a PR exercise: I am talking about encouraging the young in our community to make themselves strive for university and to ensure that we assist young people from areas such as mine to access universities. I have seen the statistics: I think, on average, two or three people from Taperoo High School and probably only two or three, if that, from Le Fevre High School go on to Adelaide University. They were the last figures I looked at a couple of years ago, and it is a very small number. For Marryatville High School the number might be 30 or 40—

Mr Atkinson: Unley High School.

Mr FOLEY: For Unley High School, Adelaide High School and the private colleges, the numbers are quite high. That has to be a very important signal that we are not getting it right, that more needs to be done. I am not criticising the university or the Government: I am simply saying that we need continually to do more to ensure that the kids in my electorate at Taperoo, Le Fevre and Largs Bay are getting the opportunity to access the fine campuses at the Adelaide University and that it is not just a university that is available to those who have the means or the ability automatically to find their way into that university.

I know it is a complex problem: it is one with which many people have tried to grapple. The university has been very progressive in putting the Fairway scheme in place, but I think we need to do more. As a member of Parliament for an electorate of the nature of mine, that is something I feel very strongly about. I hope that, over time, we can make some sort of impact.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I wish to make a contribution on this important Bill and commend the Minister and the Government for introducing it, because it is important that we get it right. The universities play a very important role in the development of this State not only in the economic sense but also in the social sense, and in the intellectual capital of all South Australians. I have a vested interest in the three universities: I am a graduate of Flinders; my daughter attends Adelaide University; and I am a member of the Council of the University of South Australia.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: If the member for Spence stopped grooming his thesaurus, we could get on with it. This Bill is important because we have to get it right. I have listened with interest to the member for Taylor in regard to historical developments at the university and the two schools of thought—the English and American models—and I have a concern that we get it right, as she does. It is important that we get the GSP (gross social product) right. Universities are important instruments to ensure that—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: I am talking about the three universities and the full production possibility of all aspects of human development. That is what I was trying to get across, but the member for Spence interjected.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: I will try to continue. The universities employ about 1 per cent of the State's employees (6 500 staff). This figure approximates to the number of employees in mining, 6 000; in manufacturing textiles, clothing and footwear, 5 500; and fabricated metal products,

6 800. The universities contribute approximately 1.7 per cent of the gross State product, that is, \$555 million. This contribution is more than that of other industries that are generally considered to be of importance to the State, such as wine and brandy, at \$435 million; manufacturing and textiles, clothing and footwear at \$435 million; wool at \$320 million; and copper mining at \$208 million. These figures are from ABS publications. The total export income to the State from foreign students was \$41.8 million in 1994 and has been growing since.

The universities play a very important role in the economy of South Australia, as I said previously benefiting not only the economy of South Australia but the whole State. It is important that we get the governance of universities right. That is not to criticise governance in the past but, as we have changes, it is important to bring things up to date. As a member of the University of South Australia Council, which has had a smaller body, I believe it has run well. We can get the balance that the member for Taylor was talking about—representation from a broad section of the community, including students—with a smaller number. I am sure that everyone is in agreement with that. It is a matter of fine tuning and I am sure that, with the amendments, that will occur.

This was really brought about as a result of the McGregor report, from which the main recommendations were that the university council should comprise no more than 20 members with a clear majority of external members not otherwise closely associated with the universities. That is really to broaden the representation and get input from the broader community. The external membership should be up to 13, including the Chancellor, 10 members appointed by the Governor on the recommendation of a selection committee, and up to two members co-opted and appointed by council. The internal membership should comprise seven, including the Vice-Chancellor, three academic staff, one general staff member and two students.

The report clearly indicated that councils should be smaller, more cohesive bodies, concentrating on policy strategy and a review of management of performance and capacity. Operational management should be delegated to the Vice-Chancellor. The Commonwealth Government initiated a higher education management review, which also addressed the issue of governance. This review stated that activities of the governing body should be guidance and review rather than executive management, and that members should recognise an overriding responsibility to bring diverse viewpoints together for advancement of the institution, rather than represent sectional interests.

The review considered that a governing body should typically comprise between 10 and 15 members. That has not been adopted, although there has been a lot of consultation with the universities and with the Minister. The Bill represents that consultation and trying to get it right, because that is what it is all about. This Bill provides the mechanism for the main features of the McGregor report to be implemented but recognises individual differences between the three South Australian universities. Each council has a maximum size of 20 with seven internal members and up to 13 external members. The Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor are *ex officio* members of each council, with council having the ability to co-opt and appoint a person or, in the case of one council, two persons, to balance its final membership.

Following consultation with the universities, there are different mixes of staff and student members on the three

councils to reflect the different operational needs of the universities. A number of persons will be appointed by the council on the recommendation of a selection committee appointed by the Chancellor in accordance with the guidelines determined by the council. Councils have 12 months from the date of assent to be reconstituted, and each new council can be activated separately within this period. Existing council members who are within the current term of appointment will continue until the new council is formed.

The common principal responsibilities are set for the council. The council is the governing body of the university. The council oversees university management and development. It devises or approves strategic plans and major policies for the university and it monitors and reviews university operation. While this Bill establishes a common role and framework for the council of the three universities, it recognises the individual needs of the three institutions in relation to membership and embodies a number of matters raised during consultation. However, it does not deviate from the major purpose, which is to provide for smaller, more focused councils, with a wide range of practical experience and capabilities amongst members to contribute to the strategic role.

The universities are playing a crucial role in the development of this State. One only has to look at the involvement and participation that universities have provided in attracting investment to this State. One only has to think of the role that universities have played in attracting companies such as EDS and all the development at Technology Park. I am very much aware of the important role that the University of South Australia has played in many of these developments. I am sure that is the case with the University of Adelaide and Flinders University. Universities will continue to play an important role. As the member for Hart stated in his contribution, they are State funded, they have enormous budgets and it is important that we get it right. Getting it right is really what this Bill is all about. With the amendments that will be debated and passed, I am sure that we are well on the way to having excellent governance for the three excellent universities in South Australia.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): The legislation before us is nothing like the Bill as originally drafted and circulated for comment. There has been a considerable amount of development of that original document, which reflects the level of consultation that the Minister has undertaken apropos of the release of the Bill. Regrettably, it was based on a premise put by Mr McGregor that currently, the governance of universities in South Australia was, in general ways and similarly across all the institutions, inefficient and less competent than could otherwise be the case. It seems to me that the underlying assumption in the McGregor report is that there are too many people involved in the governance of the university. Indeed, the proposition is that; the greater the number of people involved in the governance (the council) the less competent the university will be.

Without boring the House with a list of the size of the various governing councils of the universities in this State, across this nation or, indeed, in the western hemisphere, no such correlation exists. No-one at any time has been able to make a case that the efficiency of governance of a university in terms of the outcomes it produces is in any way related to the size of the organ which provides its governance. Here in South Australia, I would say that all members of this place and the wider South Australian community would generally

agree that the Adelaide University is the best university we have. Indeed, it is arguably the best in its size group nationally. Judged in terms of the outcomes for its undergraduates, the ease with which they obtain employment and their ability to go on, having become graduates, and do post graduate studies, higher degrees, and contribute through research to the advancement of knowledge in their professional disciplines, Adelaide is the most successful university on a per head of population basis of the universities of Australia.

Judged by the satisfaction which its graduates have with it as an institution and their willingness to participate in its affairs, formally and informally, it is more successful than those universities which have smaller governing councils. Its capacity to handle a wide range of arrangements for the number of faculties it has show it to be at least as competent as any other institution. With all that in mind, it is quaint that the Adelaide University should be criticised as being over-governed or incompetently governed by some degree just because it has 35 members on its governing council. In fact, I believe there is a case to be made for the contrary view, namely, the larger the number of people (to the point where you do not unnecessarily duplicate representative skill and opinion) the more successful will be the governance outcomes. Why do we have a Parliament if that were not so? Why is it there is some magic about 20, when there is no industrial sociological research or evidence that says that 20 or 10 or 35 is the right size.

Over the years of its existence, which are well over 100—indeed, close on 120—the University of Adelaide has allowed its governance to evolve within the framework of the Act which established it. Governments from time to time, in consultation with it, amended its Act on its request as an institution. The most recent review of governance was conducted by Dame Roma Mitchell, the accolades for whom we have seen in the newspaper in recent times since her retirement a few days ago as Governor of this State. That review of governance produced the present council.

Neither the member for Hart nor the member for Hartley made any comment whatever about the competence of that most recent review of the university itself and of its governance mechanisms, and I suspect that Mr McGregor, who produced the report upon which the Minister acted, did not bother to look at it or, if he did look at it, failed to understand it. I will not question why he failed to understand it or why he chose to ignore its findings. It is quaint, to my mind, that he should come forward with recommendations that are more akin to the kinds of structures which seem to exist in commerce rather than structures which are designed to serve the needs of a sophisticated society. The whole of South Australia is a sophisticated society, and the university is even more so.

The propositions contained in the McGregor report are opposed to democratic participation in decision making. They are completely silent on any means by which we would get from where we are to where we want to go if where we want to go is where this Bill takes us; that is, there are no transition provision proposals in that report or in the original Bill as it was drafted. They, to the Minister's credit, have been included in consequence of the consultations that have taken place since that time. The universities are not like business. They produce educated people. They do not produce products or services to people: they produce people in changed form, and they produce outcomes in terms of the research. So there is a necessity for a university to primarily be about the development of intellectual capacity within the framework of

rigour, to make sure we have achieved what we set out to achieve before we accredit that achievement. We do not give somebody something just because time has passed or because we have been there for so long. We have to test it; and do.

More particularly, universities also produce constructive critical comment on the structure and function of society and its governance at large from where they sit. They produce enormous benefit in the form of research outcomes, and the more successful they are is measured in no small degree by the number of successful outcomes they get from their research. It is for all those reasons that I find it unfortunate that we have to wrestle with a proposal to change a structure of governance when no case has been made with any rigour whatever that the current structure of governance, especially of the University of Adelaide, needs any change at all. A good case can be made to leave it as it is and change the governance of the less successful institutions for five years and then make a comparison to see if the changes that are made produce some better result for those institutions and thereby make a case for change for the Adelaide University.

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

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I thank all members for their contribution this afternoon. It is a very important Bill. It has been subject to much deliberation and consideration, even almost to this morning. The universities are very important to South Australia. We all acknowledge that. That was made quite clear in my second reading speech. The universities, as has been pointed out, are not business organisations *per se*. They need to be business like, but they are not businesses in the commercial sense of that term. The main and fundamental role of universities is to search for truth, and they do that through research, and that is backed up and complemented through teaching. Our universities are about teaching excellence and research excellence. There is nothing in the proposed Bill that would compromise those fundamental functions of our universities. If there was ever a suggestion that Governments should try to compromise those functions, I would be strongly opposed to it.

The community has a legitimate interest in what happens in universities, but it is not the role of the wider community, or of Government, to interfere with the fundamental role of the universities, which I have just outlined. The Bill enables participation by people who are within the immediate academic community, namely, staff and the students, to participate in the council in the decision-making arrangements of the university and for people from the wider community to have some input.

There is no suggestion or provision for Government to direct or dominate the councils of our three universities, nor should there be. The arrangements for the three universities are different in terms of composition of the councils. That is appropriate because each of our universities has a different tradition. In many ways, they have different specialisations, although there is overlap in some areas. It was never the intention to have any slavish adherence to conformity for the sake of it. In developing the Bill much effort has been put into ensuring that, as far as possible within the confines of a council of 20 members, each university could have an arrangement with which it was comfortable and hence the arrangements for each of the universities are different.

Many points have been raised. I do not want to take up a lot of time—members have had very late sessions—and time

will curtail our contribution tonight. I make the point that the functions and responsibilities of councils are not altered in any way as a result of this legislation. This legislation sets a maximum in terms of numbers on the council; it maintains the one-third internal and two-thirds external ratio; and it makes changes in relation to the composition and the way in which the composition of the councils is constituted. It does not address issues of university management. That was specifically excluded from the reference for the McGregor committee because I do not believe it is the Government's responsibility to dictate to the universities or to try to lead them down a particular management style path. The strong view is that, if you get the governance right, then the rest should follow.

We should also bear in mind that each university has its specialist academic boards or committees and this Bill in no way compromises their important role. There is provision, as I have indicated, for different arrangements for each of the universities and that, as far as possible, is in accordance with what has been communicated to me not only by the official representatives of the university but by others. In the words of the McGregor report, I believe that we do have a balance in respect of town and gown. Once again I acknowledge the contribution of Alan McGregor and the other members of the committee. They were unpaid; they gave their time freely and purely to enhance the way in which universities are governed. We should always acknowledge community-minded people who are prepared to put in time and effort. Members should take into account that the people on that committee could command significant amounts of money if they were paid as consultants.

It has been a lengthy process—and it should be—because it is important in reconstituting the council arrangements that we do not in any way damage the universities. I have been very meticulous in ensuring that we do not create a situation where, in the future, a Government of any political persuasion would be able to interfere in the affairs of the universities. These council arrangements are specifically designed for the universities to govern themselves in the most efficient and effective way. It has been pointed out they are multimillion dollar organisations. We should not be obsessed with the financial aspects, but collectively we are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars. That is not the most important part of universities: the most important part is their academic functions which, as I indicated before, relate to research and teaching.

There are many other things I could say, but most of them can be addressed during the Committee stage. I have already mentioned the point about the functions and responsibilities, so there is no change. In terms of representation of members of Parliament, that can be discussed in more detail during the Committee stage, but there is an opportunity within the arrangements set out in the Bill for a university to have members of Parliament on its council, if that is what it wishes. The Bill does not provide for mandatory representation of members of Parliament and that is the appropriate way to go. If a council of a university wants members of Parliament on it, then it is within the scope of the arrangements for it to do so.

This legislation is a milestone. It is not a reflection on the universities. We are not saying what they are doing is not good enough or in any way being critical of them. We are enabling the universities to ensure that they have the best arrangements in line with governing their particular universities. This will ensure that not only now but into the immedi-

ate future they can maintain and enhance their already high reputation. I commend the Bill to the House and I look forward to responding to particular issues during the Committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

Page 1—Leave out this clause and insert the following clause:

2. (1) Subject to subsection (2), this Act will come into operation on a date to be fixed by proclamation.

(2) A provision of this Act that has not come into operation by the first anniversary of the day of assent to this Act will come into operation on that anniversary.

Ms WHITE: The Opposition supports the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 3 and 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Council.'

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

Page 2, lines 13 to 16—Leave out paragraph (b) and insert the following paragraph:

(b) the presiding member of the Academic Senate or, if the Vice-Chancellor is the presiding member, the deputy presiding member of the Academic Senate, who will be a member of the Council *ex officio*;

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

Page 2, line 19—Leave out 'Governor' and insert 'Council'.

Amendment carried.

Ms WHITE: I move:

Page 2, line 21—After 'Chancellor' insert ', with the approval of the Council,'.

The reason for this amendment is that the Opposition believes that the procedure should come back to council for approval. This is the procedure of the selection of the panellists that will select external members.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I oppose the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

Page 2, line 22—Leave out 'chancellor and approved by the Minister' and insert 'council'.

Ms WHITE: This is the same as my amendment, and I express the Opposition's pleasure that the Minister is accepting our amendment.

Amendment carried.

Ms WHITE: I move:

Page 2 lines 23 and 24—Leave out paragraph (e) and insert:

(e) two Members of the South Australian Parliament, one from the group led by the Premier and the other from the group led by the Leader of the Opposition, appointed by the Governor pursuant to a recommendation contained in an address from both Houses of Parliament;

This amendment is in relation to each of the universities. It seeks to continue the representation by members of the South Australian Parliament on each of the university councils. This amendment would mean that the places for two members of Parliament on the University of South Australia's council continue but that the five members currently on each of the of the University of Adelaide and Flinders University would be reduced to two. As I said in my second reading speech, we believe that this link with the Government and the community through elected members of Parliament is important. I note that the Minister said that the councils can still have members of Parliament if they wish. I believe that it is important that

members of Parliament serve on these councils. The amendment allows for one from each of the major Parties. I therefore insist on the amendment.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I oppose the amendment for reasons hinted at earlier, namely, that the opportunity exists for universities to have members of Parliament on their council through the selection process or through the co-option process. Co-option varies from university to university, but it is the strong view of the Government that, if members of Parliament are to be on the councils, it is better that they are there as a result of what they can offer—in other words, in terms of merit—and that the council process of selection or co-option is the process followed, rather than having mandatory requirements. As I understand it, Flinders University and the University of South Australia do not support this proposition. I understand that Adelaide University is more ambivalent about having members of Parliament on its council but, as I have already said, the opportunity exists for all of them to have members of Parliament on their council if they wish, through the proposal that is contained in the amended Bill.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

Page 2, line 25—Leave out 'one member' and insert 'two members'.

Ms WHITE: I commend the Minister on adopting the Opposition's amendment. This amendment allows for the increase of academic staff by one member.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

Page 2, line 26—Leave out 'two members' and insert 'one member'.

Ms WHITE: I oppose the amendment, which would decrease the representation of general staff at Flinders University.

Amendment carried.

Ms WHITE: I move:

Page 2, lines 27 to 33—Leave out paragraph (h) and insert:

(h) two students of the university (not being persons in the full time employment of the university), one of whom must be a postgraduate student and one of whom must be an undergraduate student, appointed or elected in a manner determined by the vice-chancellor after consultation with the General Secretary of the Students Association of the university.

This amendment makes way for an increase in student representation on each of the councils as proposed in this Bill by one member. That would mean a total of three student representatives on the Flinders University Council. Similar subsequent amendments are proposed for the other two universities. Without this amendment, student representation will be decreased from five to two members in the case of Flinders University, which represents a proportional decrease out of the final 20 or 22 members, depending on how this Bill is amended. As I said in my second reading speech, student representation is very important on the council. We believe that, if the Government is serious about its public words of support for young people and their having a real say, this is a very important board that influences the lives of young people, and to decrease their representation in this way I believe is an indictment on the Government.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I oppose the member for Taylor's amendment. Clearly, if you reduce the overall size of the council you must mathematically reduce the components. I believe that, as is the case in each of the two universities on

the schedule proposed, two students is adequate representation, bearing in mind that it is proposed to have three elected academic staff on the University of Adelaide board and two academic staff on the boards of Flinders University and the University of South Australia. There is also the Vice Chancellor. I believe that that is a reasonable proportion of people who are part of the total academic community. So, I am opposed to that; I believe that students will have a voice. I want to make the point that in the operation of these councils it is important that people not be seen as wearing one sole representational hat, although I acknowledge that it is often hard for people to take off that hat. It is important that people on councils look at the wider perspective—the bigger picture—rather than simply wear a hat derived from their representational base.

Amendment negated.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

Page 2, line 36—After 'women' insert:

Who—

- (a) have a commitment to education and, in particular, to higher education; and
- (b) have an understanding of, and commitment to, the principles of equal opportunity and social justice and, in particular, to access and equity in education.

Ms WHITE: The Opposition believes this to be an important amendment, because it clearly specifies in the legislation the sorts of skills that are required of members of the council.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

Page 2, line 37—Leave out 'by the Governor' and insert 'on the recommendation of the selection committee'.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

Page 3, line 2—Leave out 'the Governor or'.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

Page 3, after line 2—Insert the following subsection:

- (3d) A selection committee established for the purpose of making an appointment under subsection (3)(d) cannot recommend one of their number for appointment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6—'Substitution of ss. 6 to 15.'

Ms WHITE: I move:

Page 3, line 5—Leave out 'section is substituted' and insert 'sections are substituted'.

Amendment negated.

Ms WHITE: I move:

Page 3, lines 7 to 11—Leave out subsection (1) and insert:

- (1) A member appointed to the council by the Governor (other than a parliamentary member) will be appointed for a term of two or four years to be determined by the selection committee on whose recommendation the appointment was made.

In a sense, this is consequential on an earlier amendment, which dealt with parliamentary members and which has been lost.

Amendment negated.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

Page 3, line 7—Leave out 'the Governor or'.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

Page 3, lines 8 and 9—Leave out (a) and insert:

- (a) in the case of a member appointed on the recommendation of a selection committee—by that selection committee; and.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

Page 3—

Line 11—After 'member' insert 'co-opted and'.

Lines 12 and 13—Leave out subsection (2).

Amendments carried.

Ms WHITE: I move:

Page 3, lines 20 and 21—Leave out subsection (6).

The Bill limits the membership of a member of a council to eight years. The Opposition believes that membership should not be limited.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

Page 3, line 22—Leave out 'Governor' and insert 'council'.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

Page 4, line 7—Leave out 'the Governor or'.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 7 passed.

Clause 8—'Conduct of business in council.'

Ms WHITE: I move:

Page 4, lines 32 and 33—Leave out 'at least five of whom are external members'.

Ms WHITE: It is the view of the Opposition that each member of the council should be treated as any other member of council. We believe that to discriminate between internal and external members is to imply a difference in value or importance in the decision making between internal and external members, and that is a concept we totally reject.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The Government opposes the amendment, because it is important that a measure be in place that will ensure that we have a balanced council, comprising external and internal members, at the time of any significant decision making. I do not believe it is in the interests of the council or the university to put a council in a position where it could, through certain circumstances, in effect, be dominated with regard to voting.

Mr LEWIS: It is quaint that it is even considered necessary, given the lengths to which the McGregor report went regarding the reduction in the size of the council and to ensure that all the people who were on it were competent (at least according to the way the Bill was drafted), to then require that we differentiate between people on the council according to the electorate whence they come. It strikes me that the smaller the quorum, the greater the number in attendance. The University of Adelaide Council now requires only eight out of 35 to be present for a quorum. Yet, because it is so small, all councils members know that is important for them to be there, lest a small cabal of members make a decision about what will happen in the university. So, the attendance is always well over 20; often it is well over 30.

In my judgment, this problem to which the Minister and the legislation seem to be attempting to address themselves would be better solved elsewhere in the legislation—as the legislation, indeed, requires—by sacking those people who do not turn up. If you are not there for three consecutive meetings, you are out on your ear. You will always have a quorum containing those people who are elected from within and those who come from outside, without needing to specify how many should come from where in the decision making process.

I cannot see the necessity to identify members of council according to where they come from. They are all members of

the body responsible for governing. If a small number present—still quorate—makes a decision, it does not mean that it is cast in stone. It can be resubmitted later in the meeting or at a subsequent meeting and overturned if it is found to be inadequate. It would not fuss me if, as I said, a quorum of only 25 per cent of the members was required to make decisions. That would have a more desirable stimulus to attendance at council meetings than the kind of arrangement proposed here for a quorum. Therefore, I agree with neither the proposition nor the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

Page 5, line 4—Leave out 'the Governor or'.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 9—'Repeal of section 19.'

Ms WHITE: This is the clause that I noted in my second reading contribution, which deals with the repeal of certain powers currently granted to Flinders University. Will the Minister assure the Committee that the repeal of this clause does not diminish the powers of that university council?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I give an assurance that the new section of the Act establishes council as the governing body and gives council prime responsibility for fundamental powers such as those in the existing section 19. The removal

of section 19 does not remove those powers from council, a point that I made during the second reading debate. Clause passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

DE FACTO RELATIONSHIPS BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER: Order! There has been a very bad habit of members, when the House is going to adjourn or when the House is first meeting, to take no notice of a convention that, when the Chair is on his feet, they all remain where they are.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Terrible!

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles is correct.

At 5.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 30 July at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 23 July 1996

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

PUBLIC SECTOR NET DEBT

80. **Mr QUIRKE:**

1. What are the dollar values for 30 June of each year represented on the graph in figure 1 of the Financial Statement, 1994-95 for both net debt and net debt plus unfunded superannuation liabilities?

2. At the time the graph was drawn what were the prospective sales of government business and in what years were they expected, what was the expected total proceeds in each year in nominal terms and what was the amount of associated Commonwealth compensation which had been received and were expected in each year in nominal terms?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER:

1. The dollar values for figure 1 in the 1994-95 Financial Statement were shown in the adjoining Table 3.4 for total public sector net debt and net debt plus unfunded superannuation liabilities. The numbers are as follows:

Year ending 30 June	Total public sector net debt (nominal— \$ million)	Total public sector net debt plus unfunded superannuation liabilities (nominal—\$ million)
1990	4 682	8 045
1991	7 155	10 890
1992	8 055	12 110
1993	8 249	12 540
1994	8 548	12 833
1995	9 090	13 476
1996	9 196	13 647
1997	9 287	13 739
1998	9 156	13 567

2. These figures were as follows:

Year ending 30 June	BankSA (nominal— \$ million)	SAAMC (nominal— \$ million)	Commonwealth compensation (nominal— \$ million)
1995			159
1996	700		80
1997			
1998		262	

SMALL-WHEELED VEHICLES

89. **Mr ATKINSON:** What are the statistics for the past 12 months for rollerblading and skateboard related accidents, involving children and adults, respectively, including victims who were not skating and distinguishing accidents that occurred on roads and footpaths from those that occurred elsewhere?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: This issue is not clearly reflected in routine medical documentation maintained by the Health Commission. The Commission uses the International Classification of Diseases (ICD, ninth revision) to code all cases of injury admitted to hospital. Unfortunately, there are no codes to specifically cover injury from skateboards or rollerblades, so statistics on these issues are not available in South Australia for the state as a whole.

Furthermore, victims of injury from skateboards or rollerblades are often treated by private medical or ancillary practitioners. Regular statistical information from these practitioners, reflecting cause of injury, is not available.

The Public and Environmental Health Service maintains regular monitoring of injury causing circumstances by means of a surveillance sampling system in the metropolitan area. This system covers the Women's and Children's Hospital and The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. From this surveillance it has been possible to gain an impression of the phenomenon in question.

In the year 1995 the surveillance system documented 169 cases attributed to skateboards and rollerblades. The injury victims were all treated in the accident and emergency services of the two hospitals mentioned above. Approximately one quarter of the victims required formal admission to hospital subsequent to emergency outpatient treatment.

Approximately 17 per cent of the accidents occurred on a public road, and an additional 9.5 per cent occurred on a public footpath. Among the victims, over one-half were in the age range 10-15 years. None of the victims was specifically identified as being a pedestrian hit by a user of a skateboard or rollerblades. Collision with a motor vehicle contributed to injury in three cases.

Rollerblades were involved in the documented accidents approximately twice as frequently as skateboards.

The most common injury was a fracture to the arm, wrist or hand.

STEEL-JAW TRAPS

91. **Mr ATKINSON:** Will the Government outlaw the setting of steel-jaw traps and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: While I recognise that many people consider steel jaw traps to be unacceptable, it would seem that their use is necessary in some circumstances, particularly in the vicinity of the Dog Fence. However it is generally agreed that if a trap must be used it is important that a strychnine rag be attached so that any suffering caused to the animal is minimised. I am advised that the need for small steel-jawed traps (ie rabbit or gin traps) has diminished and professional rabbiters now rely on other techniques. The Government intends to introduce regulations subordinate to the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1985, to outlaw the setting of rabbit traps and to severely restrict the use of dog traps while ensuring that in those situations where such traps are necessary, they have attached a poison rag to ensure the duration of suffering is minimised.

ROAD MARKING

101. **Mr ATKINSON:** Have the painted markings on State roads been assessed to determine whether they are too slippery for motorcycles, especially in wet or cold conditions and, if so, what were the results and does the Minister propose the use of paint that would permit better grip by motorcycle tyres?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information.

In the early 1980s, the Motorcycle Riders Association raised the issue of motorcycles slipping on road marking paint, in particular on the arrows and stop bars at intersections, with the Department of Transport (DoT).

In an ongoing commitment to improving safety for road users, DoT undertook extensive laboratory and field trials to address the issue.

As a consequence, a new road marking process for arrows and stop bars, comprising a mixture of paint and quartz, which improves skid resistance, was developed. In 1988, DoT introduced this process for use at all signal controlled intersections in South Australia.

Under the recently let line marking contracts, the contractors are required to continue to add quartz to these markings which means that motorcycle riders will continue to receive the same level of safety.

This line marking process is working satisfactorily and has been accepted by the Motorcycle Riders Association.

ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS

108. **Mr ATKINSON:** Why must electrical contractors submit to the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs detailed personal financial information with a licence application to show that they have net assets of more than \$5 000 when an insurance policy with cover exceeding \$5 000 could achieve the same object?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: At present, the financial standing of electrical contractors is assessed when they first apply for a licence and then annually when they lodge their periodic returns (renewals). This is done by requiring applicants and licensees to complete a simple one page financial statement which is the same as has been used for builders licensing for many years. This is then assessed to ensure that they meet the minimum requirements.

Financial assessments are performed to ensure that contracts have sufficient financial backing to warrant their work. This provides a measure of protection for consumers who are often unable to determine the solvency of tradespeople by themselves. Enquiry staff

at the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs have noticed for many years that consumer problems often arise from traders in financial difficulties and so this is certainly considered to be an appropriate area for consumer protection.

Some electrical contractors have expressed concern with providing the financial information required for this process as they believe it infringes their privacy. The information requirements are identical to those required from building work contractors and other similar licensees. The confidentiality of the information provided to the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs is protected by the Fair Trading Act 1986.

One of the most common causes of business failure is insufficient working capital. To properly carry on business, a contractor must have sufficient financial resources to purchase materials and equipment, to finance trading terms and manage business cash flows.

A policy of insurance does not constitute working capital. It cannot, for example, be used to purchase materials and equipment, pay wages and meet other business expenses.

The adequacy of financial resources is an important licensing criteria. Business failures affect not only consumers but also trade creditors (suppliers), employees and industry confidence generally.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

109. **Mr ATKINSON:** Does the Government intend to amend the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act to overcome the Supreme Court decision in *Catholic Church Endowment Society v Huntley* so that in future workers suffering from asbestosis or mesothelioma caused during employment with long-defunct employers can obtain benefits under the 1986 Act and, if not, why not and what remedy does the Government propose for these workers?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: In response to Mr Atkinson's question as to whether the Government intends to amend the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act following the decision of the Supreme Court in the *Catholic Church Endowment Society v Huntley*, the answer is 'no'.

Mr Atkinson suggests in his question that workers who are suffering from asbestos related disabilities and who were employees of companies that no longer exist do not have access to compensation. This is not the case. The workers' employers were required to cover their liability by taking out insurance policies and the insurance company that held the policy covers the liability. If the insurance company is 'defunct' then the Statutory Reserve Fund now managed by WorkCover will be responsible for the liability.

Workers who were exposed to asbestos after 30 September 1987 (the date of commencement of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act, 1986), and who suffer a trauma as a result of that exposure are covered by the current Act.

Workers who were exposed to asbestos prior to the commencement of the current Act on 30 September 1987 and suffered a trauma prior to the appointed date are covered by the repealed Act.

Mr Huntley still has a right to seek compensation under the previous Act and is likely to be granted an extension of time because of the long latency period of asbestosis and mesothelioma. The remedy is available to Mr Huntley and others in a similar situation.

No action is needed to be taken by the Government as workers in the situation described still have access to compensation. Any amendment would, in the Government's opinion, transfer the liability for this and similar situations from the insurance companies and their underwriters, who wrote the policies at the time, to the Compensation Fund.