

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 7 November 1996

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

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: DAVEYSTON BYPASS

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the thirty-fourth report of the committee on the Daveyston Bypass, Sturt Highway upgrade be noted.

The Department of Transport proposes to upgrade the 5 kilometre Daveyston-Greenock section of the Sturt Highway at a cost of some \$6.7 million. Sturt Highway is South Australia's principal northern-eastern trunk route, which services the Barossa region and the Riverland and links Adelaide to northern Victoria, and it is becoming a main road now through to Sydney.

This highway is an important commercial tourist route and was declared part of the Adelaide City National Highway back in 1992. The existing section of the Sturt Highway passes through Daveyston settlement, but has a poor alignment, narrow width and a failing pavement. It also suffers from a high accident rate and is subject to frequent traffic delays due to the slow heavy vehicles that use the road. This upgrading will improve both safety and efficiency for road users as well as improving the amenity of most Daveyston residents by removing through traffic from the existing highway section. In addition, local roads will be improved to cater for new movements and traffic noise will decrease for most residents.

It is envisaged that this project will improve transport efficiency by decreasing road user costs through the provision of an increased level of service and improved safety. Furthermore, this project will improve transport accessibility and assist economic development by increasing the attractiveness of the route for tourist, regional and long distance traffic. I am aware, in particular from local members who travel the route, that this relatively small section of road will be of enormous benefit to people living in the Barossa region, the lower Mid North and to those who travel over the border. It is a welcome proposal and, pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act, the Public Works Committee reports to Parliament that it recommends that the proposed works proceed posthaste.

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I am delighted to rise to support the Public Works Committee's thirty-fourth report with respect to the Daveyston Bypass. I have a special interest in this project, not only because of it being part of the Sturt Highway and a very fundamental and major and important route linking my electorate of Chaffey, but because at a personal level—and I concede a vested interest in this regard—of all the members in this House I would perhaps travel on that road more than any other member. The member for Custance turns and looks at me, and I suspect he will pass some comment in that regard; notwithstanding, I travel on this road, on average, a couple of times a week.

Most importantly, this section of the Sturt Highway in South Australia is a principal route servicing the Barossa and the Riverland, directly from Adelaide to northern Victoria and to Sydney. It is also an important section of the national

highway, whether it be for road freight or for tourism to those areas that I mentioned as the major interstate tourist route. The traffic volume is increasing significantly, whether it be for tourism or for road freight, and, therefore, I am particularly pleased to reinforce and support the report and acknowledge that the report identifies that the road through Daveyston at the moment is narrow, in poor condition, has poor alignment, and there is a significant accident rate with respect to that section of road.

This upgrade is long overdue, and I particularly commend the work done by the Department of Transport and the State Minister in keeping the pressure on the Federal Government and on a Federal agenda to make sure that this upgrade proceeds. In the light of the Federal financial constraints, it has been a commendable achievement by the Minister and the department that as a Government we have been able to maintain the Federal Government financial commitment to see that this project proceeds as quickly as possible.

I thank the Public Works Committee for its resolve and its positive assessment of this project. As recorded in the report, the need is soundly based. The assessment of the project is justified on the basis of the increase in transport efficiency that will be achieved from this upgrade, the long-term decrease in road user cost, and the increase in road safety. I also note that the report recognises the project will increase transport accessibility and assist economic development in those particular regions in the Barossa and in the Riverland which it services, and also the road times and safety factors for both the regional connections to these areas with respect to long distance traffic will be assisted.

I note, because of the date and the time of this new session of Parliament, that this report from the Public Works Committee has been on the Notice Paper for about a month, so I am very pleased to acknowledge that work in fact did start on this project about a week ago. Tenders were called about a month ago. In terms of my most recent travels to Adelaide I would have to say I have been particularly impressed by the amount of roadworks that have taken place on that project in the past week to 10 days. So, for the reasons I have stated—efficiency, safety and economic development—I commend the project, for the benefit of all South Australian road users, for the benefit of Adelaide, for the benefit of the regions in the Barossa and the Riverland. I commend the Public Works Committee for its efficient and positive treatment of this project.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I rise in support of this thirty-fourth report of the Public Works Committee. It has not taken long to tote up the report, considering it has only been in place for a little over 18 months. They seem to spit them out with random abandon. Certainly, this is a very important—

An honourable member: No reflections on the committee, I hope.

Mr VENNING: Not at all. I certainly agree with most of the reports that they put out. If I was not involved with the ERD committee of which I am a member I would certainly have coveted a position on this committee—which I have said to many members before. This report is on the Sturt Highway-Daveyston to Truro bypass. I challenge what the member for Chaffey just said as to whether that road is used the most by either him or me. The majority of this road is in the electorate of the member for Light. He is unable to be with us right now, but he certainly supports us in congratulating the committee on its report.

There have been many problems with this section of the road, particularly since the section from Adelaide through Sheoak Log to Daveyston was upgraded. It is a magnificent corridor now, but it was a problem before. However, it has created a bottleneck in the section of the road between Daveyston and Truro. I have been frustrated many times when often I have been running late—the member for Chaffey would say that I am usually late—for meetings in the Barossa, but it is the most direct route. When I have reached that section and I have been stuck behind a truck or a slow-moving vehicle, I have tended to take one or two risks, so I understand how the general motorist feels.

There have been some problems with land acquisition regarding this project, particularly to the north of Nuriootpa where some of the access roads have had to be closed or altered. I have appreciated being involved in this project, particularly through the consultants Rust PPK. As the member for Chaffey said, this has been a very bad section of road. I agree that some of the access roads must be closed, because the area is very closely settled and there are many side roads giving access to the main highway. We all know that that cannot continue.

I hope that, as a result of this study and after this road is completed, we will see further studies conducted into the transport needs and the corridors of this region. Hopefully, we will see the installation of a new access road from this section of the highway directly across to Tanunda via Gomersal. As I said before, the roadworks to Daveyston are of an excellent quality, and I have no reason to doubt that this road when it is completed from Daveyston to Truro will be of a similar quality. Finally, I wish to congratulate the committee yet again on another fine report.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL CAR PARK AND IMVS PROJECT

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the thirty-fifth report of the committee on the Royal Adelaide Hospital car park and the IMVS new building project be noted.

The South Australian Health Commission proposes to construct a car park and a new Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science building on the site of the Royal Adelaide Hospital at a cost of \$4.9 million. During the past five years, the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science have been subjected to increasing pressures to provide adequate car parking on site for staff, patients, visitors and associated users. This proposal will solve the car parking problem while releasing parkland to the north for redevelopment as Botanic Park. It will also rationalise on-site traffic movement and replace an unsightly agglomeration of IMVS buildings. Anyone who has walked to the Adelaide Hospital, as I have over the past 30 years or so, would have to agree with that.

The construction of the RAH car park will require the use of the site which is currently occupied by some existing IMVS and RAH buildings. As a result, the car park cannot be constructed until the IMVS functions are relocated to a new building and the vacated IMVS buildings demolished. The objectives of the project are threefold: first, to address the long-term on-campus car parking needs of the Royal Adelaide Hospital by the provision of a purpose built multi-storey car parking station; secondly, to free up the current

RAH staff car park for full commercial use to meet the needs of the East End development; and, thirdly, to enable the existing on grade northern car park at the RAH to return to parkland.

The car park will be constructed either by a BOO (build own operate) or BOOT (build own operate transfer) scheme, with proposals being sought from consortia who are experienced in car park development and management. It should be noted that the construction of the car park is to be at no risk and with no financial contribution by the South Australian Government. The IMVS building will be constructed on Crown land and funded by the Government via an allocation to the South Australian Health Commission.

The proposal encompasses the demolition of all existing buildings and structures on the site, and the construction of a new IMVS building at the northern extremity of the site. The IMVS building will be constructed, first, to three levels, with the potential for extension to five levels later. This will rehouse the existing laboratory and associated research facilities. In summary, the Public Works Committee acknowledges the current car parking inadequacies at the RAH site and considers that a purpose-built multi-storey car parking station will adequately meet the needs of staff, patients, visitors and associated users.

Furthermore, the committee is pleased that the existing RAH staff car park will be made available to the East End market development for full commercial use. Members are mindful of the work undertaken at the East End precinct and are aware that the car park site has become important to this development. The project, as it applies to the East End development, is something that should not be overlooked. The Liberman group is developing some magnificent high rise housing within the East End market complex. It is a credit to that company that it has come here and invested its risk capital in that site, and it is having considerable success in selling off the plans.

Nothing will detract from that site more than problems with car parking. Every time the Liberman group builds a high rise development, it immediately takes away some of the open space that can be used for car parking. Given the development along Rundle Street East by another consortium, Mancorp, where every one of its developed properties appears to be restaurant or a type of business that attracts many patrons, it would be an absolute disaster to have that concentration of people in the East End without adequate car parking.

The committee was mindful of the problems associated with car parking, and it was delighted to see that the Government has been able to come to a resolution that will help the development in the East End, as well as provide car parking on site for nurses. Having car parking for nursing staff will greatly increase their security when they move back to their cars at night as they will no longer have to cross North Terrace and go up to a public car park some distance from where they work. Overall, the committee is supportive of the proposal to construct a car park and a new IMVS unit on the RAH site and, 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.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MILE END NETBALL STADIUM

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the thirty-sixth report of the committee on the Mile End netball stadium be noted.

The Office of Recreation, Sport and Racing proposes to construct a netball stadium on the Mile End railway yard site at an estimated cost of \$9.9 million. Following review of existing facilities for netball at Edwards Park and a comparison of those facilities with international requirements, the South Australian Netball Association and the Office of Recreation, Sport and Racing determined that alternative accommodation was required. Edwards Park is deficient in many respects, the most notable being the lack of indoor courts which are necessary for State and National League matches, which are currently played at the Clipsal Powerhouse. In addition, the subsoil of the existing outdoor courts is such that they require a high level of maintenance. Overall, the current facilities at Edwards Park are not suitable for any national event and are below standard of the facilities available to other leading sports in South Australia.

The construction of the netball facility is seen as a major opportunity to establish an indoor stadium supporting netball as a viable family spectator sport. Furthermore, it will develop a landmark building in synergy with the adjacent athletics stadium on what was previously a derelict site. Earlier this year, the Public Works Committee endorsed a proposal to remediate and redevelop the Mile End railway yard site. The committee considered the central metropolitan location of this site and its close proximity to the CBD of Adelaide to be a significant advantage and agreed that the site was ripe for redevelopment. The committee believes that the southern segment of the Mile End railway yard site is ideally suited for the netball stadium component of the total sports complex.

The proposed building will house four internal netball courts, South Australian Netball Association administrative offices, change rooms, foyers and a refreshment area for patrons. Court No. 1 will provide a total of 2 000 fixed tiered seats along two sides of the court and a retractable seating unit will provide an additional 1 000 seats at one end to give a total seating capacity in the vicinity of 3 000 seats. In addition, eight outdoor courts will be developed in the short term, with a total of 26 courts being proposed for the total complex when it is completed in the long term.

Although the South Australian Netball Association has attained an excellent reputation for the planning and administration of national and international events, it is now a compulsory requirement of the All Australian Netball Association that all national championships be played on indoor courts. In addition, the venue must provide facilities in keeping with international standards and allow the televising of games both nationally and internationally. A stadium of the standard proposed will help the South Australian Netball Association attract national and international teams to South Australia and will add to the solidarity of the sport by providing appropriate headquarters for the highest profile women's sport in South Australia.

The total amount to be applied for the construction of the work is \$9.9 million, of which \$7 million will be provided by way of a loan secured through the private sector. It is intended that the South Australian Netball Association will contribute 50 per cent of the debt servicing of the loan over

a 20-year period. Given the above, given the fact that netball is one of the highest profile women's sports in this city, and given that it will become a headquarters for netball for the whole State, this proposal deserves support. One has only to drive down Anzac Highway at Edwards Park when the country carnivals are on and note the number of people who come from the country to use those facilities to know that, when the complex is completed, those who were involved in its planning will be able to look back on the vision and agree it was a worthwhile contribution to sport in South Australia.

Consequently, my committee strongly supports the proposal to construct a netball stadium at Mile End and, pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act, reports to Parliament that it recommends that the works proceed.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I support the proposal to upgrade the Mile End rail yards to provide for improved facilities for netball players and spectators in South Australia. The southern end of the Mile End rail yards is to be cleaned up to make way for construction of this very important netball stadium. The Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, has been assured that this proposal will allow international events to be held in the stadium, which is to seat 3 000 people.

It is a \$9.9 million construction project. Of that, \$7 million will come from a loan secured through the private sector and \$150 000 from the budget of the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing, and \$2.75 million will be made up through a number of asset sales, which I list for the information of members: the sale of the building on South Terrace, \$300 000; the sale of land at State Sports Park, \$400 000; the sale of the Mylor Recreation Centre, \$630 000; a contribution from the Recreation and Sport Fund, \$740 000; a contribution from the recurrent and capital budgets interest and earnings, \$680 000—totalling \$2.75 million.

Under this proposal, the South Australian Netball Association is expected to contribute to 50 per cent of the debt servicing on that loan of \$7 million. The method outlined according to the information given to the committee is that that money will be raised via \$2 and \$3 contributions from competitors and spectators. It is worth pointing out briefly that committee members in consideration of this proposal noted the potential for the income streams assumed in the financial analysis to perhaps not come to fruition. A concern was raised about the possibility of the South Australian Netball Association not having the capacity to meet its long-term debt obligations. I refer simply to a disclaimer included in the report of the consultants to this project, Ernst and Young, who were consulted regarding the financial analysis for this project (page 12 of the report that has been tabled). The Ernst and Young disclaimer states:

In preparing the incremental revenue and expenditure models for the Mile End construction, Ernst and Young has relied upon information supplied by the management of the South Australian Netball Association and other parties involved in the project.

The information disclosed in the report (financial analysis of the proposed netball stadium) has not been audited by Ernst and Young nor have we carried out any independent inquiries and investigations to assess the reliability, accuracy or completeness of any financial or statistical information provided to us. In these circumstances, neither Ernst and Young nor any member or employee of this firm accepts responsibility. . . for errors or omissions however caused.

The financial and statistical forecasts are based on many assumptions and are also subject to significant uncertainties and contingencies. Ernst and Young expressly disclaim. . . all liability

for representations expressed or implied in this document or any other written or oral communications.

Obviously, the House has a responsibility to monitor the progress of this construction work but, in concluding, I state very strongly that netball is a sport which the South Australian Labor Party and I are pleased to support, as we support the upgrade of facilities for netball. This asset will turn an area of land close to the city—which is obviously under-utilised and in need of rehabilitation—into a worthwhile facility for the people of South Australia.

Mr VENNING (Custance): The Chairman of the Public Works Committee challenged me by saying that I do not drive on this road, but I drive over the road every morning and by the railway yard. Once again, I support my colleague the member for Morphett, Chairman of the Public Works Committee. This is the thirty-sixth report on the Mile End railway yard site.

Considering that this site is between Adelaide Airport and the city (in the member for Peake's electorate) it is an absolute disgrace. I wonder why this process has taken so long. I know that the member for Peake has been very vocal for many years in support of this project, but why have previous Governments chosen not to do anything about it? It is the gateway to our lovely city. From the airport to the city there is no other convenient route. The rail yards have been an absolute disgrace of the worst order. At long last we see a Government that is prepared to accept this challenge. I say it every week—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Does the member for Spence disagree with me? The honourable member must ride his bike over this area. At that pace he must get a good look at it. I challenge the member for Spence. Does he think that it should not have been done before? It is absolutely disgraceful that it has been in this condition for so long. I am pleased that the Public Works Committee is being so active. Members must realise that this committee is automatically called into action every time a Government project in excess of \$4 million is proposed. The number of Public Works Committee reports to the House is proof of the Government's activity in these areas. If you multiply the minimum requirement of 36 reports by \$4 million, it equates to a minimum of \$144 million. But it is more likely to be \$175 million to \$200 million.

It is to the Government's credit that these areas are being developed. It begs the question: what did Parliament do when it did not have a public works committee? We did not have a public works committee until this Government came into power. It meant that all these projects went through without an independent umpire looking at the expenditure of Government moneys. There was no public scrutiny. This raises the question: why was this ever allowed? Everyone in this House knows that there always have to be checks and balances, because after a while things happen when people get tired and greedy. At times we all can be accused of being tardy. We often see slack work, particularly when the Government is paying. People seem to lose sight of being financially responsible for what they do. I look forward to the completion of this project, and I wish SA netball well. I hope its continued success will assist it with its part of the debt servicing. I commend the report to the House.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: GLENELG SAFE HARBOR

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the thirty-seventh report of the committee on the Glenelg safe harbor be noted.

The Public Works Committee has followed closely the Glenelg-West Beach development and has investigated in recent months both the Patawalonga dredging project and the West Beach recreational reserve development. This project takes the Glenelg-West Beach development one stage further via a proposal for the construction of breakwaters and the foreshore infrastructure associated with boat launching facilities and a future marina development. The estimated cost of these works is \$7 million. The basic harbor development is primarily aimed at addressing the long-term problems associated with the sandbar along the mouth of the Patawalonga. At the same time, the development will provide a berth for the Kangaroo Island ferry and safe launching facilities for the users of the boat ramp, including the sea rescue squadron.

I digress by indicating that this morning's motion will be welcomed by the member for Peake who for many years represented the area at the end of the Patawalonga. Certainly, I would like to place on record the fact that the campaign to have the sandbar removed has been conducted by many people and the member for Peake (Mr Becker) years ago publicised the sandbar, which rose out of the water at low tide and had the appearance of an island. He went out with a bridge table and chair and set up an office. He received considerable publicity, especially as a young lady walked by in her bathing costume and he immediately brought her to his assistance. She sat at the table where he set up his office and got statewide publicity—

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Almost worldwide publicity, as he says, for the sandbar. The sandbar has been highlighted ever since. On one occasion we re-enacted the landing of Captain Hindmarsh. Dressed in a Captain Hindmarsh costume, I was rowed out to the island in a long boat and we proclaimed the island and raised the flag. This Patawalonga island kept being established almost daily by the littoral sand movement up and down the coast outside the Patawalonga lock gates. The issue has been around for many years. All I can say in summary is that at last a Government has addressed this issue and we will get the sandbar cleaned up.

It is worth mentioning that all works undertaken for the basic harbor are compatible with the Holdfast Shores consortium master plan for the area but are not dependent upon the total project proceeding. Therefore, these proposed works are able to stand alone should the development not proceed beyond this stage. This proposal involves the seaward extension of the existing southern breakwater by 115 metres, resulting in a total length of about 300 metres. In addition, a new northern breakwater will be constructed and this will extend approximately 140 metres to sea. It is also proposed that a wharf be erected on the northern breakwater for temporary use as a ferry berth with a future opportunity for a new permanent ferry terminal and berthing facilities to be provided on the southern breakwater.

Once the ferry is relocated the wharf facility and superstructure on the northern breakwater will become available for visiting ships, for example, the *One and All* or the *Faillie*, which will be able to come in and berth and I would expect

to see many other vessels come in, particularly those that travel our coastline in the form of pleasure yachts as they travel around Australia. To assist with sand management in the region it is proposed to create a large capacity sand trap immediately to the south of the extended breakwater. The sand trap will have a capacity of some 50 000 cubic metres, and allow for the storage of six months of sediment transported in a northerly direction. It is envisaged that this will prevent the build up of sand on the beach to the south of the breakwater.

As to the actual movement of sand, the figure of 50 000 cubic metres was given to the committee and I imagine that it is a flexible figure depending on the voracity of storms that move up and down the coast, but that is the basic planning figure presented to us. The proposed works will address problems that have been experienced in Glenelg for some time. As a result of the existing Patawalonga sandbar boat owners have difficulty launching their boats and continually risk incurring damage. Furthermore, the provision of a safe harbor will provide a sheltered location for the Kangaroo Island ferry. It is well known that the facilities currently provided for the ferry make it dangerous for passengers to board and alight during bad weather. Over the past 12 months there have been 13 occasions when the ferry has been forced to cease operating due to bad weather. Such cancellations make it difficult for passengers to travel with certainty during the winter months and have a negative impact on the tourist industry on Kangaroo Island.

The committee had some concerns regarding the adequacy of the sand management plan and the subsequent impact this project might have on the metropolitan coastline. After seeking assurances from the Coast Protection Board and the Environment Protection Authority, the committee is satisfied that the project will not result in serious damage occurring to the South Australian metropolitan coastline.

The committee also had concerns that this project does not incorporate the provision of additional car parking spaces to service either Kangaroo Island ferry users or boat owners using the facility. The committee has been advised that future provision for approximately 1 000 car parks is to be included as part of the overall Holdfast Shores project. However, advice received indicates that provision of these facilities will depend on private sector investment and, if that investment is not secured, the additional car parks may not be provided. As Glenelg currently experiences a shortage of car parking spaces, the committee is concerned that the situation will worsen when this project is completed. As such, the committee recommends that the Urban Projects Authority address this issue as a matter of priority.

In considering this report, we must be mindful that we are not just talking about a \$7 million investment in a harbor at Glenelg for Glenelg or for the Glenelg project. The business being generated on Kangaroo Island by the fast ferry is significant. Those visiting the island on the ferry, or even present on the Glenelg jetty in the morning when passengers are boarding the ferry, will see that a considerable number of interstate and overseas visitors use the service. We are talking not just about a \$7 million project at Glenelg: we are talking about a \$7 million project that is part of a total tourist package for Adelaide and Kangaroo Island, and one must look at this matter in its correct context.

It also becomes a catalyst for other redevelopment around Glenelg in the form of the Holdfast Shores project. The concern I raised with the committee about car parking did not merely relate to ferry patrons: it can be argued that no

changes will occur to car parking, because as the number of passengers using the ferry will not increase the number of car parks will not increase, either. However, as soon as the harbor is completed, of course, the next step is the marina, which will open up the area to additional boating into and out of the Patawalonga Lake. Having access into and out of the lake through the new channel, people with sailing or power boats on the lake will take their friends out with them, and all these people must park somewhere.

So, when we talk in the report about ongoing problems of car parking, we are talking about the catalyst effect of the project. Other boat users who will start mooring their boats in the harbor will have access to the deep water of the Patawalonga Lake, and car parking will be required for these additional visitors. The people concerned will now be able to use the channel, bearing in mind that we are spending \$7 million to ensure that they have free access at all times of the year.

Overall, the Public Works Committee is supportive of the proposal to construct a safe harbor at Glenelg and, pursuant to section 12(c) of the Parliamentary Committees Act, reports to Parliament that it recommends that the proposed works proceed.

Mr BECKER (Peake): I thank the Government and the Public Works Committee for considering and encouraging this proposal. More importantly, I thank the Government for finally coming up with a proposal acceptable to the residents. I state plainly in this House that I live within a couple of hundred metres of this project, and it will affect the lifestyle of local residents, but at the same time we have wanted something done in this area for something like 30 years.

It proves the mistakes made in the past, going back to the early 1950s with the building of the groin at Glenelg and the impact that that had on an absolutely superb beach in the metropolitan area of Adelaide. When we first went there to live, the beach was full of seaweed, it was a great fishing area and was a very safe location. With the passage of time, the movement of sand along the gulf, the impact of the sewage treatment works and also the impact of the various pollutants flushed out from the Patawalonga, damage has occurred to the beach environment.

When the Jubilee Point project was first announced, I said I thought that it would never get off the ground and was proven correct, even though the poor developer spent about \$2 million on proving up a case trying to justify the project. Since then, a lot of work has been done by Governments and by private enterprise in assessing the sensitivity of the area. To come up with a development that will not impact unduly on that location—and, again, I refer to the sensitivity of the beach environment—is commendable.

It is important to note that the development will provide a safe harbor for the Kangaroo Island ferry, a service that is acknowledged as being a major contribution to tourism in this State. There is no doubt that we are fortunate in having a wonderful tourist destination such as Kangaroo Island and the ability to provide a tourist facility departing from Glenelg and returning from the island on a daily basis. The development will be a major boon for the local tourist industry. Only this week I noticed, more than I had ever seen previously, tourist buses at Glenelg and people standing outside the hotels and motels early in the morning waiting to go off on a local tour. We seem to be enjoying a revival of tourism in the area at this stage of the early summer season, and this comes after a lot

of work, promotion and patience on the part of the local tourist people.

This development will clean up and be the catalyst for improving one of the most valuable strips—and probably one of the best assets—that we have in our tourist industry. I commend all those involved with the project. At present, the only grizzle I have is that the sandbar should have been dredged a couple of months ago. The dredge has been sitting in the Patawalonga waiting, the operator having been waiting to get the contract to proceed. I cannot understand why a machine like that cannot be bought, anyway. I understand that the pipeline will now run along the length of the beach, and I would prefer pumping straight out to sea: put the pipeline about a kilometre out to sea and put the sand out there so that it can come back and replenish the beach. But we will live it during the summer season, and I look forward to commencing the final stage of rejuvenating the whole of this area in the interests of tourism, of the jobs it will create, and of the people of this State generally.

Motion carried

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT REGULATIONS

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I move:

That the principal regulations under the Road Traffic Act, gazetted on 29 August and laid on the table of this House on 1 October 1996, be disallowed.

After the unmeritorious closure of Barton Road at North Adelaide, I became deeply suspicious of some Government administrative actions, and I became a regular reader of the *Government Gazette* in order to see what the Government was up to in any particular week. It came to my attention that new regulations under the Road Traffic Act were published in the *Gazette* in August, I wrote to the Minister for Transport on 6 September to express my concern about some of these regulations, particularly as they related to traffic control devices, to the meaning of some signals, signs and pavement markings, and to the definition of bus lanes.

It is a matter for regret that the Minister had not replied to my letter by the time Parliament resumed, so I think it was my duty to move the disallowance of these regulations, given that the Minister had provided no satisfactory explanation of them. Indeed, my decision was confirmed by a unsolicited letter I received a few days later from Mr Gordon Howie of Clarence Gardens criticising the same set of regulations. I am pleased to say, however, that after the moving of the disallowance in this and another place the Minister did provide an explanation, and I am satisfied that that explanation is correct and that the regulations are not what I thought they might have been. However, in the course of her explanation, the Minister made a couple of gratuitous remarks about Barton Road, North Adelaide, to which I want to respond. First, she stated:

The Crown Solicitor also advised that, pursuant to section 359 of the Local Government Act, the power of the Minister. . . under the Road Traffic Act to approve the installation of traffic control devices necessary to give practical effect to a road closure does not constitute a power to review the council's resolution to close a road. In other words, the Minister cannot use his or her power of approval of the necessary road traffic devices to defeat a council's intention to close a road.

I know the Crown Solicitor gave quite contrary advice, because I have a copy of that 1993 advice in my office. It seems that, when one wants advice from lawyers, one only has to put in an order and one will get what one wants. So,

the point the Minister makes there is highly conjectural. The Minister goes on to state:

A small area of parkland was reclassified as road reserve early in 1995. The road alignment in this location had been altered over time to the point where a small portion of the existing road pavement encroached onto parkland. As a road reserve and the parkland are both under the care, control and management of the Adelaide City Council, the reclassification. . . [deemed necessary] was merely to correct the title reference for the land.

This is a falsehood stated by the Minister in another place. It is a deliberate falsehood. The situation is that the road alignment in that location had not altered over time; it was not some gradual accretion on parkland. The road alignment at that point was altered in 1987 because the Adelaide City Council, without any lawful authority, as was later ruled by the Supreme Court, went in and ripped up the parklands and put a road on parkland. That is why the Minister had the parkland reclassified to road reserve; she alienated our parkland for the private purposes of her brother-in-law. This reclassification was not because of some gradual encroachment: it was because an unlawful act had been committed and, retrospectively, on behalf of the Liberal Party, this Liberal Government acted administratively in an irregular way to cover up an unlawful act of the Adelaide City Council. It alienated our parkland. I want to make that very clear to anyone who bothers to read these debates.

Mr Bass: Put the commissioners in and support us.

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Florey says, 'Put the commissioners in and support us.' That has a lot of attraction for me, as the member for Florey knows. If the Adelaide City Council is sacked, one thing I will get out of it is the reopening of Barton Road; I will be a mug if I do not get that out of it. Having said that, I indicate that the Minister's explanation on the general question of the regulations is satisfactory to me and, accordingly, I do not wish to proceed with the motion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There being no seconder, the motion will lapse.

Motion lapsed.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (PUBLIC OPINION POLLS) AMENDMENT BILL

Mr ATKINSON (Spence) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Freedom of Information Act 1991. Read a first time.

Mr ATKINSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Last year the Government privatised the management of South Australia's system of water and sewerage. A contract was signed for an Anglo-French consortium, United Water, to manage the system. The decision was one for which the Liberal Party had not sought a mandate at the 1993 general election because it knew that such a policy would be unpopular.

After Cabinet made the decision in 1995, it commissioned an advertising campaign to promote United Water's management of the system and an opinion poll to sample the public's reaction to the water contract and the advertising campaign. When the Opposition asked about the polling, the Government denied that it existed. The Government then conceded that it existed, but denied access to the polling on the grounds that it was a Cabinet document vital to Cabinet's consideration of the water contract and ought not to be released lest Cabinet confidences be breached.

Owing to continued Opposition questioning, we now know that the polling was arranged by the Liberal Party's

Mr Ian Kortlang and consisted of telephone sampling and focus group sessions. Until 6 September 1995 it cost \$46 000. The polling continued into December. The results were sent by Mr Kortlang to the Chief Executive of SA Water (Mr Ted Phipps), and he in turn delivered the results in a brown envelope to the Cabinet subcommittee on water, although the envelopes were never attached to a Cabinet submission.

The Opposition asked the Ombudsman to look at the polls and rule on whether it was right to release them under the Freedom of Information Act. To stop the Ombudsman's deliberations, the Deputy Premier issued a certificate under the Act deeming the polls to have the Cabinet exemption mentioned in the Act. The Opposition has now appealed against that certificate and the matter is before the District Court. The Act defines a Cabinet document in the schedule, but clause 1(2) of the schedule says:

A document is not an exempt document by virtue of this clause if it merely consists of factual or statistical material that does not disclose information concerning any deliberation or decision of Cabinet.

It is the Opposition's contention that the opinion polling in question is not by that definition an exempt document, nor could any opinion polling ever fit the exemption. To put the matter beyond doubt, we propose by the Bill to include in the schedule to the Act after the words, 'if it merely consists of factual or statistical material' the words '(including the result of public opinion polling)'. We propose a similar amendment later in the schedule to the same effect.

The nub of this Bill is that after opinion polling has been completed for the Government it should be available to the public if a request is made under the Freedom of Information Act. We are not seeking to compel the Government to release immediately and publicly every poll that it commissions. We say that the taxpayers of South Australia fund Government opinion polling and that opinion polling is in all material respects factual or statistical material that is not exempt under the Act. Members of the public are entitled to have an avenue by which to view the results of that polling after it is read by the Government. By what reasoning can this be denied? Let me give the House an example that more experienced members of the Government will more readily understand.

During the second Bannon Government the then Minister of Health (Hon. John Cornwall) ordered opinion polling on matters in his portfolio and added to the polling a question about his performance as Minister. When the Opposition heard of this it disapproved—as it should have. If we had had a Freedom of Information Act at that time, the Opposition would have asked for the results of the polling. I ask the gamekeepers on the other side to cast their minds back to their 11 years as poachers between 1982 and 1993, and I ask them to be fair-minded about this issue before the House. During the 1993 general election, the Premier said that a Liberal Government would:

Insist the public is at all times fully informed about Government decisions and activities. A Liberal Government will ensure that freedom of information legislation is fully effective in providing access to Government information.

On what principle could Government members vote against this Bill?

Mr BASS secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: KANGAROO ISLAND SOUTH COAST ROAD

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the thirty-eighth report of the committee on the Kangaroo Island South Coast Road (Seal Bay-Rocky River upgrading and sealing) be noted.

The Department of Transport proposes to upgrade and seal approximately 54 kilometres of the South Coast Road on Kangaroo Island from Seal Bay to Rocky River at a cost of \$12 million. The South Coast Road is an integral part of the main road network on Kangaroo Island as it provides access to a range of road users including local residents, farmers, fishermen and tourists. The road is mainly unsealed and under the care, control and management of the District Council of Kingscote. Over recent years the council has widened and sealed some sections of the road. During the 1995-96 financial year the Department of Transport, using council resources and local contractors, upgraded a further four kilometre section.

The works proposed for this project include the reconstruction and sealing of the existing road, improvements to sections of inadequate alignment, a general upgrading of road junctions, and the upgrading of six existing bridges, three of which will be converted from single to double lane bridges. The purpose of the project is twofold: first, improved transport efficiency and decreased road user costs through the provision of an increased level of service and safety for traffic currently using the road; and, secondly, to improve transport accessibility in order to assist economic development by increasing the attractiveness of the route to tourists.

A significant portion of Kangaroo Island's income is generated from tourism and primary production. As the South Coast Road provides access to many of the island's major tourist attractions, it plays a significant role in this industry. Such tourist attractions include Seal Bay, Little Sahara, Kelly Hill Caves and Flinders Chase National Park. Many of those destinations appear on the video that is shown when one travels to the island on the Kangaroo Island fast ferry. I am sure that in the past many of us have travelled to the island on the ferry, hired a vehicle, and thought that we could visit those destinations and be back at the wharf in time for the departure of the ferry, only to find that the road conditions were such that you were lucky to get to Seal Bay and then back to the ferry, with precious little time for anything else except a quick meal.

If we compare the inability of day trippers who travel to the island on the ferry to move quickly around the island with the impact that the new bitumen road will have along the south coast, we can see what a boon for tourism it will be, let alone the safety aspect. Anyone who has travelled on Kangaroo Island's roads would know that they are constructed of a metal surface that consists of thousands of small circular stones. Vehicles simply float across the surface of the road and become a lethal weapon.

The residents of Kangaroo Island will also benefit from the works through the reduced number of accidents, and there will be savings in both vehicle operating costs and travelling time. The accident rate along the stretch of road is extraordinarily high—in fact, in some cases it is quite tragic, as is the damage incurred to vehicles, even in situations where there is no loss of life. The island roads have a reputation for a lack of safety and, of course, that is a deterrent to tourism. This improvement will result in a much safer holiday for those who visit the area. In the past, some commuters have had to

endure a longer route to avoid the unsealed section, and that has made it more difficult if they have been on the island for only one or two days.

In summary, the committee supports the proposal to upgrade and seal the Kangaroo Island South Coast Road. It considers that tourism on the island will be significantly enhanced as a result. Having inspected the route of the proposed works, members agree that the project will address issues relating to the existing road, such as: road alignments, existing single lane bridges, and general road drainage. We believe that this project is long overdue and that it will benefit the islanders and South Australians; and now that Kangaroo Island is a significant international tourist destination it will enhance our tourism promotion overseas. Pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to Parliament that it recommends that the proposed public work proceed.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I rise to support the motion. When I became the member for the island nearly three years ago, on the top of the wish list for the island's people was the sealing of the road system. Since that time, I have been lobbied considerably with all but one letter pointing out the dangerous state of the island's roads, particularly those covered in what is commonly called gunshot gravel. The lobbying reached a crescendo with the arrival of large numbers of additional tourists following the onset of the *Superflyte* ferry. Many of these tourists have rarely, if ever, been in charge of a motor vehicle off the bitumen. Except for the one constituent who most adamantly advised that bituminising the roads on Kangaroo Island would spoil the ambience of the island and lead to the killing of even more of the native animals, all contacts have been most concerned that the roads be sealed as soon as possible. A typical letter is as follows:

Dear Liz,

I am writing to you about the state of our roads here on Kangaroo Island. They are nothing short of a disgrace. We need action taken now. Our main road, which includes the complete ring route around the island and the remainder of the Playford Highway to Cape Borda, must be sealed immediately. It is the tourists who are rolling over on our gravel roads, and it is the tourist that we are promoting to come to Kangaroo Island. So, we need provision for them to drive on the only type of road they know: a sealed road. It will not matter how many signs the council erects, they will still roll over on our roads. It is beyond a joke. We need funds now. How many lives will it take? We need help from higher up now. Your urgent action required.

That is a typical letter. The sealing of the South Coast Road will go well towards sealing the remainder of the island's roads. It is with great pleasure that I support the motion.

Motion carried.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE: NATIONAL SCHEMES OF LEGISLATION

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I move:

That the report of the committee on the scrutiny of national schemes of legislation-position paper be noted.

On many occasions I have warned the House of the erosion of the sovereignty of State Parliaments. To a very limited extent indeed, this paper addresses that issue. I would like to go over some of the things that have concerned me for some time relating to State powers *vis a vis* those of the Commonwealth Government. Mr Deputy Speaker, you know that the external affairs power has been used extensively to erode State powers. The industrial power is being interpreted

in such a way that it is eroding the sovereignty of the State. National scheme legislation is doing the same thing—and I will deal with that in more detail in a moment. In addition, since the retirement of Chief Justice Gibbs in 1978, we have had a centralist High Court, which with the interpretation of legislation has been eroding State powers.

Mr Bass interjecting:

Mr CUMMINS: I am glad to hear my legal colleague on this side give a 'Yes' to that, because that is the reality of what has been happening. Those of us who support State rights will be happy with this first step in the right direction to address some of those problems. With respect to national scheme legislation, it has been the practice in the past and now to present it to the States as a *fait accompli*.

This has happened in relation to the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) when it meets, the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, and the Australian Police Ministers Council. They adopt the procedure of meeting on a regular basis and decide in what direction they are going and what legislation they need. They then refer the drafting of that legislation to public servants, who are inevitably Commonwealth public servants. The legislation is then presented back to the relevant committee, for example, COAG. The committee agrees on it, then the Premiers of the various States and the Prime Minister go back to the relevant Government and say, 'Here we are, here is some national scheme legislation; the Premier and the Prime Minister have agreed to it.' It is then presented to the Labor Party Caucus or to the Liberal Party Party room and we are told, 'Here it is. Everyone has agreed; we have to agree.' The reality is that, before State Parliaments have a chance to scrutinise this legislation, we are stuck with it. That is not good enough, and it is a clear infringement of the sovereignty of the States. We must address those issues.

Recently, a prime example of national scheme legislation was the National Competition Policy Act 1995, which was Keating-Labor Government legislation. That legislation will have a drastic effect on the States, both politically and economically. As a Parliament, we did not have the opportunity to scrutinise properly that legislation. It was simply presented to our Party room, as I assume it was presented to the Labor Party Caucus, and we were told, 'It is national scheme legislation; go ahead and adopt it.'

I am not necessarily criticising national scheme legislation as such. It is absolutely critical in some areas that we have national scheme legislation, for example, in the area of family law, finance law and corporate law, so that people know when they come into this country, particularly in relation to finance and corporation law, that there is uniformity between the States. I do not have any problems with that. My criticism of national scheme legislation and national scheme subordinate legislation is that there is basically no process whereby the legislation is scrutinised by the State Parliaments. That is my criticism of this sort of legislation.

If you look at the process, you see that the reality is that, at present in relation to national scheme legislation and national scheme subordinate legislation, the Commonwealth is being governed by committees and by the Executive. That is not the way responsible government is supposed to operate. As I pointed out earlier, the committees that draft this legislation consist fundamentally of Commonwealth public servants. Who do you think they will favour when they are drafting national scheme legislation? I submit that it certainly will not be the States. As I said earlier, the sovereignty of the States is being eroded.

The South Australian Legislative Review Committee, of which I am a member, looks at subordinate legislation in relation to certain criteria. It looks at such issues as whether it is inappropriate to delegate certain legislation or whether any subordinate legislation is within the power of the primary legislation. They are fundamental and important issues, but they do not deal with the matter of policy. One problem with national scheme legislation is that at present—and I apply this to both the national scheme primary and subordinate legislation—is that there is no criteria to look at the legislation in the terms I have just mentioned and in the terms of the concept of national justice. Secondly, there is no provision fundamentally to look at that legislation in terms of policy, because State Parliaments are not really given the opportunity to scrutinise the legislation. That is one of the issues the report attempts to address. It is critical for the democratic process that this Parliament have the right to scrutinise legislation, both primary and subordinate.

The question then becomes how we deal with the issue. This report deals with some of those issues, and I refer to page 18, where the problem is outlined from two aspects. The first is whether or not one solution to the problem is that exposure drafts for uniform legislation should be given to Parliaments. It also deals with a second option, that is, whether or not a national scrutiny committee should be drawn from the States and the Commonwealth. My personal preference is for both. It is critical that exposure drafts of uniform legislation be available to State Governments at an early date so they can be brought before this House and people can examine them in relation to policy aspects.

Secondly, it is also important that we establish a national scrutiny committee which is drawn from the States and the Commonwealth and which can deal with certain criteria in relation to subordinate legislation. The national competition policy legislation was adopted in this House with hardly any thought as to the effect and the consequences of that legislation—with all respect to the members of this House. I have no doubt that, when the impact of that legislation is felt, a lot of people will lose their jobs in South Australia, and I cite the electricity industry as an example.

Who will wear the political pain for that? It is pretty obvious that the State Government will, because, when we go into the national pool, which will operate in Victoria, and sell our electricity there, the reality is that New South Wales and Victoria will sell it cheaper. When that happens we will not be able to compete and we will lose jobs. I pay tribute to former Labor Prime Minister Keating, because he has delivered what he wanted for his big business mates and he has imposed all the pain on the States. That was a politically smart move on his part.

I suggest that there should be two solutions to this problem of national uniform legislation and, at page 34, the report deals with the basis of scrutiny. The report has adopted criteria, which I think are good criteria, in relation to subordinate legislation. It suggests that we should look at legislation to determine: whether it is in accordance with the provisions of the Act, which our committee in South Australia does; whether the subordinate legislation trespasses unduly on personal rights and liberty; whether having regard to the expected social and economic impact of the subordinate legislation it has been assessed according to the principles and guidelines for national standards setting and regulatory action by ministerial councils and standards setting bodies or other equivalent guidelines; and whether the subordinate legislation makes rights, freedoms or obligations

unduly dependent upon administrative decisions that are not subject to appropriate and external review. Fundamentally, that suggestion covers part of the principles of natural justice and also some of the criteria used by most legislative committees throughout the Commonwealth. I certainly support that.

In addition, as I mentioned earlier, that question deals only with the criteria, and it is essential that we deal with policy. At the end of the day, the States will have to wear the effect of this sort of legislation: they will have to wear it economically and they will have to wear the social and political impact. Therefore, the States should demand that exposure drafts of national uniform legislation be available to them very early in the piece so that we, as members of Parliament from both sides, can have access to the legislation to assess the impact that it will have on our State socially, economically and politically.

At page 41 the report recommends that a national committee for scrutiny of national schemes of legislation be established and that there be a chairman, and the Chair be the Senate Scrutiny of Bills Committee, and it be for a three year period. It also recommends that two deputy Chairs be appointed from other committees throughout the States on a rotating basis, a secretariat and members. That is an excellent idea. At page 43 of the report it deals with the time constraints put on the committee. As I said, this report is good in one sense: finally, there is a national report which attempts to deal with these issues. I must say I was happy to represent the South Australian Legislative Review Committee in Tasmania about a year ago when these issues were dealt with.

At that time my view was that, for obvious reasons, it was not appropriate that a national committee in relation to subordinate legislation should deal with both policy and criteria because it would present the same problem that COAG and other committees present, namely, we do not want a committee dealing with policy issues. Policy issues should be dealt with in the Parliament. I am glad to see that this paper has taken that approach. It recommends the establishment of a national committee which will deal with the criteria. But, on the face of the paper, it also supports a concept that national uniform legislation should be laid before the House at a very early date so that members of Parliament can debate that legislation rather than, as has been happening in the past, being presented by legislation *fait accompli* where the Premier or the relevant Minister will say, 'This has been agreed between all the States and the Commonwealth; you have to wear it.' That has been happening—and I am not criticising necessarily this Government—at the Federal level and in all the States.

That is not good enough. It is not good enough for responsible government. It is not good enough for members in this House to accept that sort of procedure because they are abrogating their obligation to the public of this State and they are abrogating the concepts of democracy. I commend this report to the House.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: ANNUAL REPORT

Mr BECKER (Peake): I move:

That the annual report 1995-96 of the committee be noted.

In its annual report for the year July 1995 to 30 June 1996 the Economic and Finance Committee has called for an end to

excessive delays in providing information sought by the committee and criticised stonewalling by some agencies in relation to responding to requests (page 31). The committee had a busy and productive year, but its progress with some references has been impeded by slow and/or incomplete responses from agencies and ministerial offices with delays of two or three months being common and longer delays too frequent. Since the tabling of this report, we have written to all Ministers to remind them of the powers of the committee under the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, which refers to their cooperation in providing prompt and complete responses to committee requests for information.

The Economic and Finance Committee was pleased to find that most of the recommendations made in its previous reports have been implemented. One of the good news stories is an outcome of our report on whether third party property damage insurance should be compulsory as a minimum cover for motorists. We recommended against compulsion, but supported an extensive education campaign to be run by the Insurance Council of Australia. This was done in the first half of 1996 and we now find that both rates of inquiry and sales of third party property insurance policies are increasing. This is very encouraging, given the problems of litigation and the horrendous costs which can be incurred by uninsured drivers, but more still needs to be done.

The committee also followed up responses to its fifteenth report on grants administration. We received responses from seven ministerial portfolios, and in most cases the agencies reported that they will either comply, or soon will comply, with our recommendations. In some cases they said that it was the committee's inquiry which focused their attention on weaknesses in their administration of grants and which provoked them to review and upgrade processes. During the year, the committee continued with three ongoing references on management of the Government car fleet, outsourcing, and boards and committees. The committee reported on the last-named reference in August 1996. Another major reference was the annual examination of the MFP. A new reference inquiring into the administration of grants by Foundation SA (now Living Health) was commenced. In addition, the committee considered several other issues, such as corporate credit cards, complimentary theatre tickets and the role of central agencies of government, without at this stage adopting formal references on the topics.

The committee noted that the size of the Government car fleet had been reduced from 9 700 to 8 400 vehicles, a 13.4 per cent reduction. A survey of 'on-call' use of Government vehicles found that over a two-month period there were 1 150 vehicles going home every night on the basis of the driver's being on call, but only 217 people were actually called out on duty. The fleet management task force was continuing its efforts to reduce excessive vehicle use in this and other areas. The fleet management task force ceased to operate on 28 June 1996, and the committee has sought information from the Minister regarding future plans for this area. In December 1995 there were 4 210 State Government corporate credit cards on issue across 26 Government agencies. Total expenditure on these cards for the year ended 30 June 1995 amounted to \$17.8 million. The committee was following up some problems with usage which had been identified by the Auditor-General.

Complimentary theatre tickets issued by the State Theatre Company over the 1994-95 period exceeded 11 000. In the same period, seats sold were subsidised by \$45 per seat. The Adelaide Festival Centre Trust and the State Opera also

received subsidies and issued complimentary tickets. The committee has a strong and positive relationship with the Auditor-General and usually has at least one or two meetings with him in addition to the formal examination of the Auditor-General's Report to Parliament. The committee values the support and advice of the Auditor-General whose detailed reporting greatly facilitates the committee's work.

The committee was pleased to note the production in June 1996 of a Premier and Cabinet circular (No. 13) on annual reporting requirements. This replaced the paper which the committee prepared in 1995. The preparation of annual reports by agencies is a very important part of the accountability process. We are pleased that our background work on this topic—and our highlighting of its importance—has proved to be a valuable basis for these guidelines.

Similarly, we have made recommendations on the development of model contracts, the introduction of internal audit functions and a variety of other topics which have led to refinement of control procedures and the issue of improved operating guidelines. One recommendation of our grants report was that appropriate central agencies should identify world best practice standards for the administration of grant funds—a multi million dollar area—for use by agencies and recipients. This is likely to be undertaken by Treasury and Finance with advice and assistance from other central agencies and the Auditor-General.

I reiterate the comments on pages 30 and 32 of our report in relation to staffing. It is of great concern that we have difficulty from time to time replacing officers who have been promoted and who have transferred elsewhere. We have experienced delays of some three months. However, despite the difficulties under which we operate—and I am most unhappy with our office accommodation—I thank everyone who contributed to the operation of the committee during the past 12 months' review: witnesses, respondents to correspondence and questionnaires, and those who gave us briefings. In particular, I again emphasise the outstanding support we received from the Auditor-General, Mr Ken MacPherson, and his staff.

I thank most sincerely the secretaries of the committee, Mr Paul Collett (November 1994 to July 1995) and Mr Knut Cudarans, who is now an officer of this Chamber. I place on record our great appreciation to Val Edyvean, our research officer, throughout this reporting period, and the various staff members who filled in as part-time administrative officers, people such as Louise Lucktaylor, Karen Petney and Tracey Anderson. I commend the report to the House.

Motion carried.

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

A quorum having been formed:

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MYPOLONGA GOVERNMENT HIGHLAND IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the thirty-ninth report of the committee on the rehabilitation of Mypolonga Government Highland Irrigation District be noted.

SA Water proposes to provide irrigation rehabilitation and restructuring of the South Australian Government's Mypolonga Highland Irrigation District at an estimated cost of \$4.9 million. It is proposed that the cost be shared between the Commonwealth and State Governments and the growers

in the region on a 40:40:20 basis respectively. The Mypolonga area includes both lowland irrigation on the river flats, which is predominantly used for dairying, and approximately 370 hectares of highland irrigation, which is planted with horticultural crops, such as citrus and stone fruit. This proposal before the House today concerns only the highland area. Generally, Mypolonga is a lake district for citrus, with a market niche from the first week in September to the end of October. Stone fruit, mainly apricots, is also an important crop in Mypolonga and is grown for the dried, fresh, canned and juice markets.

The existing water distribution system in Mypolonga is over 60 years old. This system is at the end of its expected economic life and suffers from the problems inherent with open channel irrigation systems. Currently, growers must use water when it is available in the system, rather than when best suited to their crops' requirements. This arrangement does not encourage economic use of water in the system and is generally inefficient. The pumps that supply the highland district are housed in a timber framed, galvanised iron shed built in the 1920s. Furthermore, the mechanical and electrical plant contained in the station was last renewed around 1960 and, as such, this equipment is outdated and past its economic life.

It is proposed to rehabilitate the Mypolonga irrigation area by replacing the existing channels with new pipelines and metering the supply to each block. A new pumping station is proposed, along with an 850 kilolitre surge tank to pressurise the system and control the pumps. With the changes proposed, water on order will be available in the Mypolonga irrigation district. A delegation of the Public Works Committee conducted an inspection of the Mypolonga area and the existing irrigation system. Members were able to see at first hand the poor condition of the existing open channel system, which requires constant repair to prevent large volumes of water leaking from the system.

Members were also able to see evidence of the age of the current pumping system and the shed in which it is housed and, as such, gained an appreciation of the high level of maintenance required for it to remain operational. The committee agrees that the existing irrigation system at Mypolonga is at the end of its expected economic life. As growers must take water based on availability rather than need, they are often required to water their crops at a time that is not necessarily optimal. The committee considers that this proposal will eliminate such difficulties, as growers will be able to 'order' water at the time it is required.

Furthermore, the committee acknowledges that this proposal will provide further incentive to reduce water consumption by metering growers' water use. This is a practice that does not currently take place, but when introduced it will decrease drainage returns to the environment, free up existing water allocations for further development and move growers towards a self-management system. Overall, the main benefits of this proposal arise from the increased horticultural output that is possible with a rehabilitated distribution system and increased grower confidence, resulting in the planting of higher value crops. Other benefits will include savings in repairs, maintenance, operation and also costs of administration. Given the above items and issues, and pursuant to section 12(c) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to Parliament that it recommends that the proposed public work proceed.

Mr BASS (Florey): After arriving from England, I grew up at Mypolonga, and I am well aware of its irrigation system. In fact, when I moved to Mypolonga the system was already 30 years old and needed some upkeep then. It is a shame that it has taken another 30 years before the system is to be corrected. The irrigation system consists of an open channel that runs along the top of the orchards in the area. Mypolonga is a settlement some 11 kilometres in length from beginning to end. It consists of a swamp between the Murray River and the highlands which is used for dairy cattle. That area is irrigated simply by the flooding method, where they allow the water to flood into a paddock and, once it has received sufficient water, the system is closed off with a sluiceway and the water seeps into the ground.

The highland area between the lower road and the top road is all orchards—oranges, lemons, apricots, peaches and nectarines—and that is watered by the water that would be pumped into the top channel. As the member for Morphet said, if you were an orchardist you would be allocated a 24-hour period during which you could take water from the channel. The orchardist would work on his orchard, putting open furrows down either side of the trees. When the 24-hour period began, the water would run from the channel, down a side channel and along the dirt between the trees. Over a 24-hour period, the orchardist had to work the whole time. Every 40 to 45 minutes, with a hoe he had to block the channels where the water was running and then move it down to another row of trees. Of course, in hot weather he lost a lot of water because of the heat. The best time to irrigate was at night, but half the orchard would be watered during darkness, when it was the best time, and the other half during sunlight when there was a great deal of evaporation.

The Mypolonga area is noted for its Washington oranges and its apricots. As the member for Morphet said, it has a great industry in apricots, both fresh and dried. They dry them on the orchard properties and they also use the juice. I have no doubt that when this system is finally implemented, it will not only make the orchardist's life easier but also increase production on the orchards. The present system is a bit like farmers who grow wheat; as the Speaker would understand, the wheat farmer gets the water when it rains. The orchardist now has a little more control with the channel system. Orchardists got it when it was their turn, whether or not the trees needed it. The irrigation channels were dangerous. I can remember that we had been at Mypolonga for a year when my younger brother, who was five, and his friend were playing, and my brother ran to my father and said that his friend had disappeared. The young boy had fallen into the channel and, notwithstanding my father's attempts to resuscitate him, he died. I am amazed that more young people have not fallen into a channel and suffered the same fate.

I know that the \$4.9 million to be spent in this area will be well spent. It will increase exports for this State and increase productivity at Mypolonga, and I congratulate the Government for finally upgrading this very important system to the Mypolonga Government Highland Irrigation District.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): As a member of the Public Works Committee and as the member for that district in which Mypolonga is located, naturally, I support the proposal. All the reasons given by the committee in the report are sensible. They are not exhaustive, and it is on that basis that I seek to contribute. It is not out of any desire to be prolix or for that matter to echo the statements of fact made by the Presiding Member and the anecdotal information provided by the

member for Florey, who is well known and highly respected in the Mypolonga community.

The 370 hectares at present could be increased substantially in the way which has been mentioned in the Public Works Committee report as well as given to it in evidence by those witnesses who appeared. It is over 60 years old, as has been pointed out by the Presiding Member of that committee, the member for Morphett. I wanted to recall that particularly, because it was the Morphett family who first used water from the river for irrigation purposes in the lower Murray—interesting connections.

The 40 per cent provided by the Federal Government, and 20 per cent by the State and then local ratepayers to the scheme, is the breakdown which, it had been decided in exhaustive negotiations over many years, would be used for all these old irrigation systems throughout the Murray Valley in South Australia on highland irrigation areas. Information provided by both the member for Morphett as Presiding Member and by the member for Florey about the way the system operates—or in this day and age fails to operate—underlines and illustrates the necessity to do away with these open channels, the cracks in which allow water to escape in great quantity and it is wasted. Worse than that, it is not possible to deliver a pressurised supply through open channels and equally it is not possible properly to meter the amount of water that is being used. Accordingly, we can only estimate how much water is being used or how much has been used by these systems in years past.

We also know from groundwater studies in shallow bores that a great deal of water—in excess of that which is needed—is applied. It runs back towards the river, taking with it a load of salt and contributing to the problems we have in the riverine channel of increasing salt loads. They are all very good reasons why the project has to go ahead. More important still is the fact that the practice of taking the water when it is allocated to you, regardless of whether or not you need it, is an abuse of the principle of sustainable agriculture using minimal amounts of resources necessary to maximise profits so you get optimum marginal physical product for each additional unit applied.

The reason why that is not just undesirable but stupid is that, when you apply water you do not need, you are clearly going over field capacity to saturation point, dissolving the available plant nutrients in the soil and, in consequence, seeing them taken from the soil simply by gravitational drainage away from the root zone, beneath the root zone of the plant crops. They then go to the river where they contribute to this process of pollution through more nutrients getting into the river than is desirable, which results algal blooms during periods of low flow.

The growers do not want to do that. The Government itself does not want to do that, and certainly it is detrimental to the environment and to those of us who have to use the water. It is therefore vital that all these schemes, which enable a watertight pressurised supply, are properly metered. In doing that, we know that we are freeing up additional water which can then be used to extend and expand the areas irrigated to achieve even greater economic recovery from the use of the resource and, in the process, expand the local economy and employment opportunities. They are all very good reasons why it ought to be done.

More importantly, once it is done, it will be possible to transfer water within the same system. Ultimately systems collectively will be able to transfer water from one system to another and then sell it to prospective irrigators within that

system area. It is my wish that ultimately the irrigation systems will all be owned by the people who use them, because the Government does not need to be the landlord of these schemes. If they were privately owned, they would be more efficiently managed in ways that suit the people who own them, because they are the people who would use them, benefit from them and need them for the enterprises in which they engage and which are dependent on that supply of water.

Accordingly, with that freed up water and the opportunities to expand, I want to see the word 'irrigation' stricken from the public record as the purpose for which this water is provided. It is a misnomer which puts blinkers on our minds as to how we can use the water. We ought to refer to it as water diversions from the Murray River, because that would enable us to then see that we do not have to put it on fruit trees (even though that is desirable), vines or vegetables. We can use it for aquaculture or even semi-intensive hydroponic production for those vegetable crops which are increasingly in demand in East Asia, whether grown completely hydroponically or semi-intensively hydroponically.

It is a multi-million dollar business and market and we do not have to sell any of it in Australia—it can all go out of Australia. It provides the best kinds of jobs in Australia that are possible in this country—export production jobs that have a multiplier of over 2 to 1 in the benefits they bring to us. Equally, we will then see people using the water to farm aquatic animals, whether crustaceans like fresh water mussels and yabbies or fin fish.

I will never tire, whilst I am in this place, of talking about the great benefits that aquaculture can bring to this State and its economy, and I will continue to mention it until I see a sensible allocation of public resources to its development. At present we spend a hell of a lot of money on a good many activities which have no prospect whatever of returning to the State's economy anything like the economic benefit that will come when we ultimately start producing and selling aquaculture products to the markets to our near north and even to ourselves.

Accordingly, on that note, I will conclude my remarks by saying that, even though it is the last of these highland irrigation schemes to be rehabilitated, it is overdue. I am pleased to see that it is happening, and I hope that the people who live there will have an expanded view of the way they can use the resource in future and get benefit for the increased number of people who can come and live there as a consequence of this new efficient technology now being introduced. I commend the report to the House.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MONTAGUE ROAD

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the fortieth report of the committee on the Montague Road upgrade, Chester Crescent-Belalie Road section be noted.

The Department of Transport proposes to upgrade the section of Montague Road between Chester Crescent and Bridge Road at Pooraka from two to four lanes at an estimated cost of \$5.9 million. Montague Road has been a major east-west road in the northern metropolitan area since the 1960s, with the primary function of providing a route for traffic movement between Modbury and Port Adelaide. Previously, sections of the route between Para Vista and Ingle Farm and Pooraka and Cavan have been upgraded to a four lane medium divided road, and this proposal deals with upgrading

a further 2.2 kilometre section of road that will link these existing upgraded segments together.

The section of road proposed for the upgrade currently consists of two narrow lanes that carry traffic in either direction. The road has residential properties on its southern side, which creates problems with traffic noise and congestion, along with the hazards that result from residents reversing onto the road from adjacent properties. The proposed upgrading will overcome these problems via a service road designed to separate local traffic from the through traffic. It is envisaged that the upgraded road will provide smoother main traffic flow and safer access to adjoining southern side properties.

Overall, the purpose of the project is to redevelop this section of road consistent with standards on the existing adjoining sections by providing a safe facility with a higher travelling speed of 70 km/h and smoother traffic flow; significantly reduce hazards to the southern side residents who now have to reverse from their properties directly onto congested narrow through lanes; and also cater for future increases in traffic volume through the residential suburbs of Modbury and Tea Tree Gully and the industrial areas west of Main North Road. The committee is aware of the noise and traffic congestion difficulties associated with this segment of road and acknowledges the hazards that exist for residents who have to reverse from their properties directly into congested narrow through lanes.

Furthermore, members note that the volume of traffic using this route has increased significantly in recent times and, therefore, considers that the proposed upgrading is required to cater for this increase and to improve safety for all road users. In addition, it is the committee's view that this upgrade will reduce travel times between Modbury and Tea Tree Gully and the industrial areas west of Main North Road, whilst also reducing vehicle operating costs and the risk of accidents. Given this information, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act, the Public Works Committee reports to Parliament that it recommends that the proposed public work proceed.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

RETAIL SHOP LEASES (SELECT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Mr ATKINSON (Spence) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Retail Shop Leases Act 1995. Read a first time.

Mr ATKINSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

For a number of years now, small retailers have been worried about the terms upon which they are offered leases by shopping centre landlords. It is highly desirable for retailers to be situated in major shopping centres such as those owned by the Westfield Trust and managed by Westfield management and others such as Colonnades in the south owned by the AMP Society. It is fair to say that small retailers are desperate to get their shop into a major shopping centre because the rewards of doing so are high indeed, but the owners of those major shopping centres have put a very high price on obtaining a lease.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Ridley may well be right about that. It seems to me that retailing is being very highly concentrated, and that is because customers want the

services and the range of goods offered by big shopping centres. Retailing is becoming concentrated, and there is a desperate rush to get into those shopping centres. However, more important than that, once a retailer is situated in such a shopping centre, they would regard it as a catastrophe to have to leave, because once one has a successful retailing business in a major shopping centre it is not conceivable at the end of the lease to take that business out onto the street into, say, a strip of shops and expect to succeed. In the great majority of cases, such a retailer would not succeed in sustaining their business once they left a major shopping centre.

Last year, when, contrary to its election promises, the Government sought to allow Sunday trading in the City of Adelaide, it brought a Bill before Parliament having been defeated in the High Court by the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees' Association, of which I am proud to say I am a member. So the Government introduced legislation to authorise Sunday trading in the city. That legislation was opposed by small retailers, because it was flatly contrary to their interests, and it was also opposed by the Parliamentary Labor Party and the Australian Democrats. The Government entered into negotiations with the Small Retailers' Association and agreed with it that, provided that association asked the Australian Democrats to let the legislation for Sunday trading in the city go through, the Government would revise the Retail Shop Leases Act, which it had so recently put through the Parliament, for the purpose of increasing the rights of small retailers as against those of their landlords.

When the Government succeeded in doing that deal, it was exultant over the passage of its trading hours legislation. Members opposite gloated about the promises made to small retailers to have a select committee to inquire into the Retail Shop Leases Act, saying that it was merely a flimsy promise which had obtained the passage of the legislation and that no serious consequence would flow from it. The Joint Select Committee on Retail Shop Tenancies was established, and I had the honour to be a member of that committee. To the horror of the Government and in particular that of the Attorney-General, serious consequences did flow from that joint select committee, because it made a number of recommendations, which the Attorney-General, and in some cases the member for Mawson, strongly opposed. The most important recommendation of that select committee was that an existing tenant should have the first right of refusal upon the renewal of a retail shop lease. The recommendation is as follows:

The committee recommends that the Act be amended to provide that the landlord must give the existing tenant the first right of refusal on a new lease unless it can be established that the landlord would be disadvantaged by the granting of the right or that any of the following occur:

1. the tenant has been in breach of the lease;
2. the landlord has plans to redevelop the centre;
3. the centre would benefit from a change of tenancy mix; or
4. the landlord can obtain a higher rate for the tenancy.

The Attorney-General has sought steadfastly to avoid legislating for that recommendation. I understand that he took a proposal to the Liberal Party room on Tuesday that would have avoided bringing in this recommendation. The Liberal Party room sent him packing, I believe. Congratulations to members opposite on sending the Attorney-General packing, because he deserved that on this issue. It is a recommendation of the joint committee, one to which my Bill now gives effect.

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Newland opposes this recommendation. She says it is nonsense: she says that the tenant having a first right of refusal on the renewal of his lease is nonsense. When you build up a retail business in a shopping centre and you put all your resources into building up that business and its clientele, upon the termination of that lease—which will often be a five year lease—if you do not get a renewal of your lease, you lose your business. The member for Newland ought to be worried about that. She ought not to refer to it as nonsense.

Mrs KOTZ: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The member for Spence is making improper remarks about comments that were not made by me, and I ask him to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Newland is not raising a point of order. She will have the opportunity to participate in the debate if she desires, to correct any statement that was incorrect in relation to her, or to make a personal explanation.

Mr ATKINSON: Sir, thank you for your protection. I hope that, when you look at the question list for Question Time, you pay careful attention to the name of the member for Newland, who misuses the Standing Orders to take a point of order that is not a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the member for Spence not go down that track but concentrate on his speech.

Mr ATKINSON: Yes, Sir. Another recommendation of the committee was that written reasons ought to be given by a landlord's for his refusing to renew a retail tenant's lease. Recommendation 3 provides:

The committee recommends that the Act be amended to enable the lessee to request from the lessor written reasons for the lessor's decision not to offer the lessee a renewal or extension of the lease where the reasons will provide a basis for judicial review of the lessor's decision.

That is an important recommendation of the joint committee. I do not know whether that clause was included in the Bill that the Attorney-General put before the Parliamentary Liberal Party on Tuesday, but it is certainly included in my Bill.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: As the member for Giles says, it is a critical clause because, unless the tenant knows the real reasons why the landlord is refusing the renewal of his or her lease, what chance does the tenant have to put his or her position or get judicial review of the landlord's reasons for non-renewal of the lease? Recommendation 4 was also rejected by the Attorney-General but accepted by a majority of the committee. The recommendation is as follows:

The committee recommends that the Magistrates Court have jurisdiction to entertain an application to review the rent if it is harsh and unconscionable.

In this Bill, every recommendation of the joint committee is faithfully reproduced. If the House wants to honour the report of the committee, this is the Bill for which it ought to vote. Another Bill has been introduced in another place by the Hon. M.J. Elliott, but it goes considerably beyond the recommendations of the joint committee. A number of matters were before the committee about which it was unanimous. It agreed that there ought to be a more detailed statement of legal consequences given to the tenant upon the tenant's entering into a retail shop lease.

The committee believed that there ought to be an extension of the landlord's obligations on disclosure of outgoings to tenants whose leases were still under the old Landlord and

Tenant Act. We recommended that mark-ups on outgoings ought to be disclosed. There was some evidence that landlords run electricity from ETSA into a shopping centre and then charge not just the ETSA charge for connection and power but a premium on top of that. It seemed to the committee that retail landlords are not in the business of supplying electricity but they are in the business of supplying retail shops and they ought not to have a mark-up on the ETSA charges. The committee also recommended that there be a statement on tenancy mix, as follows:

The committee recommends that the Act be amended to require a lessor to state in the disclosure statement the current tenancy mix in a retail shopping centre and any changes to the tenancy mix that are contemplated by the lessor at the time the lease is negotiated and, where appropriate, make it clear that there is no guarantee of exclusivity if that is the case.

We also recommended that landlords ought to give retail tenants early notice of any fit-out requirements. We decided to change the name of the Act to the Retail and Commercial Leases Act, and we also held that a casual licence for a calendar month or less be excluded from the operation of the Act. We also recommended that the mediation provisions of the Act come into effect as soon as possible, and I notice that the Attorney has done that.

The joint committee recommended that the law ought to stick with a minimum five-year term for a retail shop lease and we also held that registered conveyancers, not just lawyers, ought to be able to draw up a retail shop lease. We determined that, where outgoings are very few and small, there ought to be no need for the landlord to comply with the detailed disclosure requirements on outgoings. The committee also held that the Act should not apply retrospectively to leases entered into before the Act. Finally, we held that there needed to be no change in a valuer's duty in respect of the Retail Shop Leases Act because a valuer's duty was adequately dealt with in the provisions of the Land Valuers Act.

Small retailers in South Australia are crying out for this Bill. This is the Bill that small retailers want, and small retailers have been telling members of the Government that this is the Bill they want. The Attorney-General, who is a great friend of the landlords, is not proposing to bring in a Bill in accordance with the recommendations of the Retail Shop Tenancies Joint Committee.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Custance asks whether I am casting aspersions on the Attorney-General. I am not. The Attorney-General is a fine Attorney-General. He is one of the best Ministers in this Government and he does a conspicuously good job. However, one would not have to be on the Retail Shop Tenancies Joint Committee for 10 minutes to know that the Attorney-General sees retail shop tenancies from the perspective of landlords, and all the questions he asked were the landlords' questions. In fact, the Attorney-General seems to regard retail tenants as benighted mugs who ought to have a closer look at their tenancies before they enter into them.

Mr Venning interjecting:

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

Mr ATKINSON: The Parliamentary Labor Party is the friend of retail tenants. We are moving the Bill they want. I urge as many members of the Government as possible to cross the floor and vote for the Bill that the tenants want.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (VICTIM PROTECTION) AMENDMENT BILL

Mr ATKINSON (Spence) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Correctional Services Act 1982. Read a first time

Mr ATKINSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to give the victims of a crime of violence—and where that crime of violence has been a homicide the next of kin of the victim—the statutory right to be notified when the prisoner who has been convicted of that offence applies for parole and the opportunity to make a submission to the Parole Board on whether parole should be granted and, if it is granted, whether any conditions should be placed on that parole. The need for this Bill came to my attention from a constituent who had had certain of her relatives murdered by an in-law. This lady wanted to know when the prisoner, who was sentenced to life for the multiple murder, was going to appear before the Parole Board because she would like to make submissions on behalf of her family about whether that prisoner ought to get parole and, if so, what conditions ought to be placed on that prisoner's parole.

The family of my constituent were particularly concerned that the prisoner, being an in-law, might seek to approach them after his release or that he might linger in the suburb in which they lived with a view to approaching them. That seemed to me a reasonable request, but there is no statutory obligation on the Government so to inform victims or the next of kin of the victim in the case of a homicide. I give some credit to the previous Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner) and the current Minister for Correctional Services because both of them tried to ensure that the correctional services system ensured that victims and next of kin of victims were so notified, but that notification was not always practicable, and furthermore, where it was practicable, it did not always succeed. The importance of this Bill is to create a statutory obligation to ensure that, in all those cases where notification is practicable, it is given.

The Opposition attempted to introduce these amendments at my instigation in another place in the committee stage of the Criminal Law Consolidation (Mental Impairment) Amendment Bill. The Attorney-General was good enough to accept the Opposition's amendments as they related to prisoners who were confined in James Nash House because they had pleaded not guilty on the basis of insanity, but the Attorney was not willing to accept the amendments as they related to prisoners who were sane at the time the crime was committed. The Attorney-General gave some arguments why he thought our amendments ought not to be accepted on principle in respect of sane offenders, but he invited us to introduce a private member's Bill to give effect to this principle, and that is what I am doing. It seems to me that the Bill before us increases the rights of victims in a way that does not go far beyond what the department is attempting to do now, but it gives those rights statutory effect, and that is desirable.

The Opposition accepts the point which the Attorney made in another place that sometimes the victim will not want to know anything more about the prisoner. The victim will not want to know when the prisoner applies for parole; the victim will not want to know when the prisoner is released; the victim will just want to put the crime behind him or her, and I accept that. But, those victims and next of kin of victims who want to know the progress of the offender through the

criminal justice system and then through the prison system and the parole system ought to have that right, and that right ought to be enshrined in law. I sincerely hope that the Government gives every consideration to the Opposition's Bill and that Government members support it.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: HINDMARSH SOCCER STADIUM

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Oswald:

That the thirty-third report of the committee on the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium upgrade be noted.

(Continued from 24 October. Page 353.)

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I continue my contribution from where I finished two weeks ago. Of course, I shall not start from where I finished yesterday; otherwise, I would be walking backwards out of the Chamber. Mr Speaker, I can assure you that I will not allow you the pleasure of removing me this Question Time.

I refer to the important report into the redevelopment of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. It is a pity that the Chairman, the Acting Chairman and all members of the Public Works Committee, except the member for Elizabeth, are not present to hear this contribution—

Mr Meier interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Of course they are not physically present in the Chamber. I acknowledge to the member for Goyder that all members are here, but they are not all present to hear me in person. It is not a big deal; do not get too concerned about it.

The SPEAKER: Order! There will be no further interjections. I ask members not to encourage the member for Hart.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir. Little things bother little people. The Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium is something that the Opposition supports. However, the Opposition and the committee are concerned by the process involved. Last week I mentioned my concern about the member for Coles. I raised this issue during the Estimates Committees of the Parliament. My concern relates to the position in which the member for Coles has been put. I am pleased that the member for Mitchell has returned to the Chamber: this is obviously a topic of interest to him. I look forward to his contribution on this matter, because he made many public comments thereon.

The member for Coles has been asked by the Government to do a very difficult job. The honourable member has been put in a difficult position by the Government in having to be Chair of a body known as either the project executive or the executive committee—the terminology seems to change—which was put in place to oversee the soccer stadium redevelopment.

My concerns for the member for Coles are centred on whether or not she has put herself into a position where she may have, dare I say, a conflict of interest in terms of being an elected member of Parliament while performing a role that is normally fulfilled by the Public Service. With respect to the Public Service, issues of liability, Crown privilege and protection are taken care of and given to public servants. I was concerned whether the member for Coles could unnecessarily expose herself to risk simply because the Government has asked her to take on an important role in relation to which she feels duty bound.

I say this not wanting to criticise the project, because it is an important one. I will leave criticism of the project to the members for Mitchell and Morphett, who were extremely critical—and to the member for Davenport—in their report. I raised this issue with the Auditor-General because I wanted to make sure that the member for Coles is not put in any difficult position. During an Economic and Finance Committee meeting I asked the Auditor-General about the issues I have just raised and whether or not it is appropriate for an elected member of Parliament, who is not a member of the Executive Government, to be chairing a body overseeing a multi-million dollar capital works program. The Auditor-General said:

I think one needs to be a little bit cautious—

this is in reference to the role of the member for Coles—

I would have thought that a member of Parliament should not put themselves in any position which would fetter or handicap their ability to be able to scrutinise Executive Government.

That was a significant statement. The member for Peake was with me and heard what was said. The Auditor-General was simply saying that we are all elected to Parliament—whether we be Labor or Liberal—and, unless we are part of Executive Government, our role is to be able legitimately to scrutinise Executive Government. If you are an elected member of Parliament and are put into a role that in any way puts in doubt your ability to be objective and to scrutinise properly decisions of Government, you may be putting yourself in a position where there is some conflict with your role as a member of Parliament.

I am the last member of the House who would want to see the member for Coles in any way, shape or form put under any pressure in her role in this Parliament. I know many others who might like to see the member for Coles have some discomfort, but I do not. I will give a copy of this evidence to the member for Coles and allow her to reflect on the Auditor-General's words. I think it is a little unwise for a member of Parliament to be in that role; it is unfair and unfortunate on the member for Coles that the Minister and the Government have put her in that position and it is something that she and the Government should reflect on.

Mr Leggett interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The member for Hanson interjects.

Mr Leggett: I said, 'Don't point.'

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir. It is something the member for Hanson can long reflect on as he sits in retirement at home after the next election. Perhaps we can send him copies of *Hansard*.

Mr Leggett interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: No, you will be able to watch *Days of Our Lives*; you will be the one at home and I will be in here representing my electorate.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart will not allow himself to be sidetracked.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir. With the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium development we have to be careful that it is not just done right but is seen to be done right. As I said last time I spoke on this matter, the report is without precedent from a Government controlled parliamentary committee headed by the member for Morphett, whose deputy is the member for Mitchell. Other members include the members for Davenport and Ridley, and Labor is represented by the members for Elizabeth and Taylor. We had a Government dominated committee bringing down a report highly critical of the

Government's handling of the soccer stadium. The report was highly critical and questioned the role of the member for Coles. Its questions went almost to the probity of the issue. I was stunned to read that, because we need the stadium to be built quickly.

The soccer stadium is a good initiative of the Government: I have said that publicly. I applaud the Government for its decision, but let us not complicate the decision on the stadium by unnecessary mistakes. The Government needs to read and digest the report and learn from the criticisms of its own members. This is a Government controlled committee, albeit controlled I suspect by the dry faction and not the wet faction. There may well be some internal politics in question here, but far be it from me to comment on that. That would be something for a far more objective person to do from a distance, but heed your own criticisms.

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

Mr BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

MULTICULTURALISM

A petition signed by 138 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Federal Government to give a firm commitment to the principles of multiculturalism was presented by Mr Rossi.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Legal Practitioners Conduct Board—Report, 1995-96

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

Department for the Arts and Cultural Development—
Report, 1995-96

Department of Transport—Report, 1995-96

Libraries Board of South Australia—Report, 1995-96

Passenger Transport Board—Report, 1995-96

Ports Corporation South Australia—Report, 1995-96

South Australian Film Corporation—Report, 1995-96

TransAdelaide—Report, 1995-96

By the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources (Hon. D.C. Wotton)—

Department of Environment and Natural Resources—
Report, 1995-96

By the Minister for Emergency Services (Hon. W.A. Matthew)—

South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service—Report,
1995-96.

PORTS CORPORATION

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development): I table a ministerial statement made by the Minister for Transport in another place.

QUESTION TIME

TOURISM COMMISSION

Ms WHITE (Taylor): What response has the Minister for Tourism made to the South Australian Tourism Commission Board's strong criticism of the Minister's handling of the restructuring of the tourism portfolio and the sacking of the tourism CEO, Michael Gleeson?

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that she is asking a question, and that does not allow her to comment or debate. She is already commenting, and I do not want to have to speak to her again.

Ms WHITE: The Opposition has been given a copy of the minutes of a special board meeting of the South Australian Tourism Commission held on 31 October 1996. The minutes state:

The board expressed its strong disappointment with the Minister's handling of the portfolio restructure process and its concerns relating to the Chief Executive's departure.

The minutes further state:

Resolution: the board resolved that the Chairman convey these concerns to the Minister in the strongest possible terms.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: There has been no correspondence between me and the commission.

INTEREST RATES

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Will the Premier inform the House of the groups of South Australians which stand to gain by yesterday's interest rate reduction by the Reserve Bank, and whether that interest rate reduction has been flowed on by financial institutions operating in South Australia, and in what areas?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: There are three important groups in the community who will benefit from the drop in interest rates. The first is families with mortgage home loans. This will benefit them directly, because they can expect a .5 per cent drop in their interest payments. There are those people who would normally work in the building industry. This is likely to boost the number of houses built throughout Australia and especially here in South Australia, and those people will benefit as well from the drop in interest rates. The third group comprises the small business people; we equally expect the small business people and farmers to benefit from the drop in interest rates. I am concerned to see reports in the paper this morning that the banks will not drop credit card rates. Let me send a clear message, at least from the Government of South Australia, to the banks. We expect to see a .5 per cent drop in credit card rates here in South Australia as a result of this.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: At least a .5 per cent direct flow-on from the drop in the Reserve Bank rate. I believe that the banks are open to very severe criticism for their failure immediately to pass on a lower interest rate for credit card holders. As I said yesterday, I welcome the drop in interest rates. That will tend to boost the housing market, and that is particularly good news here in South Australia. We acknowledge the fact that the higher interest rates brought about by the Labor years have certainly damaged the position of the housing industry in South Australia. I also stress that these lower interest rates come on top of other Government initiatives to make sure that we create jobs in South Australia,

and I cannot go past looking at the unemployment figures that have come out today.

Unemployment in South Australia has dropped from 9.8 per cent to 9.4 per cent, at a time when national unemployment has gone up; the figures now show that Victoria, Queensland and Tasmania have worse unemployment than South Australia. Very importantly, youth unemployment in South Australia has dropped from 38.9 per cent to 32.8 per cent, a very significant drop indeed. It is interesting: if the figures were bad, the Leader of the Opposition would be on his feet asking a question about unemployment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The figures are good, and where is the Leader of the Opposition today?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn both the member for Mawson and the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: He should be highlighting the fact that unemployment in South Australia has dropped. We know that members opposite love to go out and knock if unemployment goes up, but they do not come out and highlight it when unemployment drops. I happened to hear on the radio this morning information about jobs being created in South Australia. For some reason, the Opposition does not want part-time jobs—even though they may be 33 or 34 hours a week—to be recognised as jobs at all. What is wrong with members opposite? The clear evidence is that about 25 000 extra jobs have been created in South Australia since this Liberal Government was elected. We have the proof today that unemployment has now dropped but, very importantly, youth unemployment has dropped as well, down to 32.8 per cent. Some interesting figures have also come out in terms of job creation and job retention.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We can look at some of the companies that are in the process of creating new jobs here in South Australia, such as Bankers Trust Management Funds, which is transferring its operation and setting up a national telephone facility here in South Australia, providing 400 jobs; Link Telecommunications to establish 400 jobs here; SAFCOL, where 35 jobs have been saved and a further 80 jobs are to be created; Australian Wool and Pelt, which is creating 35 jobs in South Australia; Caroma, establishing 30 jobs, to grow to 60 jobs over a five year period; Clyde Apac, with 21 jobs already created; First Chicago NBD Corporation, with 40 jobs saved here in South Australia; and Vision Systems, creating 150 jobs over a two year period. That is a number of examples of jobs now being established here in South Australia. I point out that the latest drop in unemployment reflects the September figures, when South Australia was the only State in Australia to record an increase in the number of job vacancies.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: There was an increase in the number of jobs advertised in South Australia. There are some encouraging employment figures for South Australia and we look forward to their continuing.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am pleased that the member for Giles has now finished. The member for Taylor.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: It may be involuntary if he keeps it up.

TOURISM COMMISSION

Ms WHITE (Taylor): My question is directed to the Minister for Tourism. What are the reasons for his lack of trust and faith in the board of the South Australian Tourism Commission? The minutes of a special board meeting of the South Australian Tourism Commission held on 31 October 1996, which have been given to the Opposition, state:

The negotiations relating to Michael Gleeson's departure were not referred to the full board for consideration, which the board views as an indication of the Minister's lack of trust and faith in the board.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I do not know where that message has come from as far as the Opposition is concerned. There was a special board meeting on, I think, 31 October to deal with the relationship of the Chief Executive. At the previous board meeting, which I think was on 15 October—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: If the honourable member would like to get the minutes, she would note that the Minister went along to that meeting and not only spelt out the reconstruction but also discussed with that board at that time the position in relation to Michael Gleeson. That position was an agreed decision regarding which he has asked that there be commercial confidentiality in relation to the terms of the agreement, and that was reported to the board meeting on 15 October by me as Minister. There is absolutely no doubt whatsoever as to what happened at that board meeting. I will get those minutes and make sure that they are made public so that everybody can see.

The SPEAKER: The member for Elder.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Peake. The member for Elder has the call.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION

Mr WADE (Elder): Will the Minister for Industrial Affairs advise the House of any progress that has been made in achieving the Government's target, which was announced in late 1994, of reducing Government workers' compensation claims and costs over the three year period to 30 June 1997?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I thank the honourable member for his question. One of the most important things we have been able to do in government is to recognise that occupational health and safety is a very important issue for all public servants. The recognition of that is clearly shown in the drop in workers' compensation claims. The majority of agents have made a significant improvement and, in assessing the improvement in claim numbers, the number recorded by the Government Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Office in 1995-96 was 3 978 compared with 6 061 claims recorded in 1993-94. This represents a 33 per cent reduction, meaning that the Government's target in this area has been achieved in just two years. Early indications are that a further reduction of at least 5 per cent has been achieved in 1996-97.

In relation to workers' compensation expenditure, there has been a reduction from \$52 million in 1993-94 to \$41 million in 1995-96—a reduction of 21 per cent in two years. If, as is expected, comparable reductions are achieved in 1996-97, the goal of a 30 per cent reduction will have been achieved well before the target time. Total expenditure will be the lowest since 1988 and 1989.

The most important issue in this whole area has been the implementation of a good occupational health and safety program within Government. That has been a significant result as far as the Government is concerned. As the Deputy Leader pointed out, the change of legislation has also had some effect, but the most important issue is that it is going down. It is recognised that improved occupational health and safety and changes to the Act have been very important in reducing costs to Government but, more importantly, in reducing the accident level of individuals within the public sector.

TOURISM COMMISSION

Ms WHITE (Taylor): My question is directed to the Minister for Tourism. Why has the South Australian Tourism Commission been denied access to the final report or a summary of the report of the \$160 000 consultancy by Mr Sam Ciccarello and his company regarding the restructure of the tourism and recreation and sport portfolios, and why will not the Minister release the report publicly? The minutes of the special board meeting of the South Australian Tourism Commission of 31 October state:

The South Australian Tourism Commission contributed \$75 000 to the consultancy but has been denied access to the consultant's final report or a summary.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: As the honourable member knows, last night after very lengthy questioning I advised the House that there has not been a final report and that the reason for that is that the consultants are still working with the Government on a whole range of issues related to the consultancy. I told the honourable member that last night in the House, and I cannot be any clearer than that. With regard to the report, the Tourism Commission—in particular, the Chief Executive (who is no longer there)—has not at any time requested to be briefed on the reconstruction, neither has the Chairman of the board requested any briefing for the board. However, I point out to the honourable member, as I did last night—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is called for the second time.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:—that a working party was set up three months ago to work on this reconstruction, and it just happens that the Chairman of the Tourism Commission is a member of that reconstruction committee. The committee is made up of Ian Cox, John Heard as Chairman of Major Events and John Lamb, who is the Chairman of the Tourism Commission. I have been informed on many occasions by the Chairman of the Tourism Commission that the tourism board has been briefed on every single occasion when reports have been made by this group to that board. So, whilst the minutes might reflect that—and I have not seen them—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:—I suggest to members opposite that that may be one of the reasons why the General Manager of the commission is not there. Perhaps the honourable member ought to ask the person concerned why they were written. That might be an interesting question to ask me once I have delved into this whole issue. One thing is absolutely certain: the Chairman of the board of the Tourism Commission has been a member of the reconstruc-

tion committee for the past three months, and that is the total length of time that the committee has been set up.

PATAWALONGA

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources inform the House of the status of the draft Patawalonga catchment management plan and say whether it is intended to acquire residential properties in the vicinity of the Sturt River for the purposes of developing a river park along Saratoga Drive, Novar Gardens? I am advised that local government councillor, Mr Reece Jennings, has caused deep concern by distributing to residents around Saratoga Drive in the West Torrens district selective extracts from the accompanying report to the draft Patawalonga catchment plan, which was released recently, suggesting that these homes will be demolished.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I thank the member for Morphett for his question, because it will give me the chance to clarify a number of issues that need clarification.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: From the outset, I want to stress that this is not the case: the State Government has no intention of allowing the acquisition of residential properties in the said area. I also find it deplorable that Councillor Jennings has taken out of context mooted suggestions contained in what is, after all, a draft plan's attachments. Even Councillor Jennings admits in his letter to residents that 'the scheme will never be carried out', so I do not know what he is trying to achieve with these scare tactics. The Patawalonga Catchment Board employed consultants BC Tonkin and Associates to prepare a draft—I repeat, draft—catchment plan for consideration by the public. I might add that a final report can be released only after I have given my approval to that report. This draft plan, referred to as the 'draft for consultation', is available for inspection at local council offices and the Catchment Management Board office, and it documents the works and measures the board is considering undertaking to clean up water quality and revive waterways in the Patawalonga catchment.

A series of technical reports, referred to as the 'accompanying report', and the appendices were also prepared by BC Tonkin and Associates on behalf of the board. These reports document all the options assessed by the consultants in preparing the draft plan. A number of these options were considered inappropriate by the board. The river park concept along Saratoga Drive (Camden Park concept, plan No. 1B) was not accepted to be part of the draft plan's priorities and future actions. As such, this plan did not include funding for the creation of a park along the drive that would require acquisition of residential properties. The draft plan has no official status and is open for public comment until 17 January 1997. A catchment as complex as the Patawalonga requires that a catchment water management plan be developed to achieve an important and diverse range of goals which can be summarised broadly as:

- water quality—to improve water quality over time by a combination of education, improved practices, installation of trash and silt traps—and that is proceeding—and reduction of pollution through years of development and land use controls;

- community expectations—by working with concerned groups and using general community consultation to establish the goals for the catchment held by the community; and
- stormwater as a resource—to adopt policies that will promote the reduction of runoff and increase the use of this valuable resource.

I hope that this puts to ease the concerns of the House and the community. I hope it prevents further irresponsible actions by people who I can only surmise are self-interested and self-motivated and who ignore the benefits to the community that can be achieved by catchment management boards such as the Patawalonga board. On the matter of the draft plan, I have also received representation from the members for Mitchell and Davenport who have also expressed concern about the lack of consultation on their part. It is my intention today to meet with the Chairman of the board to address that issue. I appreciate the member for Morphett's raising this question and enabling me to clarify the situation.

POLICE CAR ADVERTISING

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister for Police indicate whether the idea of placing sponsorships on police cars was a Government or police initiative and what, if any, constraints will be placed on the type of advertisement to appear, given perceptions of endorsement of such products and services?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I have been waiting for the question. I read with interest the contribution during the grievance debate last night about having 'Charlie's Chickens' on the back of police cars. The police have considered a number of initiatives regarding community involvement and greater communication with the community. One of the ideas—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER:—just hold on a second—that came forward was the Crime Stoppers program, and everybody would recognise what Crime Stoppers is doing. It has focused attention on the idea of people reporting crime, of people doing something about crime, rather than leaving it up to the police. Anyone who has seen the program and some of the advertisements on TV would recognise that it is a very constructive approach towards crime prevention in this State.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not know whether the Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows anything about baseball, but three strikes and he is out.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: As to what the Crime Stoppers program involves, there is a whole range of material on TV, radio and in other areas. As the member for Playford would recognise, that is a sponsored program, including rewards for information received. South Australian firms are committing to crime prevention through the Crime Stoppers program. The Police Commissioner told me that his department would like to emphasise that message, that it would like the same message to be translated into the community all the time, and that he would like to try an experiment. The Police Department has publicly released a program which for 12 weeks will see 10 cars on the road with Crime Stoppers as the major header, plus the telephone number, plus some sponsorship. I told him that, as long as the major message is Crime Stoppers and crime prevention, I do not have a difficulty with it. That is exactly what is happening.

At the end of the 12-week period, the positives and negatives of the program will be evaluated, including the

matter of whether the screens affect visibility, whether the advertising is appropriate and whether it is effective. Similar programs have been implemented in many other places overseas. It is a matter of saying, 'Let's see whether we get something better out of it.' If it focuses the community's attention on being a part of crime prevention, I am all for it, and I think that the Commissioner's idea is a very good one.

The honourable member may have some difficulty with the question of sponsorship, but I have a long list of sponsors associated with police operations. They include Neighbourhood Watch, and I do not think that anyone here has complained about sponsorship for Neighbourhood Watch; the Police Band; and the Blue Light activities of the Police Department, which have received sponsorship from a number of organisations including Living Health, Coca-Cola and the Variety Club. Other sponsors have been the Tuna Boat Owners Association with mobile radios and the RAA. So the list goes on.

The Police Department has a history of believing that, if organisations put some money into a program, they have an interest in that program. Some of South Australia's most important firms have said that they want to play their part in it. If they want to play their part, that is a very good initiative. At the end of the 12-week period, the whole issue will be evaluated.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Three or four members—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER:—and one extra member on my right are slow learners and do not want to take any notice of what the Chair has said. I call the member for Davenport.

ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION

Mr EVANS (Davenport): My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure. Is the Government discriminating against the electors of Davenport, in particular the Belair area, in the distribution of electricity? I was dismayed to be approached by electors who claim that, under this Government, their microwaves are slower than under the previous Government, their lights are dimmer than under the previous Government and their breakfast toast cooks more slowly than under the previous Government. Investigation reveals some truth in these allegations. For example, one constituent claims that his breakfast toaster took a minute under Labor but it now takes a minute and a half under this Government. I ask the Minister to explain.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I think the honourable member's constituent needs a new toaster. I thank the honourable member for the question which I understand follows a constituent's concern that his breakfast was taking a little longer than normal to cook. I was of the view that it should take as long to cook a piece of toast in the morning as it does in the evening. But that is not necessarily so. As any good bushman will tell you, while you can boil a billy in just a few minutes when at sea level, it is a much slower process when you rise well above sea level. There can be a delay in cooking toast too, because while the domestic supply voltage is nominally 240 volts—and do not worry, Frank, we will keep up the voltage in Whyalla for you—it varies minute by minute as loads are added to or switched off. If a lot of hot water services are on the early morning heating cycle, the net effect is that voltage levels can drop marginally. This may cause the dimming lights or slower microwaves to which the

honourable member refers or slower hair dryers—although that would not worry me too much.

ETSA has investigated the honourable member's problem and the situation at Belair. It found that the problem was caused by too many hot water services remaining on automatic cycle until 8 a.m. I know that we have reduced the cost of off-peak hot water services by 15 per cent in the past year, but this is taking it to the extreme. I also understand that under ETSA's modern remote technology it can send signals down the line to a customer's address and change the heating cycle to an earlier part of the day. To rectify the member for Davenport's problem, that has already been done. As a result, normal breakfast moods ought to be re-established. I hope in reporting this matter that it does not spark a lot of concern among constituents. If there should be any concern in the wider community, I invite people to contact ETSA's advisory service on 131377, and they will have their matters—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: You closed it down.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am glad that the Leader interjects because, with the productivity and efficiency gains in the telephone room at ETSA, over 90 per cent of phone calls from customers are answered within 30 seconds. That is not bad. Under the previous Government it was about five minutes: it is now about 30 seconds. This is an example of the productivity and efficiency gains we are getting in place with ETSA. I assure the honourable member that he does not have to buy a new toaster for his constituent. There is no difference in the voltage; it is simply the drain on the end. ETSA, like a good corporate citizen in South Australia, has fixed the honourable member's problem.

PLAYFORD HOTEL

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Why did the Premier fail to inform the House and the public that the State Government will provide \$750 000 of taxpayers' funds as subsidies for the developer of the hotel to be built on the old North Terrace News site? The Opposition has obtained leaked Tourism Commission documents confirming that Cabinet approved a financial incentive package worth \$750 000 on 12 August this year.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The reason that I am answering the honourable member's question is that, as Minister for Tourism, I submitted that matter as a tourism proposal, and it has nothing to do with the EDS proposal. It is purely and simply a proposal for a hotel, and it is a supporting infrastructure grant, which the previous Government did on many occasions. It is a totally different project owned by totally different people. There is no connection in anyway whatsoever. There is no connection. As far as I am aware, there is no connection. As far as I am aware, the proposal is supported by a group of people from, I think, Malaysia, and Mr Bill Sparr put the proposal to develop a hotel to the Tourism Commission.

As far as I am aware, there is absolutely no connection in ownership whatsoever. That is my position. The Tourism Commission, playing its part to redevelop our city and State, has an infrastructure position of encouraging people to build new hotels and developments in this State. This subsidy is no different to any infrastructure subsidy put up by the previous Government. It is an encouragement to people to build and put together hotels and proposals for this State. It is absolutely no different to the \$2.5 million infrastructure support the former Minister for Tourism under the previous Government

gave to the Kinsman development in the Barossa Valley. In principle, this subsidy is exactly the same.

It is no different to the \$750 000 this Government gave to develop the McLaren Vale Visitor Centre. It is an encouragement for the private sector and the Government to work together to get up developments in this State. I remind the honourable member opposite that the previous Minister, who is now the Leader of the Opposition, supported and recommended to his Government—and had it endorsed—that a \$2.5 million up-front payment be made to the Kinsman group in the Barossa Valley.

FEMALE CAREER OPPORTUNITIES

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education inform the House of the latest information in regard to the number of young women opting for a non-traditional career? New figures out yesterday show a continuing imbalance in the number of young women studying for a trade in South Australia.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I thank the member for Kaurna for her very important question. The answer, sadly, is rather perplexing. I have previously raised this matter in the House, but the latest statistics show that we still have a long way to go, despite spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on school visitation programs, using female tradespeople as role models, and encouraging employers to take on young women. The latest figures to October show that, of 794 motor mechanic trainees or apprentices, 12 were female; carpenters and joiners, 204 males and 4 females; and metal fitting and machining, 636 males and 11 females.

If we look at trainees overall, the total for females in the State is 23.3 per cent, but if we take out clerical and hair-dressing careers, females make up only 11.05 per cent of the total traineeship/apprenticeship statistics. This is just unacceptable, and the message we must get across to parents and to young women is that they are doing themselves out of employment opportunities in the trades areas. Young women need to realise that the non-traditional areas are open to them for employment. Sadly, we find that, at careers nights, parents still drag their daughters away from the non-traditional areas and say, 'This is not for you; you should be doing hair-dressing', or something else.

There is nothing wrong with hairdressing as a career, but young women need to consider other areas, particularly electronics and some of the other growth areas. I have asked my people to urgently reconsider our current approach, because it is clearly not delivering the outcomes, and that is no reflection on the people involved in the program 'Tradeswomen on the Move'. However, following the recently developed national strategy, we will look at how we can try to improve the participation rate of young women in the non-traditional areas. That may involve offering scholarships and other strategies rather than relying on advertising and promotional-type campaigns. The situation is unsatisfactory. Parents and young women need to get the message that they are doing themselves out of a job.

GOVERNMENT OFFICE SPACE

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Why did the Minister for State Government Services tell this House on 23 October that less than 3 per cent of the city's office space owned or leased by the South Australian Government was unoccupied, when

Cabinet had previously been informed that the true figure was much higher? On 23 October, in response to a question I asked on the levels of unoccupied South Australian Government office space in the Adelaide CBD, the Minister told the House:

The South Australian Government's commercial properties portfolio. . . has an uncommitted vacancy rate of 2.85 per cent.

The Opposition has been leaked Cabinet documents that were part of the Government's consideration of the North Terrace development which state:

Adelaide has a substantial oversupply of office space at present . . . with the State itself holding over 30 000 square metres of vacant office space in its own portfolio.

That is seven times greater than the figure given to the House by the Minister.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is comment, and I do not want any repetition.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: If the honourable member reads the answer I gave to the question very carefully, and compares it with the other information he claims to have, he will see that my answer is entirely inconsistent.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Consistent, not inconsistent.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Yes, it is entirely consistent. The answer I gave in this House accurately reflects the number of uncommitted vacancies within the Government's commercial properties portfolio. It very accurately reflects the uncommitted vacancies within the office portfolio.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: If the honourable member wants to talk in more detail, I am happy to do that. The honourable member would be well aware, for example, that the Government has recently called for tenders for the redevelopment of the Old Treasury Building. The Old Treasury Building is not included in the figure I gave the House, and the reason is very simple: it is not the Government's intention to use the Old Treasury Building on an ongoing basis for office accommodation. It is empty because it is on-call for tender—now in the final stages of negotiation—for conversion to a boutique hotel. That is one building that was not included.

If the honourable member wants to stand up in the House and knock that development too, as he sits in this House knocking every other development that occurs in this State, let him do so. I was at the function when the Premier announced the EDS development. As the Premier made that announcement, I had the advantage of sitting in that room and looking squarely at the reaction of the member for Hart. That function was attended by 1 200 South Australians, who had endured a Labor Government that did nothing for this State other than destroy its finances. When the 1 200 South Australians at that function responded to the Premier's announcement with joy that at last there will be a development in the city, the member for Hart's chin hit the table.

He was the only depressed person in that entire room. You would have thought that he had been handed the worst news of his life. I would have thought that all South Australians, as were the 1 200 or so people in that room—with the exception of the member for Hart—would be pretty happy about that. The Old Treasury Building and the Torrens Building were not included. The Torrens Building is also currently a capital works project, which is to be tenanted. I stand by the figures I gave to the House, because they

represent the useable vacant office accommodation owned by Government.

TELEMEDICINE

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Health inform the House whether the Government sees value in telemedicine for providing services to remote communities?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Flinders for her very important question about a matter which will enable this Government to address the well-known tyranny of distance in the provision of appropriate health care services to South Australian, Australian and international remote communities. Telemedicine provides valuable opportunities in this area, and the benefits of the technology enable access to expert care to remote communities. The boundaries of what can and cannot be effectively managed via the use of information technology are continually being pushed back, and I am sure that exciting new potentials will be identified as the clever boffins of science work hard and diligently in the background. It is quite stunning to think of what can now be performed safely under remote supervision, and I am sure it will be even more a source of wonderment in future.

In December 1995 the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory, Shane Stone, and the Premier announced a collaboration between the two Governments. We have since had a teleoncology service provided between the Royal Darwin and Royal Adelaide Hospitals and there is an agreement between the Flinders Medical Centre and the Northern Territory University on the training of medical staff.

In particular, this morning I was at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to recognise another major telemedicine project supporting communities in the centre of Australia. In late 1995 the QEH was approached by the Tanami network to provide telemedicine services in the Tanami Desert. Since April the QEH has been linking regularly with Yuendumu, which is 300 kilometres north-west of Alice Springs, providing services in areas such as diabetes, substance abuse and renal health management. The AAP Communications Technology Company, which now has a major carrier contract for the management of carrier services with the Government, offered to provide its satellite free of charge and the Tanami network agreed to provide free transmission for trial purposes.

During the links, the staff discussed matters with the health workers and elders of the Aboriginal communities in areas which are incredibly remote, and both bodies evaluated the services to see whether the communication methodology utilised can improve services. It is an important part of the future of health care in Australia. We are recognised around the world as being particularly good providers of distance medical facilities, which provide not only advantages for remote communities in health care but also advantages for every South Australian, as this is, frankly, a burgeoning industry and we are right at the forefront of it. That is obviously good news for job creation in South Australia.

EDS (AUSTRALIA) PTY LTD

Mr FOLEY (Hart): When was the Premier first advised of the proposal for the Government to be involved in the redevelopment of the old News site on North Terrace, and can he confirm that he and his parliamentary secretary on information technology, the Hon. Robert Lawson QC,

discussed this issue with Provision Supplies Corporation during a visit to Singapore in June 1996?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I think the honourable member has his buildings mixed up.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Provision Supplies is the company that is the developer of the hotel site. He is talking about the EDS site.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier does not need any assistance.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: There are two quite different buildings. Provision Supplies is the company that is involved in the development of the tourism hotel on the east side of the laneway on North Terrace and, yes, I met the company in Singapore when I was there in June or July. I am delighted to say—

Mr Foley: It is the registered owner of both sites.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It was, but it is not. I invite the member for Hart just to listen, because what had occurred was that a company in Perth had both sites. That company is no longer involved in either site—point one. Secondly, Provision Supplies has become the proposed developer for the site east of the laneway.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No, it did not buy both lots: it took out an option on both lots. In fact, what happened was that Provision Supplies decided to go ahead as the developer of the eastern site for the international hotel and a quite separate group took out the purchase of the site on the western side for the EDS building. If only the member for Hart knew what had gone on at the Lands Titles Office, because I will produce some evidence that will embarrass him, given the sorts of assumptions he jumps to. He jumped to assumptions yesterday and was wrong on all three counts: he has jumped to the same assumption today and again ended up wrong. A letter I received from Hansen Yuncken today states:

Dear Premier: As a result of recent media coverage of the EDS North Terrace project, we wish to clarify the various issues raised and the position of Hansen Yuncken. Hansen Yuncken initiated discussions with EDS approximately six months ago to locate EDS on North Terrace. These discussions were direct with EDS and involved negotiation with other parties in order to secure the site. Later in these negotiations the Government was informed of the proposal and then acted as a facilitator to secure the transaction. Hansen Yuncken took the lead role of developer in putting together a highly competitive and innovative package to attract EDS to the site. The company has used local consultants to maximise local content which demonstrates its faith in the local industry.

I ask the member for Hart to listen to the following:

As at 14 October 1996, Hansen Yuncken had not secured the land and, as such, it could not confirm its offer to EDS until this was effected. The land was settled at approximately 5 p.m. on Friday 18 October 1996, which enabled the transaction to be announced. The documents were then lodged with the Lands Titles Office on Monday 21 October 1996. I hope the above assists in the clarification of the situation. Yours faithfully, P.H. Kennedy, Chief Executive, Hansen Yuncken.

That shows quite clearly that Hansen Yuncken is the developer of the site west of the laneway—the other side of the laneway and west, for the honourable member. The one on the east side happens to be Provision Supplies of Singapore and, yes, Robert Lawson and I met with that

company in Singapore and talked about the hotel development. People ask about the value of travelling overseas; there is the proof that we are able to attract investment money from Singapore to put up this international hotel.

I stress the fact that Adelaide has not seen an international hotel such as that go up for at least eight to 10 years. Again, the member for Hart is jumping to conclusions, does not know the facts and is standing up trying to exhibit himself in front of the media, trying to make a big name for himself when he clearly has the facts wrong. I can see the embarrassment on the faces of his Opposition compatriots. I can see that they are saying to themselves that once again he has jumped to conclusions which clearly are not right. So, before the member for Hart makes a fool of himself again, I invite him to come over and ask the questions, and I will be happy to answer them.

PRISONER BRACELETS

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Gordon): My question is directed to the Minister for Correctional Services. It was reported a couple of days ago that the Government was looking at the use of electronic bracelets for prisoners working in gangs on the outside of perimeter fences in State prisons. Will the Minister advise the House of the reason for and the rationale behind that decision, if it is true?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I thank the member for Gordon for his question and interest in this matter. One of the latest measures I have requested the Department for Correctional Services to investigate is the use of electronic monitoring devices in the form of a bracelet or anklet to be fitted to those low security prisoners who from time to time undertake work outside the perimeter fence. Work is undertaken by low security prisoners outside the prison fences on a regular basis at Port Lincoln, at the Mount Gambier prison in the District of Gordon, and at Cadell and Mobilong prisons.

Some of the work undertaken by prisoners outside the fence is productive work for the community. Examples of the types of projects undertaken by prisoner work gangs under this Government include the construction of a boardwalk and general rubbish removal by Port Lincoln prisoners in the Port Lincoln National Park area. I acknowledge the support of the member for Flinders in that project. The restoration of the Pitchi Ritchi railway line has been undertaken by prisoners from Port Augusta Prison and I acknowledge your support and involvement with that project, Mr Speaker. The restoration and upgrade work to the local community hall, church hall and Cadell institute hall has been undertaken by inmates at Cadell. You, Sir, and the members for Custance and Chaffey have all been very supportive of that project.

As well as the obvious benefits to the community from these sorts of projects, prisoners also work on the farms at Cadell, Port Lincoln and Mount Gambier and in so doing are able to undertake action that generates farm produce, and that further reduces the cost of incarceration. More recently they have also been involved in landcare program work at Port MacDonnell in the District of Gordon, and I acknowledge the support of the honourable member for Gordon and advocacy for that program.

So, there are benefits in this sort of work and prisoners learn a work ethic, a trade or a skill. Obviously, if prisoners do work on the outside of the prison fence, there is an increased risk that there may be an escape. Escapes are something of which the previous Labor Government did not have a proud record, and I will shortly table in this House the

1995-96 annual report for the Department for Correctional Services. I am quite confident that that report will show a drastic reduction in the number of escapes from our prisons, in fact by about 50 per cent over the past year. The escapes that are occurring generally involve low security inmates working outside the fence. By attaching bracelets to prisoners to monitor their movement outside the fence, we will be able to track where those prisoners are, and we will have a chance of reducing that problem.

The electronic bracelets I have asked the department to examine are, in appearance, very similar to those presently used for home detention. However, there are a couple of significant differences. The home detention bracelets require attachment to a separate monitor to be able to determine where the prisoner is. If there is an attempt to tamper with or remove the device being considered, they activate an alarm, thereby allowing immediate response by staff to intercept that prisoner. They also enable the officers to track the location of those prisoners. In the rare event that they are silly enough to try to walk away from their work, they will be easily detected as so doing.

A number of significant work programs have been invoked by this Government. This Government is one that puts prisoners to work: this Government is not one that is prepared, as was the previous Labor Government, to have prisoners sitting in cells doing nothing all day when they can put work back into the community. I look forward to advising the House of the developments in this issue.

EDS (AUSTRALIA) PTY LTD

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Given the Premier's answer to my previous question, why did he tell this House that the hotel development was quite separate and had nothing to do with the EDS office building next door when he has been advised in Cabinet that the hotel would be built only if the EDS building was built next door? Further leaked Cabinet documents that the Opposition has obtained state:

The Provision Supplies Corporation of Singapore has already secured a site adjacent to the proposed IT precinct and has been offered assistance by the SA Tourism Commission for the building of an all suites hotel. This has been in doubt, but PSC has now stated that it will develop the [hotel] project immediately if the IT precinct proceeds.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The member for Hart at long last seems to have appreciated the fact that this Government has brought in a group of Singaporean investors to build a hotel and brought in quite separate investors through Hansen Yunken to build another building for an IT precinct. They are quite separate operations. I think Hansen Yunken happens to be the builder on the other site, but the owners of the projects are quite separate.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Too right. Here is almost \$100 million worth of new development on North Terrace—an area which under the Labor Government ended up with boarded up windows—the main thoroughfare through Adelaide—the North Terrace boulevard. Old, disused buildings were vacant under the Labor Government and about to be demolished: \$100 million worth of new development is to be put on them. I would have thought that that was a pretty good deal that this Government has done.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: As the Minister for Services SA has pointed out, we all know the expression on the face of the member for Hart when the announcement was made. We know that all he is interested in is being out there and knocking, knocking, knocking.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Tapping on the front bench is out of order.

Mr Clarke: What if he taps his head?

The SPEAKER: Order! The House has been in reasonable humour. I suggest to the Deputy Leader that he has had more than a fair go. I do not know whether he wants to get himself on television tonight, but he may.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We know that the member for Hart likes to get himself on television, even if his facts are wrong. I have further information for the member for Hart. He may be somewhat interested as it is a letter from EDS addressed to me today. It states:

Dear Premier—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Just listen to this.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It states:

I am pleased to confirm some of the salient points relating to the construction of the EDS Asia Pacific Resource Centre at North Terrace.

1. During the selection process EDS negotiated with a number of developers in Adelaide and considered a number of options.

2. At all times EDS has taken the lead role in negotiations and discussions.

3. EDS has not sought, or been offered, any subsidy for rental, outgoings or fitout in relation to the premises.

4. The role of the SA Government has principally been that of a facilitator to give substance to the vision of the IT precinct.

5. The leases will be back to back leases between the SA Government and EDS and—

listen to this—

will completely cover the Government's outgoings on the space that EDS occupies.

6. EDS expects to bear the full cost—

I stress that—

of any fitout of the space it is occupying.

7. EDS has approached a number of companies in the IT industry seeking expressions of interest in occupying space in the building. So far a number of companies have expressed in-principle agreement. We plan to continue these approaches with other companies. In addition, I am sure you will be delighted to know that the successful construction consortium is comprised principally of South Australian companies.

I hope these points clarify the current status of our plan to establish the EDS Asia Pacific Resource Centre.

Yours sincerely,

Mike Butcher

Managing Director, EDS Australia Pty Ltd.

That is the fax.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: There is no subsidy by the State Government. The full costs, including the fit-out costs, will be covered by EDS. There it is in black and white for the honourable member to see. Now let him try to deny those facts.

Mr Foley interjecting:

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: There are the facts. Once again the member for Hart is acutely embarrassed, and his colleagues sit there embarrassed because time after time he

creates a spectacle of himself and does not come up with any genuine facts whatsoever.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition for the second time.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The member for Hart is clearly wrong in all the allegations that he made yesterday and today.

REVEGETATION STRATEGY

Mr VENNING (Custance): My question is directed to the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. What plans does the State Government have to implement a State revegetation strategy? Surveys have shown that revegetation is a major tool to help tackle issues of major environmental concern such as land degradation and loss of habitat. What plans does the State Government have in this regard?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I find the honourable member's question interesting.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Well, to be quite frank, I am very pleased that a farmer has asked this question, because farmers are more interested in this matter than anyone else. I am particularly interested in this question because I had the opportunity recently to look at a policy document which the State Labor Party brought down and which it would implement if it were in Government. It says that one of the first things it would do would be to bring down a State revegetation strategy. I do not know where members opposite have been but the fact is that for some time we have had in place in this State a revegetation strategy, and it is working well. As a matter of fact, we are getting very close to beating last year's milestone of planting about 10.6 million trees. This is the first time that more trees have been planted than cleared—and that is quite a feat.

This document also states that a State Labor Government would allow representation of the Conservation Council on the Native Vegetation Council. Where has the Opposition been? We have had a representative of the Conservation Council on the—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is warned for the second time.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:—Native Vegetation Council for some time. In fact, it is the former Government's legislation that allowed that to happen. Further, this document goes on to say that a Labor Government would ban the use of bird repellent gel. We have done that—we put that in place some time ago. Not to be outdone, the Party says—

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Exactly! They would not know how to listen. Not to be outdone, the Party would also ban the use of steel jaw traps. We have done that. The thing that really disturbs me about this statement is the number of lines which the Labor Party has given to dealing with the Murray River: 2½ lines in a whole statement on what is the most important environmental issue in this State and this country. If only we had some of that \$3 billion that was lost to this State because of the Labor Party's mismanagement—what we could do to clean up the Murray River! I invite my colleagues on this side of the House to look at this statement, because I suggest that half the initiatives it contains have already been carried out by the Liberal Government and the

other half will be close to being implemented before we go to the next election. This is a remarkable document.

WORKCOVER

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): What action will the Minister for Industrial Affairs take against a WorkCover employee who divulged the name of a WorkCover client to an outside party? As late as last Friday, a WorkCover officer gave the name of a WorkCover client to a party who was making inquiries regarding a particular case that had been discussed in general terms on a radio station. When first contacted by this party I refused to give the name. I then received a subsequent call in which the name of the WorkCover client was stated. When I asked this person how he knew the name I was told, 'From a WorkCover officer'.

Mr Brindal: And you believed him?

Mrs GERAGHTY: Yes, because it was confirmed twice.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: If the honourable member is prepared to see me afterwards and give me the details, I will investigate the matter for her.

HEALTH, CHILD AND YOUTH

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Will the Minister for Health confirm that as a result of a cut of \$500 000 to the budget of child and youth health the Magarey Research Institute and the Vivienne Laidlaw Library will close?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I will provide a more detailed briefing, but what I can say—and I say this with real passion because I used to work in child and youth health—is that I have been advised that there is a possibility of the library and those facilities merging with the Women's and Children's Hospital rather than closing. If that is the case—and I reiterate that I will provide a further briefing—as it is a children's based library, if it is located at a hospital which has an international reputation as a women's and children's hospital, that seems to be an appropriate facility.

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education inform the House of developments in training for small business in South Australia?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I thank the member for Lee for his question, because he is not only a well-known member of this House but also a successful small business person. Next week I will provide details of a new Flexible Small Business Traineeship. This is a new development for South Australia whereby very small businesses, usually of five employees or fewer, will be able to take on board a person, usually a young person, as a trainee. A lot of work has gone into this traineeship. In its first year we expect to have between 500 and 1 000 trainees. It is strongly supported by both the Commonwealth and the South Australian Governments.

Young people will receive training in-house, but where appropriate they can also access training from TAFE or private providers. The idea is to ensure that this important section of the economy can be accessed by young people who want to be part of that industry. They will get meaningful training as part of that important area. Small business is the largest employing group in the community, so it is important that this sector of the community has access to a properly provided and structured traineeship scheme. Next week, the whole community, particularly the business community, will

be aware of the details of this new Flexible Small Business Traineeship.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr WADE (Elder): Many years ago when I was a councillor on the Happy Valley Council a small group of people decided that they did not want to have any Housing Trust residents in the area. They made every effort they could to remove Housing Trust people from the Happy Valley area. As a councillor, I fought those people and I won. I went to public meetings, I addressed the council, and I did everything in my power to ensure that all the people in Happy Valley could live in safety and friendship with each other. Even though that was a State and Housing Trust matter, I as local councillor took a great deal of interest in it.

Recently, when the Bridgestone episode occurred in my area and when the information of this chemical leak was reported to the EPA, nearly 2½ years after it was first discovered by Bridgestone, the community was naturally outraged and worried. The morning after the night I was told about the leak—and that was in October this year—I met with the Minister, Bridgestone consultants and the EPA to make sure that my people of Elder were not in danger. I am confident now—and was confident then in discussions with them—that the spillage spread is under control and the purity of our underground water supplies is not being threatened. It came as a surprise when I read in the local *Guardian Messenger* on 6 November 1996 a letter written by a Marion councillor named Bruce Hull, who said:

With reference to the pollution article titled, 'Wade irate over toxic waste leak', printed in the *Guardian Messenger* on 23 October, all I can say is 'What a sideshow.'

In his letter, it would appear that Councillor Hull regards the serious chemical leak at Bridgestone as a sideshow. Perhaps the councillor should have attended the meeting with Bridgestone, the residents and me last week. He should have attended the public meeting on Tuesday 5 November. Where was this concerned councillor? If he had attended the meetings, he would have learnt that the residents do not regard the leak of thousands of litres of methylethylketone and toluene into the environment as a sideshow. Where was he? Had he been there, he would have learnt of all the measures that have been taken to ensure that it never happens again.

If the concerned Councillor Bruce Hull had bothered to approach me, he would have been told of my 1994 initiatives that led the EPA to my area where it is now controlling other industrial pollution. The problem is that the councillor never approached me. He decided that he did not want to talk to me; he did not even contact me. Had he done so, he would have been pleased to know the actions I have taken to protect my people, both now and in the future. If Councillor Hull had attended the public meetings, or spoken with the residents or to me he would have had the knowledge to assist him in representing these residents' concerns. Is that not what councillors are supposed to do? Not this councillor. Perhaps he is too busy playing politics, as the Secretary of the local

Labor Party branch—talking of which, where was the concerned Labor candidate?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WADE: Pat Conlon was invited to attend the Bridgestone meeting but he did not go because he was too busy. Pat Conlon failed to show up at the public meeting held for all the residents. Pat Conlon has failed to show his commitment to the people of Elder. I ask the member for Hart and emphasise to this House that at a time of need, when the people need their representatives, where are they? I was there, but the Labor candidate and the councillor were not there. They are a disgrace.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Won't we miss the member for Elder in the next Parliament! We really will.

The SPEAKER: Order! We will miss the member for Hart if he does not continue to address the Chair.

Mr FOLEY: Through you, Sir, won't we really miss the member for Elder in the next Parliament? I can assure the member for Elder that the Labor candidate Patrick Conlon will be the next member for Elder.

I am glad the Premier is still in the House, because I would like to briefly touch on a saga that will go on for quite some time, that is, the issue of the EDS North Terrace development. The Premier has been trying to paint an impression that, of all the commercial opportunities available to EDS, the North Terrace site was the best site—the North Terrace site jumped out at EDS and said, 'This is where you should locate your office.' Quite wrong! This is something the Premier has been working on since at least mid-year. The Premier admitted in the House today that he had met with Singaporean investors mid-year.

I welcome Singaporean investment in this State. I do not have a problem with that. I am rallying against the use of taxpayers' money and the real financial risk the Premier is taking in trying to broker a deal that puts together a hotel with an 11-storey, Government subsidised office building. At a time when CBD rates of unoccupied space are running at 18 per cent and when there is in excess of 30 000 square metres of Government owned office space, this Premier goes out and supports the development of an 11-storey building that has received a minimum of \$2.2 million worth of taxpayers' subsidies. He keeps telling—

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Exactly! You would have thought that with the Remm mistake and the ASER mistake—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn both members for the second time today. They might both go for a holiday together.

Mr FOLEY: On a point of order, Sir, what am I being warned for?

The SPEAKER: Interjecting.

Mr FOLEY: I am giving a contribution.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member wishes to proceed, he should do so. He should not argue with or answer back the Chair.

Mr FOLEY: I can hardly—

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest the honourable member get on with his speech or he will find out what Standing Orders can do.

Mr FOLEY: Mr Speaker, through you, Sir, I will continue my grievance, as I have been doing for two minutes. A development had failed, and we should have learnt from that. However, we have a Premier who wants to build a monument to his name on North Terrace—an 11-storey

building that is taxpayer subsidised. The Premier claims this great back-to-back EDS contract: it is for half the building for half the time. The balance of the building is yet to be let. If the EDS contract is not renewed, there is still another seven or eight years of the contract to run for the lease of the building, and there is no tenant if the EDS contract is not renewed; and, of course, that will be decided later. The issue is this: why is he prepared to put at risk something between nil and \$32 million? That is the statement from the Cabinet submission. That is saying that, if the Government is unable to bring in tenants to whom it can sublease that building, the taxpayer will end up footing the bill.

The Cabinet submission also states that EDS will be needed to pressure other IT companies to take up occupancy. The Cabinet submission says that, if at the end of the day we cannot get any tenants, we can put in the Department of Information Industries. It also says that that would be a disadvantage for that department and supplementation would have to be made from elsewhere within the budget to make up that shortfall. That is another example of the potential financial risk at which this Government has put the State. For the Premier to say on 15 October that he had no knowledge of negotiations between EDS and Hansen Yuncken was absolutely wrong and untrue, because the day before he signed a letter, which stated:

The Government agrees to take a 15-year lease.

He knew when he was in this Parliament. He failed to give us the full truth; he failed to tell us exactly what the Government was doing. I stand here today to make this pledge: for the weeks and months ahead, I will get to the bottom of this deal. It is not the fault of EDS: that organisation is an innocent party. It is a Premier who is re-creating some of the terrible mistakes of the mid-1980s—Governments getting into property development when even their own Cabinet advice is sounding alarm bells. This Premier goes building on, because he wants a monument on North Terrace.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): Presently on the statute books there is one stupid piece of legislation that requires people who live in the Mallee to pay a levy to a dog fence board. They already pay a levy through their council rates to a local dog fence board, and it distresses me that they have now been sent summonses. Some of them will go to prison because they cannot afford to pay and have no inclination to do so. I cite the instance of Mr Walker of Lameroo, who has been summonsed for \$225, yet he is on a senior's card. His land is locked up in native vegetation.

The land is over 2 500 acres, that is, over 1 000 hectares, which is the threshold level at which there is a tax on the dirt to pay for the fence, yet he is on a seniors card. The land is only valued at about \$100 000 simply because it is covered in native vegetation. It distresses me to have to bring this matter to the attention of the House.

I turn now to another matter of grave concern to me, and that is the ALP's current silence and disturbing hypocrisy on the question of the Hindmarsh Island bridge. Certain people should apologise to me and to this Chamber for the way in which they have conducted themselves over the three years—

Mr Brokenshire: The Leader of the Opposition would have to be one of them.

Mr LEWIS: Clearly, and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who attacked me and did not attempt to establish the veracity of the remarks that he made to the Chamber at

that time. Sandra Saunders of the Aboriginal Legal Rights Commission should do so also.

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Is it in order for a member of this House to wear a campaign button of a foreign power? I appreciate that the member for Ridley supports a failed political Party, but is it in order to openly—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. That is frivolous nonsense, and the Deputy Leader should know better.

Mr LEWIS: That is typical, Mr Speaker. I would be pleased to draw the honourable member's attention to the contribution that he made at the time that I read a letter from Nana Laura Kartinyeri into the record of the House. Subsequent events have proved that what I drew to the attention of the House had veracity; what he said had no veracity. Members opposite are steeped in political correctness and what I call political opportunism. Political correctness is a disease. To my mind, a better way of describing it would be to refer to it as toadying terminology, word waffle or Gestapo grammar. They use such crazy terms as 'persons'. Why do they not simply say 'people'? I do not know what is wrong with the terms 'woman' or 'man', but I will not be distracted on that point. I am simply saying that I am fed up with word jerks and thought police.

Hindmarsh Island and the bridge to it across the Murray River at Goolwa is a big problem for the ALP. The other night I had the good fortune—or, more aptly described, misfortune—of hearing Mr Melham, who is the shadow Minister for Aboriginal affairs in the House of Representatives, and then the Hon. Ian McLachlan. The ALP has to decide whether to denounce the royal commissioner and call the royal commissioner a liar, and people such as Justice Sam Jacobs, or repudiate Robert Tickner, because it cannot have it both ways. The two are in conflict and in contradiction. It is about time we got some sensible answers from the ALP about that matter.

Yesterday I had the good fortune to be in Canberra for the launch of a book by Chris Kenny, who has thoroughly researched this matter, not at my instigation or anyone else's, but because he wanted to document the truth and where his inquiry for truth led him through this maze. If it were not so serious and real, it would be funny and it would make a good plot for a Hollywood movie. Nonetheless it has happened, and now is the time for us to try to sort it out. I acknowledge the guts that those 13 Ngarrindjeri women, who stood up and told the truth, had in doing so. The two Mrs Wilsons, Dorothy and Dulcie, and Jenny Grace, who took the trouble to accompany them, travelled to Canberra for the launch of that book and to be present with Chris and his family to answer questions from journalists.

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

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): It was good news today when the unemployment figures came out, particularly with respect to youth unemployment, because there was a reduction of 6.1 per cent in youth unemployment and a general reduction in South Australia of .4 per cent. If there had not been an increase in the participation rate in South Australia in the past month of .3 per cent, there would have been a further .3 per cent reduction in unemployment. As has been said in this Chamber for a long time, that means that real jobs are being created—in fact, 24 000-plus jobs have been created in just the past three years.

That is a far cry from the 33 600 manufacturing jobs alone lost by Labor in 11 years under the ministership of the now Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mike Rann). The increase in the participation rate means that more confidence is coming back into this State. However, as all members of the House know, we cannot take one month's figures in isolation. Nevertheless, the clear fact is that, against a rise in unemployment nationally, both youth unemployment and general unemployment, South Australia had a reduction.

I do not expect that the front page of tomorrow's *Advertiser* will run a story about it, and I do not expect to hear on the radio waves tonight that there has been a reduction in unemployment against an increase in the national trend in Australia. As has already been highlighted today, it is interesting that we did not hear the Leader of the Opposition, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition or one or two others on the other side, who are always negative and carping in this Chamber, espouse the fact that jobs are being created, despite the fact that the Opposition makes every effort to pull jobs and confidence apart, to work against programs and to see negativism in this State.

It seems that it is more important to the Leader of the Opposition and the South Australian branch of the Labor Party that they try to get back into Government. They are desperate to get back into Government, but they still have not apologised to South Australians. I invite and encourage all South Australians to look at the Labor Party's 200 pages of fairly useless policy. As the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources pointed out, most of it has been reinvented from the past couple of elections. After sitting here for three years, I have come to realise that members opposite, particularly a senior Minister at the time of the debacle and now the Leader of the Opposition, have not learnt a thing, but they are desperate to get back into power because, at all costs, all they want is power. They do not care about South Australia. If they can pull everyone down to the lowest common denominator and get a big fat pension at the end of it, they will be happy.

Let us look at the job bank. People everywhere are saying that it is about time that the Government had the guts to get on with something like job bank, but the Opposition has done nothing to support job bank. Let us look at economic development. Every time an opportunity is put forward for this State, members opposite want to pull it down and oppose it. They try to create innuendo and ill truths about facts and twist and manipulate.

The biggest problem in Australia and South Australia at the moment is lack of confidence. We have a lack of believing in ourselves as South Australians. This State has done very well for about 180 years, and we should be proud of that and build on it. It is most unfortunate that in 11 years we saw a lot of that hauled back, but we want to look at the big picture. The big picture is that South Australians are committed to the challenge. The mums and dads and the young people of this State have joined with the Government of the day to work for the common good. The Opposition has not done that—that is a fact.

I look forward to rolling out all the information in my electorate over the next 12 months to offset the innuendo, the absolute lies and propaganda that has been run out by members opposite. I hope to show the people the benefits that will be forthcoming if they stick with us and if they put in an effort. The Government cannot do it alone. We must all work together, talk things up, create opportunities and capitalise on them. Of course, it is not possible to turn the mess around in

three or four years. It took the previous Government 11 years to create the \$8 billion debt. I believe that we will be totally sustainable in just another two or three years. I challenge anyone to show me a Government that has been able to do better. It is a pity that the Opposition is not prepared to be supportive and help us with job bank and other youth unemployment initiatives.

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

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Some of the information that came to light today in Question Time as well as in last night's debate of the tourism amalgamation legislation calls into question the Minister for Tourism's methods of operation. In Question Time today it was revealed that a special meeting of the tourism board had expressed significant concerns about the Minister's handling of a number of issues. For the benefit of members I will read a few sections of the special board meeting's minutes of 31 October, as follows:

The board expressed its strong disappointment with the Minister's handling of the portfolio restructure process and its concerns relating to the Chief Executive's departure. In particular the board highlights the following inadequacies:

- the South Australian Tourism Commission contributed \$75 000 to the consultancy but has been denied access to the consultant's final report or a summary;
 - the objectives of the consultancy specify that the review would be undertaken in conjunction with relevant boards, chief executives and senior management, however consultation with the South Australian Tourism Commission has been minimal;
 - the general lack of consultation and information from the restructuring committee, consultant or Minister;
 - the negotiations relating to Michael Gleeson's departure were not referred to the full board for consideration which the board views as an indication of the Minister's lack of trust and faith in the board.
- Resolution: the board resolved that the Chairman convey these concerns to the Minister in the strongest possible terms.

Further, the minutes state (and this is relevant information for members of the House):

The board individually and collectively commended Michael Gleeson on the high standard of his work and professionalism over the past 3½ years and expressed their regret for the way in which the Minister had managed his departure. The board also acknowledged the professional manner in which Michael has personally managed the circumstances of his departure.

Clearly, the board regarded the former chief executive highly. As the board points out, there are questions to be answered regarding the circumstances surrounding his departure. In this House I also raised the issue of the consultancy carried out by Mr Sam Ciccarello's company with respect to the restructuring and amalgamation involving the Department of Tourism and the Department of Recreation, Sport and Racing. The Minister boasted about appointing Mr Ciccarello by simply telephoning him. The Minister said:

There is a difference between a ministerial consultancy asking someone to come in and do a review for a Minister on a series of departments and the situation where a board does it.

Perhaps the Minister regards that as a significant difference, but taxpayers are reminded of the fact that one way or the other it is taxpayers' money and, therefore, due process should be followed.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms WHITE: This is not a Labor Party criticism of the consultant who has been appointed. The competence or otherwise of that consultant will be seen in the quality of the report. But where is the report? The Minister has refused to release the report.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson: I told you last night.

The SPEAKER: The Minister is warned for the second time.

Ms WHITE: Previous reports have been made public. Is there a report to table? Last night the Minister said, 'Of course there is'. In Question Time today he said the review is ongoing. Why will the Minister not table a report that Government departments have paid for? I ask the question again: how much in total has the Government paid the consultant for work over the past 12 months?

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurana): I congratulate the Port Noarlunga Primary School, which celebrated its eightieth birthday today. In 1916 the education department decided that it was necessary to establish a school at Port Noarlunga. It did so in what was then a congregational church in Gawler Street. The school commenced with one teacher (Miss Eden G. Sharrad) on 7 August that year. The Sharrad Hall now stands as a monument on the Port Noarlunga Primary School site to the first teacher at that school. At that time 13 students attended the school. Obviously, over the years, enrolments at the school have increased. It is obvious to anyone who knows the area that the new school is a reflection of the village atmosphere. Port Noarlunga, the original village, has become surrounded by areas such as Seaford, which are rapidly growing areas, and yet it is still able to maintain its village atmosphere. The school is an extension of that. Certainly, the school community has that village atmosphere.

This was put on display today very well, because most of the children, some of the parents and all of the teachers arrived for the special celebration day dressed in traditional clothes. Those who did not wish to dress that way wore the school colours and looked absolutely fantastic at the assembly. Some of the teachers went to some effort to display the old style. This was backed up by the fact that some of the older ex-students and older residents in the area visited classrooms, talked about what they called the 'olden days' and told students what it was like to attend school in the days before computers, biros, etc. A display of memorabilia was placed in Sharrad Hall. Some of the memorabilia was donated by local historians and the Noarlunga council. A special morning tea was held for older ex-students, which was very enjoyable.

The thrill for the children was the arrival of Keith Martyn in the Channel Nine helicopter. If anyone has nothing better to do tonight, I suggest that they watch the Channel Nine *News* to see Keith arrive in the helicopter. I had great pleasure in donating to the school a birthday cake which was cut-up and eaten quickly by all the students. The rest of the day, which was designed to be a family fun day for the whole family, involved a lunch on the oval. The number of families in attendance who shared the day at the school with their children indicates the strength of the community at Port Noarlunga. Some of the people who attended were ex-students, but some just wanted to support their own children at that school. The children have been given a school holiday tomorrow by the school council. I would not want to be one of the parents taking one of those excited children home tonight with another day at home tomorrow, because the enjoyment that they will feel by the end of the day will be reflected in the fact that by this evening they will not want to go to bed.

On behalf of the Government I had great pleasure in donating to the school for its eightieth birthday a book about Adelaide and about the history of South Australia. I ask that, when children have the opportunity to read that book in the

library, they remember the importance of Port Noarlunga and its role in the history of South Australia. I place on record my congratulations to Trudie Bradley, Principal of Port Noarlunga Primary School, and to everyone who took part in today's celebrations, because it was a fantastic day.

GREEK CYPRIOTS

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I move:

That this House condemns the murder of unarmed Cypriot citizens Tassos Isaak, Solomos Solomou, Petros Kakoulli and Stelios Panayi and the illegal Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus for engaging in systematic killings of Greek Cypriots and calls on Turkey to stop attempting to provoke an incident by such killings, to recognise Turkish and Greek Cypriots can live together if it withdraws its troops and to withdraw its troops from Cyprus immediately.

Members might recently have read in the newspaper that, in a period of four months, four unarmed Greek Cypriots were killed by Turkish troops. It is patently obvious that this is an attempt to provoke Cyprus into attacking the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. It is clear also from the historical negotiations between Northern and Southern Cyprus that Denktash, the Prime Minister of the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, has no intention of attempting to resolve the Cypriot situation. That is clear because negotiations have been ongoing now since about 1974. His concept of a federation, given his speeches under the auspices of the United Nations, indicates that he wants a state with a foreign policy.

There is no way that Cyprus will ever be united if Northern and Southern Cyprus have separate foreign policies. It is patently obvious that his intent is that there be either a separate State or, alternatively, that Cyprus will become part of Turkey. As I said, four unarmed Greek Cypriots have been killed by Turkish troops, and I will give some details about the last killing, which involved Petros Kakoulki, a 58-year-old refugee from the village of Lefkiniko near Famagusta, which is a city the size of the Gold Coast, which the Turks invaded and over which they now have control. Of course, it is now a complete ghost town. The Turks have simply taken possession of it; they are not occupying it in any form or manner. They obviously took it as a negotiating point on the off chance that there might be moves to unite the whole of Cyprus, and they are still there.

That 58-year-old man was holding a bucket and, according to eye witness reports, was collecting snails. He was shot although unarmed. The three other Greek Cypriots who were shot were also unarmed. It is patently obvious that the reason the Turkish Government—

Mr Andrew interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Venning): Order! The member for Chaffey is out of order.

Mr CUMMINS: —is shooting unarmed Greek Cypriots is that it is attempting to establish to the international community that there can be no resolution to the Cypriot problem. Equally, of course, Cyprus is determined that there will be a resolution and is not being provoked by these illegal criminal acts. Two days prior to the last killing, the Force Commander of the UN Peace Corp in Cyprus requested of the Commander of the Turkish forces in Cyprus that he 'instruct the soldiers under his command not to shoot unless their own

lives are threatened'. It is clear that Turkish forces disregarded this direction. Why? It was for the reasons I have mentioned: they are trying to establish to the international community that Northern and Southern Cyprus cannot be united.

However, prior to the invasion by the Turkish troops in July 1974, the Greek and Turkish Cypriots did live together. In fact, they are still living together in areas of Cyprus, for example, in the area of Karpasias. Turkish and Greek Cypriots are living together, as are Anatolians—settlers whom the Turkish Government has brought into Northern Cyprus basically in an attempt to outnumber the Greek Cypriots. Three female Greek Cypriot teachers in Karpasias are teaching both Greek and Turkish Cypriot children and children of Anatolian settlers. They are doing that at some risk to themselves because of the way the Turkish authorities behave.

In late August I met with Lieutenant Colonel Clissitt, who is the officer-in-charge of the UN forces in Cyprus. I was with the Premier and he told me that, in his view, if the Turkish troops withdrew from Cyprus, the Turkish and Greek Cypriots and the Anatolian settlers could sort out their problems themselves. The Turks now occupy 38 per cent of Northern Cyprus. The United Nations, on numerous occasions, has called for the withdrawal of Turkish troops from Cyprus: on 20 July 1974, 1 November 1974, 20 November 1975, 13 May 1983 and, since then, on many occasions.

I have spoken on this issue in this House on at least three previous occasions. The Premier, when he was in Cyprus, declared that he supported the Greek Cypriot cause and, at a meeting with Greek Cypriots from Australia in Cyprus, he made the same statement. The Government supports the Cypriot cause, and I commend this motion to the House which fundamentally accords with the line that the United Nations has been taking.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I support the member for Norwood's motion. I will not delay the House for very long on this matter, because the issue of Cyprus was debated only fairly recently, in July, when we commemorated the anniversary of the invasion of Cyprus by Turkish forces in 1974. However, it is worth pointing out that these types of murders of innocent Greek Cypriot nationals by Turkish guards on the island of Cyprus will unfortunately continue until such time as the international community, rather than passing pious resolutions, actually gives some meaningful effect to those resolutions with respect to ensuring the withdrawal of Turkish troops from Cyprus. By that I do not necessarily mean armed intervention by the European Union or the United States or anything of this nature. There are many ways of securing the support of a nation that might otherwise be truculent on these sorts of issues through the use of economic sanctions and the like.

Turkey is very keen to join and belong to the European Union, as it sees it as a pathway to a more prosperous future. It is quite important that the European Union take a very forceful stand with the Turkish Government and refuse to admit Turkey until it recognises the resolutions passed from time to time by the United Nations which call on it to withdraw its recognition of the illegal northern republic of Cyprus and to withdraw its troops from the island. In particular, it also needs strong lobbying and diplomatic efforts by the United States and the United Kingdom.

As the former colonial power of Cyprus, the United Kingdom is a co-guarantor of the independence of Cyprus. It has been somewhat mealy mouthed in passing pious resolutions in the past but, in 1974 when the chips were really down with respect to the Cypriot people and when there were United Kingdom service people on the island, it failed to act as the co-guarantor of the island's independence by acquiescing in the Turkish invasion of Cyprus. Likewise, the United States has had a chequered history with respect to Cyprus because of its support for various Turkish regimes over the years, because Turkey has allowed the installation of United States bases and because Turkey was on the southern frontier of the then Soviet Union. So, because of Cold War politics during the 1970s, by and large the rights of the Cypriot people were totally ignored by the large powers as they played out their games, but to the very great cost to literally thousands of individuals who lost their homes, lives or families.

I would hope that, rather than simply passing pious resolutions, the international community would give effect to them through the imposition of economic sanctions and the like against Turkey to bring it to heel. Often people say that economic sanctions do not bring truculent nations to heel, but we know that that is not true. In 1994 we had the example of the first democratically elected President of South Africa. That was largely achieved by the economic sanctions that were brought to bear on the former apartheid regime in South Africa. Those sanctions limited investment within that country, which brought a great sense of economic insecurity to the white people of South Africa, notwithstanding the fact that they held the upper hand in terms of military power, police and the laws and were able to intimidate the overwhelming black majority of that country.

At the end of the day, economic sanctions made the former apartheid regime realise that its days were well and truly numbered and that it had to make peace with the majority citizens of the country or ultimately be destroyed economically and then, possibly in a military situation, from an armed uprising from amongst the overwhelming black majority of that country. So, economic sanctions do work, particularly against regimes which do not have their support base well founded in the people of the country concerned.

Mr Atkinson: Such as Cuba.

Mr CLARKE: The honourable member refers to Cuba; I cannot let that comment pass. I think it is remarkable that, after more than 30 years of economic blockade of Cuba by the United States and the imposition of quite unwarranted sanctions against that nation, Cuba has been able to survive, notwithstanding the fact that the United States Government largely represented the United Fruit Company of the United States and its particular capitalist interests in central and southern America. In conclusion, I am happy to support the motion moved by the member for Norwood and would urge the House to pass it unanimously.

Motion carried.

GREENER SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICY

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I move:

That this House congratulates the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources and the Premier on the successful release of 'A Greener South Australia policy'.

On 11 August this year I had the pleasure of being with the Premier and the Minister for the Environment and Natural

Resources, David Wotton, at the Torrens River linear park to launch 'A Greener South Australia'. I might say that, in relation to greening South Australia, in 1994-95 we passed a major milestone: for the first time in the history of South Australia, we planted 10.665 million trees, about 4.5 million more trees than we lost in this State.

In relation to this policy 'A Greener South Australia', I wish to congratulate Greening Australia, Trees for Life and the land care groups, as well as Bush Care and Australian Trust for Conservation, the volunteers and the catchment board for the incredible work they have done in relation to this initiative. The program is exciting and requires a new effort from the State's farming community. The greening of 200 kilometres along the Torrens River and Patawalonga catchments, and a major green belt running from Gawler to the Flinders Ranges, are part of this. It is clear that the program will reduce soil erosion and soil nutrient loss, manage rising salinity and counter erosion. It will also play a major role in relation to the greenhouse effect by the absorption of atmospheric carbon dioxide as well as enhancing our quality of life.

Under this policy the Government will put a stop to major clearance of native vegetation on farming properties. A clearance application must now be assessed by the State Native Vegetation Council. If approval is given, it will be only on the basis of preservation and re-establishing other larger areas of native vegetation. The council will also have a role in encouraging land holders to enter heritage agreements to conserve land for conservation purposes.

There are other exciting initiatives in relation to 'A Greener South Australia'. There will be an urban forests program for the protection, restoration and re-creation of urban forests, woodland, scrubland and grassland for which model areas will be established this year. There will be a new State revegetation strategy for the management, re-establishment and regeneration of vegetation through regional vegetation programs in rural areas; the greening of our catchment areas, including those of the Murray River, Mount Lofty, the Patawalonga and the Torrens River, which will provide corridors of green linking rural areas with the sea; the greening of road corridors; and the mapping of existing roadside vegetation.

It will also mean assessment of pastoral leases for the development of a complete biological inventory of our range lands and a continuing research into the State's flora and fauna. Remedial work and revegetation will be undertaken in national parks along with the development of a new and efficient direct seeding machine and seeding technique and improved plant establishment rates. In addition, it is proposed to develop education material and programs to promote regreening, propagation and a better understanding in schools of biodiversity issues. There will also be the promotion of community-based tree planting and habitat restoration programs. That is an exciting program for the State.

As a member of the environment backbench committee, I am proud to say that I played a minor role in proposing some of these initiatives. I advise members to read 'A Greener South Australia'—a report on trees and shrubs established in South Australia between 1989 and 1995. In relation to that report I congratulate Greening Australia SA Incorporated and Barry Mackie, the General Manager of Greening Australia. I also congratulate Neville Bonney, the Manager, Field Operations, and his team on that report. I would be remiss also if I did not congratulate some of the people who have been personally involved in this report. I

will not mention where they are from, but they include: J. Whittaker, D. Krehenduehl, S. Vелlette, N. Collins, P. Collins, T. Barron, A. Allison, M. Whitehead, S. Lewis, R. Playfair, J. Kuys, F. Bennett and the revegetation officers of Primary Industries South Australia.

I also mention some initiatives resulting from the report and some of the conclusions, which are exciting. The report shows that South Australia in 1995 for the first time reversed a decline in natural vegetation. The figures show that in 1995 more vegetation had been put back on the landscape than had been removed. In 1989 some four machines were operating in South Australia. From that year to 1996 there has been an increase to some 30 machines in operation. In 1995 over 2 000 kilometres of linear rows of seedlings were planted in South Australia, which roughly equates to 800 hectares. This even allows for a drier spring than normal. Around six million shrubs and trees were established using direct seeding alone.

The report also establishes that native vegetation clearance is still occurring but at a lesser rate than previously recorded. Even allowing for native vegetation clearance, more areas of vegetation are being reestablished. Figures from 1994 do not take into account vegetation established in natural revegetation in national parks, at heritage agreement sites and in roadside vegetation. The 10 million-plus trees and shrubs established in South Australia are a credit to all those involved. These are exciting times for the environment in South Australia, and I commend those who have had a strong involvement in and commitment to this matter and who have come through with these results, sometimes unfortunately with opposition from certain sectors of this community. I commend the motion to the House.

Ms HURLEY (Napier): The Opposition cannot but support any initiatives which encourage the greening of the environment in South Australia in particular. I acknowledge the work done by the people referred to by the member for Norwood. Malcolm Campbell, the former Manager of Greening Australia, is a good friend of mine, and I am well aware of the work done by Greening Australia and the broad acre planting it has done. Indeed, he was involved with a lot of tree planting around Elizabeth and the northern suburbs nearly 20 years ago. We are now enjoying the benefits of that planting.

It is pleasing to see that that sort of planting might be continued and expanded. We all know well the benefits of greening not only in aesthetic terms but of the essential requirement that we increase the level of vegetation, particularly trees, around Australia to combat the effects of pollution and the disappearance of the ozone layer. It is a matter not merely of being something that is pleasant to do and something we should do in terms of preserving our environment but something that is an absolute necessity and becoming more critical all the time. The Opposition certainly supports any attempts to green South Australia and recommends that the Government continues and expands its efforts.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL AND EMPLOYEE RELATIONS (PRESIDENT'S POWERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I move:

That this House—

- (a) congratulates the SANFL on a very successful year;
- (b) commends the Port Adelaide and Central District Football Teams on reaching the Grand Final; and
- (c) congratulates Port Adelaide on its win.

It is with great regret that I have found it necessary to amend my original motion as it appears on the Notice Paper, because I had hoped to have been standing here talking about the first premiership win of the Central District Football Club. I would have been pleased to be able to do that and many people in South Australia also shared those sentiments.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Not all.

Ms STEVENS: Not all, but many. Regrettably it was not to be and I offer Port Adelaide my congratulations, because it was definitely the better team on the day, and winning the flag at the end is what counts. I was very disappointed with the result on the day, as were the many supporters of the Central District Football Club, but Port Adelaide certainly deserves to be congratulated. However, in our disappointment we should not lose sight of the achievements of the Central District Football Club over the past year and, in fact, over the past three years.

Central District was minor premier again this year, having been in the grand final for the past three years. We are a very determined team, and I assure the House that we will be back again to finally achieve the goal of winning the premiership. I pay tribute to the coach of Central District Football Club, Steve Wright. It was his first year as a coach and his first year coaching Central District. It was a big job, and he did it well. We look forward to having him with us for many more years so that we can achieve that goal. I want to pay tribute to his wife Kerrie. All those who follow Centrals and who attend matches, especially home matches, would not mistake the voice of Kerrie Wright as she shouts her support for our team. She is a great supporter.

I would like to pay tribute to the players and their captain, Roger Girdham, who played a great season of football—they gave it their all. Despite the fact that the last game was below standard, overall they played very well indeed. We will lose a number of our players to Port Power—this is an issue for many avid Centrals supporters—but we wish the following players well: Jarrad Cotton, Rick MacGowan, Mark Conway, Stuart Dew and Nathan Steinberger. I am sure that they will succeed and take the spirit of Elizabeth and Central District into that new AFL side.

In congratulating the SANFL on a very successful year, I would like to refer to some of the achievements of the league this year. We had two outstanding wins over Western Australia. We achieved a second AFL licence—Port Power. I personally wish the team well. A number of people from Elizabeth do not, but I am certainly not one of them. A number of successful country championships were conducted by the league: the Under-17 Country Youth Championship; the National Under-18 Championship; the Under-16 Championship; the SAPSASA championship; and the Under-15 Play Safe Competition. Again, they were very successful. There was also the launch of the South Australian Football Umpiring Academy, the production of a teacher resource kit, a facilities upgrade of \$2.3 million for the players' facilities and \$1 million for other facilities. So, I congratulate Max

Basheer and the commissioners on a very successful year indeed.

Returning to Central District, I wish to pay tribute to the club itself and its organisation: to Ken Russell, the Chairman of the board, and Bill Cochrane for his energetic work for the Central District Football Club and also the Elizabeth community. I would like to congratulate Ken Russell. He does a great job as our President. He sells the club well, he has commitment, flair and a sense of humour, and he pulls the club together well. Bill Cochrane is a very energetic worker as the Marketing Manager of the Central District Football Club. He works hard not only for the club and its football teams but also for the development of sport generally in the Elizabeth community. Bill has a vision for the future that involves many different sports in the northern area, and he is energetically working towards that goal. He is an important asset for our community.

I pay tribute to our sponsors and supporters: to our major sponsor General Motors-Holden's, which is always evident at Central Districts games, and to our many other sponsors who play their part. I pay tribute to the Elizabeth City Council, which strongly supports the football club, especially its Mayor, Marilyn Baker, who is probably the most vociferous of all the supporters of our football team. Finally, I wish to recognise a group of people by their christian name: Lloyd, Peter, Rob, Steve, Geoff, Terry and Gary, the authors of the *Fanzine* magazine that comes out at every home match at Central Districts. 'Brendan Maguire is playing quite well' is named by the magazine I have here. I congratulate them for this publication. It certainly keeps many people smiling and interested and often laughing uproariously. It is a special touch that goes with the Central District Football Club. In closing, I again congratulate the Port Adelaide Football Club. We will be back there next year and in the years to come, and I give notice that I will move the original motion at about this time next year.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I have followed the South Australian National Football League since the 1964 season when I started to attend matches. I love South Australian football, and I am saddened by the takeover of the football public's affection by the AFL. I used to take my children to the Woodville-West Torrens football matches at Woodville Oval. Now I find it hard to keep their loyalty to South Australian football. There is one reason why it is very hard to keep anyone interested in South Australian football now, and I will come to that.

I listened to the last quarter of the preliminary final on the radio. When Norwood was about 21 points up, a Port Adelaide player unlawfully poleaxed one of Norwood's best players. I listened to the radio and I had heard this drama so many times before. Every free kick went to Port Adelaide. With 10 seconds to go, the ball was in the forward pocket. There was no chance of Port Adelaide getting back into the game. Norwood was going into the grand final, but what have I heard over so many years? The umpire gave a free kick to Scott Hodges. Out of nowhere came the free kick, and Scotty Hodges lined up. I thought, 'I don't even have to listen to this, because I know how the drama will end.' I reckon the umpire would have been more nervous than Scotty Hodges. He kicked the goal, and Port Adelaide went into the grand final. For the first time since 1964 I decided not to attend or listen to the SANFL grand final. I decided to boycott it, because after that free kick I knew how the plot had to end.

One of the reasons for this great fall off in attendances at the SANFL and why there will be a bigger decline in attendances next year is that the system is loaded so that Port Adelaide always wins. I know many Port Adelaide supporters, some of whom are friends of mine. What do they say to me? 'Oh, it's just another premiership.' That is how the SANFL premiership has become devalued. It does not matter any more. I must say that I will have to revise whether there is any point in my going to Woodville Oval next year when we all know that because of the entry of Port Power into the AFL it will give the Port Adelaide SANFL team a whole swag of AFL players so that it can win another premiership, and one after that and another after that. Max Basheer and Leigh Whicker may figure that that puts people on seats. Well, good luck to them. The South Australian National Football League competition is not what it was in the 1960s and the 1970s.

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Hartley interjects that it's a fix. It is not a fix; it is just the way in which the competition is structured. In Scotland, Rangers or Celtic always win. In Adelaide we do not even have that choice: only one team wins. It is boring. It is not entertainment, it is not football, it is not competition and it is not sport.

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Hartley says that he will take me to the soccer. That is a very kind offer, and after the most recent grand final I shall consider it.

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Members of all political Parties are inclined to indulge in conspiracy theories from time to time. My friend the member for Spence has never particularly been one for political conspiracy theories, and I am very disappointed that he goes in for football conspiracy theories. As a long-term supporter of Port Adelaide and having seen the team go up and down over the years since about 1964 when I moved to Adelaide and began to follow the team—

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: I must admit that I do not follow the team from the Elizabeth area, but I follow, as do many Port Adelaide supporters, the team that my family and my grandmother and their parents before them have always followed. And that is the trait of Port Adelaide supporters that I think sticks most in the craw of other people: loyalty to their team. There is no conspiracy; there is only loyalty.

Motion carried.

COOPER CREEK

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I move:

That this House urges the Queensland Government to reject the Currareua cotton fields development within the Cooper Creek catchment.

Since I put this motion forward in October, I am delighted that there has been a great deal of wisdom and initiative. I am pleased to see the Queensland Government's decision to refuse the proposal for an irrigation development on the Cooper Creek. The Currareua proposal would have been enormously damaging not only to the whole of South Australia because the ramifications would have spread right around the country.

The proposal to open up the head waters of the Lake Eyre basin for a 3 500 hectare cotton irrigation development—and that is nearly 10 000 acres of irrigation; it is about 8 500 acres of irrigation—sparked the strongest opposition from the

South Australian Government, led by the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources (Hon. D.C. Wotton). It also had a lot of opposition from the conservationists and the pastoralists. As parliamentary secretary for the Environment and Natural Resources agency of Government, I was delighted to see a strong stand by the Government, the conservation movement and, indeed, the pastoralists.

The Cooper is one of the few largely unregulated river systems in Australia. Extracting significant volumes of water in Queensland for irrigation purposes could have had disastrous effects on that water volume, the water quality and the ecosystems downstream in South Australia. As a fellow farmer, Mr Speaker, you would also be interested in the environment, sustainable agriculture and in protecting the outback. On a few occasions, I have had the pleasure of travelling through Innamincka and the Cooper Creek area and, indeed, camping on the banks of the Cooper. It is one of the most magnificent experiences you could ever wish for. If members have not visited the area, I encourage them to take their families there in the middle of winter and look at that magnificent ecosystem. Given the nature of the area, with the lack of rainfall and the dependence of the Cooper Creek primarily being fed from that part of the basin in Queensland, it is always under severe stress when it comes to the water that runs down through that area.

The issues are about protection of the only reliable water supplies in the Innamincka and the downstream areas for the landholders, for tourists—as I am—the beef industry and for the protection of what is recognised internationally as the Cungee Lakes wetlands system. The Cungee Lakes is just a magnificent wetlands area of the north. It is a trip that you would not want to take by yourself unless you were very well experienced. However, if you are experienced or you have the opportunity of going to the Cungee Lakes, it is almost indescribable. It is an enormous expanse of inland waterways, full of bird life and magnificent indigenous plant species. It is just a world apart from anywhere else on this planet.

Australia is definitely paying the price for the degradation of our main river system—the Murray-Darling Basin system. Of course, we in this Parliament talk regularly about cleaning up the Murray-Darling Basin for 2001, driven from the top, from the Premier, and we now see that everybody is contributing to that. I have not heard anybody complain about the 1c a kilolitre levy they are paying to ensure that that system is cleaned up. Hundreds of millions of dollars are required to address this problem. We cannot afford to ever allow the same mistakes to be repeated, particularly in respect of the wetlands, which are renowned right throughout the international arena.

I am delighted that the Queensland Government has announced that it will bring in water resources legislation and that it will also control licences throughout the Queensland section of the Cooper Creek and the Cooper Creek Basin. Through our Minister, we will be pushing for joint legislation to manage the whole catchment area. I commend the Queensland Coalition Government for its wisdom and strength to make sure that the cries from not only South Australia and Queensland but also the Federal Environment Minister, Senator Robert Hill, were heard.

I congratulate Senator Hill for his support of South Australia. This is one case where having a senior Cabinet Minister from South Australia in the Federal Government can benefit all South Australians. As the Howard Government continues to rebuild the Australian economy, to go through exactly the same initiatives we have had to go through to get

debt down and to get at a sustainable future, we will see many more Federal Cabinet Ministers who come from South Australia making other great initiatives and decisions for South Australians.

We must make sure that we protect the entire catchment. The people of this country can no longer go merrily on their way degrading our waterways, being irresponsible to our environment and, most importantly, not considering other parts of Australia. People have to remember right throughout Australia that South Australia is at the bottom when it comes to the drainage of most of our major water systems. Given the salinity problem, as well as phosphorus, nitrogen, heavy metals and other pollutants, South Australia has much work to do to clean up the waterways.

The Murray River is the lifeblood for South Australia. Without the Murray River we would not see the beautiful gardens that abound in Adelaide, and certainly we would not see any productivity right along the river, particularly through the seats of the members for Chaffey and Ridley, where the economic benefits to South Australia are so vital. Anyone who drives over to places such as Port Lincoln will see the Morgan to Whyalla pipeline and so on, which reinforces the fact that it is such a vital resource for South Australia.

I have no hesitation whatsoever in moving this motion. The issue will need bipartisan support to ensure we protect that basin because, after talking to colleagues in the Parliament, irrespective of their political colour, it is apparent they have all been concerned about what ramifications would have occurred for South Australia had this cotton project got up in the Cooper area. The Australian Cotton Foundation claims that it is responsible with its practices, and so on, and that may well be. However, I still have many questions about the safety of cotton farming practices. I would rather see other irrigation practices utilised where fewer chemicals are required.

It is not just the water supply that would have been lost to South Australia. If all that cotton was grown up there, one can imagine the pollutants that would have been generated. The South Australian outback has a great future in relation to tourism—and I have highlighted that in this debate—but it is more than that, because there is organic farming and the marketing of cattle and mutton that have been fattened on the natural vegetation of the north. Places such as Japan are all about buying product that is very clean and very green.

Although through the 2010 initiative to promote clean, green food into Asia we are starting to get our act together, there is much more in the way of economic opportunities that we can secure for the State, particularly for the outback pastoral area. We can target that niche market in Asia with outback, organically grown, clean, green mutton and beef. I am sure that the pastoralists, particularly with the unfortunate downturn in the beef industry, would be keen to capitalise on those opportunities. Members may have had the chance to eat a nice roast leg of hogget and the resulting cold meat sandwiches from sheep grown on salt bush and blue bush. It is just one of the most magnificent meat products that one could wish for.

Members of Parliament and the Government have to be ever vigilant in making sure that we protect our environment. One of the fundamental reasons that we are elected to Parliament is to provide a balanced and sustainable future for South Australia. The environment has a big part to play in that. I am the first one to agree that, with respect to balance, economic development can be brought right alongside the protection of the environment. The protection of the environ-

ment can be enhanced by good, strong economic development. People are aware of the importance of sustaining the environment, because it enables them to continue to earn money. If the economy is vibrant, the millions of dollars required to rehabilitate degraded areas across the country can be addressed.

Now that people have seen the importance of these issues, the general public will also support the sale of one-third of Telstra, which would allow \$1 billion to be injected into the environment straight away. Some of the reports that I have seen and some of the people that I have spoken to suggest that the real value of Telstra will depreciate a lot over the next 10 to 20 years as more competition comes in and as telecommunications links are freed up across the country. When one considers how important the environment is to Australia and the fact that it was part of the policy platform, that nothing was hidden and there was no broken promise, that it was an absolute commitment to make sure Telstra was part of that, it would be fantastic for Cooper Creek and all other aspects of the environment in Australia if that \$1 billion could be spent next year to enhance this program.

I reinforce how grateful I am as a member of Parliament for the efforts of Minister Wotton and the Queensland Environment Minister. On 29 November this year, at the ANZEC meeting, Minister Wotton will meet again with the Queensland Environment Minister to further develop the joint legislation and management of this very important resource for South Australia.

Mr BASS (Florey): I support the member for Mawson's motion. Only a matter of weeks ago I visited the Cooper Creek area at Innamincka with the Speaker and met with the local people who are represented by the Speaker in his role as the member for Eyre, and they were very concerned about the planned cotton fields development and the effect it would have on the Cooper Creek catchment area. Everyone knows that the area around Innamincka from the Queensland border down and on through the many hundreds of miles of the Cooper Creek is a really beautiful and natural area, and it must be protected at all costs.

I am very pleased that some agreement has been reached between the South Australian Minister and the Queensland Government not to allow the Currareua cotton fields development to go ahead. That is the right decision because, notwithstanding that the Cooper Creek catchment area from Innamincka down is nothing to do with Queensland, it has control of the area that feeds into the Cooper Creek. It is most important that Queensland is aware that some developments in that State, as in New South Wales and Victoria on the Murray River, may damage the environment in another State. I congratulate everyone who was involved in ensuring that the development in Queensland does not go ahead so that it does not damage the Cooper Creek catchment area.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): I place on record my support for this motion. It is important that we do not attempt to establish any irrigation enterprises on ephemeral streams. We all know that Cooper Creek is a South Australian name given to a stream which runs only on unpredictable occasions. It may run for more than a year, indeed, a few years at a time, and then not run at all for another few years. My familiarisation with this region began in the early 1960s, over 30 years ago, and I have visited the area since then several times for various lengths of stay.

We know nothing about the behaviour of surface ground water and the likely consequences of wide areas of irrigation, yet we do know that the available water is so unpredictable that geographers refer to that entire river system as ephemeral, so it is crazy for such a proposal to go ahead. We also know that, in similar locations where there has been even greater reliability in terms of the supply of water, such large irrigation enterprises as are proposed in the form of cotton fields get into financial difficulty the moment they are confronted with inadequate or even no water.

It ought to be a lesson to these people to leave well enough alone instead of attempting, on the off chance that the seasons are with them, to make millions of dollars. It is great for the balance of trade figures of this country to make millions of dollars when the seasons happen to be good, but what are the consequences if it does not rain or if it rains too much? Such a proposed monoculture in such a climate on such a huge area would no doubt lead to a build up of a residual population of pests, whether they be pest insects, pest bacteria or pest fungi. Notwithstanding that, these pests and diseases will certainly bring about the early death knell of the industry if it were ever to proceed.

The dollar signs some people saw in their eyes and the belief that they could shift from the less ephemeral but nonetheless insecure tributary waters of the Darling River into this more risky area were the things which drove this proposition. I commend the member for Mawson for having moved this motion in the House to enable us to place on record not just our concern but, more importantly, the reasons for our concern, and they are wide. It is ill-advised.

It is about as sensible as attempting to establish a huge gold mine on the discovery of one surface nugget and expecting that, because you found that one nugget, you will find tonnes of gold beneath for as long as you want to go digging there. I have absolutely no sympathy whatever for anyone who may feel aggrieved that they will be prevented from doing this development. It was always ill-advised.

Motion carried.

LEGIONNAIRE'S DISEASE

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I move:

That this House—

(a) expresses its concern at the superficial nature of the investigation by Professor Lane into the outbreak of legionnaire's disease at Kangaroo Island, the inadequacy of the six page report and the failure of the report to address major terms of reference;

(b) notes that Professor Lane failed to consult with the public and did not visit Kangaroo Island during his investigations; and

(c) considers the integrity of the report to have been compromised by the Minister's involvement in its preparation.

After announcing that there would be an independent review into the most recent outbreaks of communicable diseases, that this review would be conducted by a world expert in the area of public health and that the Government would commit up to \$50 000 so that South Australians could be reassured that our risk management was world class, the Minister for Health had the gall to table in this House a report of just 5½ pages—a report that is nothing more than a superficial endorsement of everything that Professor Lane was told by the Health Commission; a report that took just four days to research and write; and a report that is compromised by the Minister's admission that he had his fingerprints on the draft.

Before dealing with the major points of the motion, I remind the House why concern has been building about the management of public and environmental health in South

Australia and the capacity of the Health Commission to respond to emergency situations that are frequently fatal. The outbreak of the Garibaldi HUS epidemic in January 1995 brought the issues of surveillance, risk assessment and risk reduction into sharp focus. People wanted to know how this could have happened. While much of the work by scientists, doctors and nurses at the time of the Garibaldi epidemic was to be applauded, the coronial inquiry into the death of Nikki Robinson found major shortcomings in how the epidemic was managed and how the food, manufacturing and retailing industries are regulated.

The Coroner made 12 major recommendations to Government. The Minister said the Government accepted these recommendations and told the House on 28 September 1995, 'We are acting swiftly to address the recommendations not already addressed.' It is now November 1996 and major recommendations by the Coroner still have not been addressed. Just how swift is that? As we face another summer, we know that the arrangements between State and local government authorities for the surveillance of these industries are not working. We know that public and environmental health is under-resourced, even though the Public Health Division underspent its budget this year. We know that provisions of the Food Act are inadequate. We know that prosecution for breaches of standards under the Food Act is difficult, and where a fatality has occurred there can be conflict between the prosecution and any subsequent coronial inquiry. We know that penalties are inadequate.

It was against this background that public concern forced the Minister to commission a review of the fatal outbreak of legionnaire's disease on Kangaroo Island and the revelation that the disease had been contracted by people who had visited spa pool sales centres. Unfortunately, the Minister's motives were open to questioning from the beginning. The *Advertiser* said it looked as though it were a public relations exercise. In fact, as we recall, the announcement of the inquiry followed a storm of criticism of the Minister in relation to the handling of the episode. The Minister showed his hand when he told the House in a line straight from *Yes Minister*, 'If the review serves no purpose other than to reinforce that we have a very good public health service, it will be money well spent.' The Minister also told the House that the review would be in two parts. He said:

A report will be prepared after this initial response. The second stage will deal with the wider public health issues and Government policy, including regulatory and, possibly, legislative responses.

The terms of reference set out a two-part program dealing, first, with the review of the surveillance and performance in relation to the recent outbreaks and, secondly, with the taking account of existing legislation to make recommendations on best practice, particularly in risk management. After I requested a meeting with Professor Lane, he met with me and explained that in the time available he would not be able to address the second term of reference and that he had come for 'a quick and dirty look' at the issues. He also said in conversation with me that Garibaldi was ancient history and no longer relevant to the exercise. He mentioned that there were both technical and political considerations in the review that he was carrying out. Not only did Professor Lane fail to address all the terms of reference but the process was also totally flawed.

The so-called 'independent' report was based solely on advice given to Professor Lane by the South Australian Health Commission and, then, by his own admission, checked by the Minister. Just how independent can a report be? There

was no attempt to research what happened by talking to the victims; there was no attempt to talk to local government, which has responsibility for the day-to-day regulation of these matters in council areas; there was no attempt to seek the views of the public; there was no attempt to interview people operating spa pool sale centres; and there was no attempt to take advice from the media. Professor Lane did not even visit Kangaroo Island. In fact, the only external advice to Professor Lane appears to have come, first, from a submission from the Opposition—which he said he would read on his way home after he had given his draft report to the Minister for checking—and, secondly, the editorial advice the Minister gave on the draft report.

This brings me to the Minister's involvement in writing this report. By his own admission, the Minister met with Professor Lane on 9 August and was shown a draft of the report. The Minister said that he took the opportunity to discuss with Professor Lane his broad conclusions. Then, in an extraordinary outburst of self-indulgence, the Minister claimed that this was what the people of South Australia would want their Minister to do. I say: wrong again Minister. After spending \$50 000 to get an independent report, the people of South Australia did not want the process tainted by a Minister's making sure that it contained nothing that would embarrass the Government or vindicate the questions being asked by the Opposition.

How the Minister influenced the non-findings of this report, we will never know. What we do know is that his interference tainted the process so that this report, brief as it is, has absolutely no standing at all. It must be disappointing for Professor Lane to know that his international reputation and his work have been compromised by the actions of the Minister. It is also interesting to reflect on the fact that, when the Garibaldi affair was at its height, the Opposition in this House called for an independent inquiry. Members will probably recall that the Minister spoke vociferously against that proposal, saying that the appropriate place for an independent inquiry lay with the Coroner.

It was very interesting to note the Minister's quite different response this time because, of course, he was very anxious to produce the kind of report over which he could have some control. However, the most disappointing aspect of this whole sorry tale lies in the results for the people of South Australia. We the community have a right to expect, and the Minister has the responsibility to ensure, that these important issues are addressed, so that we can be confident that our public health standards protect us. I believe that we are no closer to that position as a result of a cynical exercise designed by a Minister, panicking to protect his own position and having nothing to do with a proper analysis of our system.

Mr CUMMINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

DENTAL SERVICES

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I move:

That this House condemns the decision of the Federal Government to axe the Commonwealth dental program and the failure of the State Government to oppose the decision; and calls on the State Government to immediately ensure the provision of adequate dental care for the elderly, the disabled, single parents and the other pensioners as well as the unemployment.

In conjunction with the August Federal budget there was a very sudden and drastic announcement in relation to the

cessation of funding to the Commonwealth dental program. I condemn the Federal Government for this decision. I will detail aspects of the program and the effects that this decision will have on the provision of dental services to people in our community who are least able to cope with the ramifications. The Commonwealth dental health program began in 1994, being part of the budget for the 1993-94 financial year. The program was put in place in response to documentation on the social inequalities in oral health and access to dental care throughout the adult population of Australia.

The documentation showed that the levels of tooth loss was higher amongst Government health card holders; that card holders were more likely to visit for a dental problem rather than for a check up; and that they were also more likely to have extractions rather than fillings. The documentation also clearly showed that card holders in remote locations and indigenous people were further disadvantaged.

This social justice program was established across Australia to do something about redressing these inequalities. It was an appropriate program for the Federal Government to launch nationally in which to put money to achieve these aims. The program was targeted carefully. Only health card holders were eligible—aged pensioners, single parents, those on disability pensions, and the unemployed. Approximately 4 million people were eligible. The Commonwealth dental health program received \$100 million a year and 820 000 eligible adults were receiving care in any one year—an approximate 50 per cent increase on the number of eligible adults receiving public funded dental care without the program. A significant increase was noted in the number of people able to access dental care which, in the long run, would improve their health outcomes and which certainly, in the long run, would save Government money.

Last financial year in South Australia approximately 120 000 adults received public dental care, at a total cost of \$26 million. The Commonwealth dental health program's contribution to that was about \$10 million. Of that figure, \$8 million related to subsidised card holders receiving care from private dentists and \$2 million went directly into public dental clinics. Therefore, there will be a reduction of more than one-third in the number of adults to be treated in the public sector in the coming year.

The University of Adelaide carried out research and has documented outcomes of the Commonwealth dental health program for the years 1993 and 1994. First, it found a decrease in the percentage of card holders reporting extractions and in the average number of extractions. It reported an increase in the percentage of card holders reporting fillings and an increase in the percentage of the average number of fillings in 1994 compared with 1993. We must remember that, in terms of long-term dental health, it is much better for people to have fillings than extractions. The research also discovered that fewer card holders reported waiting 12 months or more for a check up in 1994 than in 1993.

It found that the awareness of the program had doubled from the start of 1994 to 1995, and it also found that the gap in satisfaction with dental care between card holders and non-card holders was reduced in 1994 compared with 1993. The indicators are that the program was successful, and members must agree because no-one has been reported in the media as saying that this was not a successful program. The Federal Minister for Health, Dr Wooldridge, actually used the success of the program as his justification for cutting it, and that was a very interesting extrapolation from the Minister.

The other important point is that, within a couple of years, it is believed, all those people on the waiting list would have been seen and the scheme would have been recalling people for a check up. In other words, that would have been another successful outcome in that the scheme would have seen every person once, would have dealt with emergency issues, and would be into preventive care and preventive check ups. The scheme in South Australia had reached that point when the funding was cut.

So, what will happen? Waiting times for publicly funded routine care for the elderly, disabled, single parents and unemployed will increase. The end of July 1996 waiting time was 9.5 months. It is estimated that this will increase to 1.5 years in 1997 and to more than five years by June 1998. We will find that we will return to the bad old days and the only care that people in those categories can get will be emergency, severe pain, chronic condition type of care. The preventive care that has been so successfully introduced has now ceased. So, what is happening in relation to this program? I noted that, in one of the regional Australian papers, in fact the *Fairfax Sun* of 3 October 1996, the Federal MP, Brendan Nelson, who as we know is a former President of the AMA, made some statements in relation to this matter, and his comments are referred to as follows:

Dr Nelson, the former President of the Australian Medical Association turned MP for Bradfield in Sydney's north, said governments sometimes made the wrong decisions, referring to the budget announcement abolishing the dental care program that provided free dental care for pensioners and low income earners.

'A number of us have advised the Government,' he said. 'The message the people are giving Government about the dental plan is being heard. The Government is at the moment looking at ways of ensuring that the low income people who have benefited from the dental plan continue to receive care.'

That was Dr Nelson in full flight, campaigning in the recent by-election. That was on 3 October; it is now 7 November and, of course, we have heard nothing. The Federal Government has announced no intention at all to reinstate this funding. I certainly know and I am sure other members know that out in the communities chaos is reigning. The dental clinics are absolutely overwhelmed with people obviously unable to cope. Even though this funding is to stop at the end of December, because the cut starts at the beginning of January, they have had to start to pull back very acutely at this stage, as it takes a couple of months for the money to run through the system. So, the cuts are impacting right away. Out in the communities the program is in chaos.

What has happened here in this State? Well, one Government Minister—not the Minister for Health; I believe it was the Minister for the Ageing—was quoted as saying that he was appalled at this decision. But it is interesting to note that the Minister for Health in this State has made no such statement in relation to his view of the cutting of this program. He has said that he is looking at ways to rebalance. I will quote from the Treasurer's statement yesterday:

Various options are being considered by the South Australian Health Commission to ensure that there is an appropriate balance in the supply of dental services which adequately addresses public demand.

The Treasurer said that yesterday when he announced the reduction in specific purpose payments for the State following the Federal budget. We have heard these sorts of statements before. We have heard the Minister for Health on many occasions saying that he will work out an appropriate balance that adequately addresses public demand. We know that this is a hollow statement and a hollow promise, and I feel very

concerned the same will apply in this case. I must also quote from a sentence earlier in the Treasurer's statement yesterday when he said:

There will not be substitution of State funds to offset cuts which reflect Commonwealth priorities.

So, on the one hand the Treasurer makes that very definite statement that the State Government will not pick up responsibility for this program and, on the other hand, makes a very wishy-washy statement that it is looking at options. I think the Government should look at options. As my motion indicates, the Federal Government should be condemned for this action, because it was a good and successful program which was appropriate for the Federal Government to put in place and which made life better for a hell of a lot of people in Australia who would not be able to get this form of care any other way. It also should be condemned because it did this without warning; this was dropped on the States in the Federal budget without warning. The Minister for Health ought also to be finally condemned for the reason he gave. The Hon. Michael Wooldridge stated that he was cutting this program because it was successful. That is an incredible statement to make.

So, the Federal Government should be condemned, but so should this Government. It is not good enough to say, 'Well, it's not our fault.' This is a refrain that we hear continuously from this Government. I remember that under a Federal Labor Government members opposite continually pointed to that Government and looked forward to the time when the Liberals gained power in Canberra. The Liberals have gained power in Canberra but the State Government's comments are still same: 'It's not our fault; we're not taking responsibility.' I say that this is a moral issue; this is something for which a responsible and caring Government must take responsibility. I await and hope for a quick response, because the people in the community are suffering now; the issue is right upon us. We need the Minister for Health in this State to come out strongly and quickly say that indeed this program and those people will be picked up by this Government.

Mr LEGGETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

EUTHANASIA

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lewis:

That this House, regardless of our individual views and attitudes to the law relating to euthanasia, and in keeping with our respect for the spirit of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, calls on Mr Speaker in the House of Representatives and all honourable members of the House of Representatives and Mr President of the Senate and all honourable senators in the Commonwealth Parliament to desist from contemplating any proposal to over-ride any such law in any of the Territories in the Commonwealth of Australia.

(Continued from 24 October. Page 354.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I rise to speak against this motion. The motion condemns a Bill before the Federal Parliament moved by a Liberal member of Parliament, Mr Kevin Andrews, which seeks to use the Commonwealth Parliament's undoubted authority to veto a law of the Northern Territory. The law which the Federal Bill seeks to veto is a law to allow the administration to a terminally ill person of a toxin unrelated to pain relief for the purpose of killing that person, namely, active voluntary euthanasia. The member for Ridley's motion attacks the Andrews Bill on the basis not of its intrinsic merits but that it violates the Federal nature of our Constitution. I do not agree with that proposi-

tion. The relevant section of the Constitution is section 122, which provides:

The Parliament may make laws for the Government of any territory, surrendered by any State to and accepted by the Commonwealth, or of any territory placed by the Queen under the authority of and accepted by the Commonwealth or otherwise acquired by the Commonwealth and may allow the representation of such territory in either House of the Parliament to the extent and on the terms which it thinks fit.

At Federation the Northern Territory was part of South Australia. South Australia ceded the Northern Territory to the Commonwealth in return for certain financial arrangements and promises, so the Northern Territory become a territory of the Commonwealth. Therefore, it was in order for the Commonwealth Parliament to legislate for the Northern Territory, which it did for many years until—and the member for Elder may be able to help me—I think it was in 1974 or some time in the 1970s that the Northern Territory acquired its own Parliament—a territory Parliament.

Nevertheless, under the terms of section 122 of the Constitution, which has not been amended, the Commonwealth Parliament retains the authority to legislate for the Australian Capital Territory and for the Northern Territory. There is a way of overcoming that, namely, to give the Northern Territory statehood. What goes with statehood? Well, 12 senators for a start, along with the ability of the Northern Territory Parliament to pass laws within the legislative competence of the States in a way that cannot be overturned by the Commonwealth Parliament. So, if the people of Australia want the Northern Territory to have the authority to pass a law for active voluntary euthanasia that cannot be overturned by the Commonwealth Parliament, it is for the people of Australia to ask the Commonwealth Government to give the Northern Territory statehood: it is as simple as that.

However, the motion of the member for Ridley does not call for statehood for the Northern Territory, so it does not make sense to me. The very people who are complaining about the Commonwealth Parliament's legislating to prohibit active voluntary euthanasia in the Northern Territory are the same people who, if the Northern Territory Parliament had recently stuck with its laws permitting residents of the Northern Territory to own pump action shotguns and semi-automatic shotguns, would have been calling for Commonwealth legislation to overturn that right to bear firearms in the Northern Territory—the very same people.

So, the question of whether you support or oppose this motion depends entirely on whether you support or oppose active voluntary euthanasia. There is no middle ground, because the Commonwealth Constitution is very clear. The Parliament of the Commonwealth has authority to legislate for any of the territories. If you want to change that, it is quite simple: give the Northern Territory statehood—it is one or the other. Let us not be confused and believe that you can be opposed to active voluntary euthanasia, yet vote for the motion of the member for Ridley: you cannot do that.

Mr Scalzi: I can.

Mr ATKINSON: You cannot do it consistently. The question of whether you support the Andrews Bill is simply whether or not you support or oppose active voluntary euthanasia. If you want the Northern Territory to have legislative competence to defy the Commonwealth Parliament on the question of active voluntary euthanasia, then you vote for the Northern Territory to have statehood. The member for Ridley makes the comparison between the Northern Territory

and the other States of Australia. It is quite in order for any of the six Australian States to pass a law for active voluntary euthanasia. Indeed, we have a Bill before the other place—

Mr Scalzi: And we will oppose it.

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Hartley says that he will oppose it. That is not the point I am trying to make. The point I am trying to make is that, if this Parliament passes a law for active voluntary euthanasia, the Commonwealth Parliament cannot override it. There can be no Andrews Bill to prohibit active voluntary euthanasia in the States that have passed such a law. That is because South Australia is a State and the Northern Territory is a territory—it is a different thing.

Mrs Rosenberg interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: I will come to that matter, since the member for Kaurna has invited me to comment on it. Let us not have the member for Ridley telling us that the Andrews Bill might restrict the legislative competence of the States to pass a law for active voluntary euthanasia: it will not, because of the constitutional settlement we have. The member for Kaurna asks, 'How did the Federal Parliament pass a law to override the sodomy section of the Tasmanian criminal code?' The answer is that it tried to rely on the external affairs power of the Commonwealth to do so. But, given that there has been no prosecution for sodomy in Tasmania for as long as anybody can remember, the matter will never be tested. If it were tested, possibly a Tasmanian State prosecution would be upheld, but we will never know. In conclusion, do not be confused about this motion. If you vote for this motion you are voting against the very clear provisions of the Commonwealth Constitution. Read what section 122 says.

Mr Cummins interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: If the member for Norwood wants active voluntary euthanasia in the Northern Territory and wants it without the ability of the Commonwealth Parliament to review the matter, he can do one of two things: he can call for the Northern Territory to get statehood or he can amend section 122 of the Constitution.

Mr MEIER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the State of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

AYES (32)

Armitage, M. H.	Ashenden, E. S.
Atkinson, M. J.	Baker, S. J.
Bass, R. P.	Brindal, M. K.
Brokenshire, R. L.	Buckby, M. R.
Clarke, R. D.	Condous, S. G.
De Laine, M. R.	Evans, I. F.
Foley, K. O.	Geraghty, R. K.
Greig, J. M.	Hall, J. L.
Hurley, A. K.	Ingerson, G. A.
Kotz, D. C.	Leggett, S. R.
Matthew, W. A.	Meier, E. J. (teller)
Olsen, J. W.	Penfold, E. M.
Rann, M. D.	Rosenberg, L. F.
Scalzi, G.	Stevens, L.
Venning, I. H.	Wade, D. E.
White, P. L.	Wotton, D. C.

NOES (3)

Cummins, J. G.	Lewis, I. P.
Rossi, J. P.	

Majority of 29 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

Patriarch Bartholomeos I

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

That the order of the House adjourning debate on the motion until Thursday 14 November be rescinded.

Motion carried.

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

That this House welcomes the official visit to South Australia this weekend of the spiritual leader and world head of the Greek Orthodox Church, His All Holiness, the Archbishop of Constantinople and ecumenical patriarch, Bartholomeos I.

In doing so, I know I speak for all members of this House and, indeed, this Parliament in extending an official welcome to His All Holiness on the eve of his first visit to Australia. Indeed, I understand that it is the first visit ever of an ecumenical patriarch to Australia and certainly the first visit to South Australia. Indeed, the decision of His All Holiness to visit South Australia and Australia is very much a testimony to the international recognition of the outstanding work undertaken in the ecumenical councils by the Patriarch of Australia, Archbishop Stylianos, who, last year, celebrated his twentieth anniversary in that position and visited South Australia. He is held in enormous esteem by the leaders of all Christian churches in this nation and is enormously well respected internationally for his work in trying to bridge the gap between Christian orthodoxy and the Roman Catholic Church and, indeed, other denominations.

Archbishop Stylianos is not only a world-ranking theologian but is also someone who is a very well established poet, having published many books of poetry. I know that Archbishop Stylianos is held in enormously high regard by His All Holiness, and the visit to South Australia is something we should all rejoice in. That he is spending so much time in South Australia is a testimony to the high regard that His Grace Bishop Joseph in South Australia is held both by political leaders and members of this Parliament and indeed by the leaders of other Christian denominations.

I will talk about some of the work and background of His All Holiness, who was born in 1940 on Imbros Island in Turkey. He attended primary school in Imbros and high school in Constantinople. He received his Diploma of Theology from the Theological School of Chalki (Hons) and entered the priesthood in Imbros as a Deacon on 13 August 1961. For two years, from 1961 to 1963, His All Holiness fulfilled his military obligation, serving as an officer in the Turkish Army. As an ecumenical patriarchate's scholar from 1963 to 1968, His All Holiness undertook postgraduate studies at the Ecumenical Institute of Eastern Studies in Rome, the Ecumenical Institute of Bossey in Switzerland, and at the University of Munich, specialising in canon law. In 1968, he gained his doctorate at the Institute of Rome (the Gregorian University), submitting his thesis on 'Concerning the codification of the holy canons and canonical decrees in the Orthodox Church'.

On returning to Constantinople in 1968, His All Holiness served as Sub-dean of the Greek Orthodox Theological School of Chalki. He was ordained a priest in Constantinople on 19 October 1969. Six months later, he was elevated to the rank of Archimandrite. In 1972, he was appointed Director of the Private Patriarchal Office of his predecessor, Patriarch

Demetrios I of blessed memory. In 1973, His All Holiness was unanimously elected by the Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate as Metropolitan of Philadelphia, and consecrated as a bishop at Christmas 1973 in the Patriarchal Cathedral of St George, Constantinople. Since March 1974, he has served the church in the capacity of a member of the Holy Synod.

On 14 January 1990, he was elected Metropolitan of the Historic City of Chalcedon. On 2 November 1991, after the late Patriarch Demetrios I passed on, the Holy Synod unanimously elected Metropolitan Bartholomeos as Archbishop of Constantinople—New Rome and Ecumenical Patriarch. Apart from speaking Greek, His Holiness is a fluent speaker of Turkish, Italian, Latin, English, French and German. He is a founding member of the Society of the Canon Law of the Eastern Churches and served as its Vice President for several years. For 15 years—eight as Vice President—he served as a member of the Faith and Order Committee of the World Council of Churches and participated in three general assemblies of the World Council of Churches.

Patriarch Bartholomeos I has paid official Apostolic visits to many countries. He convened extraordinary meetings of the heads of all the autonomous orthodox churches in Constantinople in 1992, and on the historic Greek island of Patmos in 1995. Additionally, he convened special meetings of all the Hierarchs of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, in both 1992 and 1994, in Constantinople. I am delighted to learn that His Holiness will be awarded a doctorate by Flinders University. Of course, he has already been awarded doctorates of theology by the University of Athens, the Theological Academy of Moscow and the Holy Cross Theological College of Boston in the United States. He has been awarded doctorates of philosophy by the City University of London, the University of Crete and the Department of the Environment of the Aegean University.

We are about to welcome to this country a person of enormous world standing. He is the equivalent of the Pope of Orthodoxy and someone who has enormous respect in interorthodox, interdenominational and international meetings, conventions and congresses. He will certainly be welcomed by all members of this House. I understand that the Ecumenical Patriarch has an enormous interest in environmental issues. That is something that is very welcome from someone of his standing. He certainly comes to South Australia at a time when Greek people and people of Greek background have made an enormous contribution to this country in terms of endeavours in small business, community activities, industry, the arts and sport.

His Holiness can come here knowing that Greek orthodoxy is strong and that the children and grandchildren of Greek orthodox parents continue to observe the faith, as Greek people continue to fight for those basics of family, faith and freedom. At a time when President Clinton is about to arrive in this country, I hope that the fundamental issues of Cyprus and justice for Cyprus and also justice for the Greek Macedonian people and the honouring of their heritage are addressed. We are campaigning to get an Australian consulate established in Thessaloniki, just as we are campaigning to have the Cyprus issue raised by Australia in every international forum. I look forward to meeting the Ecumenical Patriarch personally and commend him to all members of the House.

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I have pleasure in supporting this motion and welcoming His All Holiness, Bartholomeos I, Archbishop of Constantinople and New Rome and Ecumenical Patriarch. I am glad that this motion is supported in a bipartisan way by the Liberal Government and the Labor Opposition, as it should be. Yesterday I spoke to the Premier about the visit of His All Holiness. He mentioned to me the great honour that had been bestowed on South Australia by the visit and how he was looking forward to welcoming His All Holiness, Bartholomeos I, at the airport this weekend. The Premier is attending many functions with the Patriarch this week, including the Patriarchal Divine Liturgy, which will be held at the Clipsal Powerhouse this weekend.

The Premier indicated that the visit is of historic significance to South Australia because, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, it is the first time a Patriarch has visited Australia. He has not even visited the United States, so this is a great honour. The Premier will also attend the opening of St Basil's Homes for the Aged and he will also attend a community dinner and a State dinner, which will be held for the Patriarch on Monday night because it is such a great honour to have him here.

As was pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, the Patriarch is a great scholar and a great linguist and he will be honoured by Flinders University for his scholarship. It should not be forgotten that the Orthodox Church traces its origins in an unbroken link with the Faith of the Apostles. The Church of Byzantium was founded by St Andrew the Apostle in 36 AD. It has an ancient, historic, Christian heritage and one of which the church is proud. It should be remembered that the Ecumenical Patriarch is the patriarch of all the Orthodox communities, not merely the Greek Orthodox community, and that represents a flock of 250 million people across the world. One has only to go to Mount Athos, as I have, to see the diversity of the Orthodox community in the world.

The first Greek Orthodox Church in Australia opened in May 1898 and the first Orthodox mass was celebrated in Australia in 1820, 16 years before South Australia was settled. The church has flourished in Australia since that day. There are now 110 parishes and communities of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Australia. I am proud to say that I have a strong link with the Greek community in South Australia. As pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, on 1 October 1995, we celebrated the seventieth anniversary of the establishment of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Australia and the twentieth anniversary of the enthronement of His Eminence Archbishop Stylianos.

It was a great occasion in honour of the church in this State and a great occasion for a man of great scholarship and holiness, Archbishop Stylianos. On that very significant occasion the Patriarch sent the following message:

We are among you in spirit.

I am proud to say this weekend he will actually be with us.

On my own behalf and that of the Government I express my thanks for the contribution that the church and the Greek community have made to this State. We are very fortunate that the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of South Australia has Bishop Joseph Arianzos as its leader. He attends the feast day of the Prophet Elias, the patron saint of the Greek Orthodox community and the parish of the Prophet Elias in Norwood and the eastern suburbs, which is in my electorate. As members know, he conducts the Blessing of the Waters in

January each year. I have had the honour of speaking to him on many occasions. He is a man of great learning and humility and this State is honoured to have him as the leader of the Greek Orthodox religious community.

I assure the Patriarch that this Government supports the Orthodox community in this State. This Government is also sensitive to the contribution that Greek culture has made to the Western World and to the contribution that the Greek community has made and will continue to make to South Australia. I assure him also that this Government supports the Cypriot cause in Cyprus and supports the Greek Government on the Macedonian issue.

The Premier, the member for Coles, the member for Hartley, and I were recently in Greece, and Greek Ministers will visit South Australia in the new year. On that occasion, the Premier, in the presence of the Ministers from the Greek Government, made a commitment to the Macedonian cause. The Premier, the member for Coles and I were also in Cyprus recently, so we are aware personally of the trauma that Greek Cypriots have suffered in Cyprus. We are also aware of the desecration that has been caused to Greek Orthodox churches, religious icons and paintings in Cyprus, which is an unmitigated disgrace. Today this House passed unanimously a motion calling for the withdrawal of Turkish troops from Cyprus, requesting that the Turkish Government recognise that the Cypriot problem can be solved simply by withdrawing its troops, and calling on Turkey to stop systematically killing Greek Cypriots. That is in line with the United Nations resolution.

The Government has supported the elderly Greek community through the Greek Welfare Centre of South Australia and will continue to do so. I also mention Reverend Father Stavros, who is the Greek Orthodox priest in my area. He looks after the Greek Orthodox community in the parish of Prophet Elias. He is a tireless worker for the faithful

in my electorate and I feel honoured that he is the parish priest.

The community is also well supported by Mr George Karatassas and his committee, who look after the welfare of elderly Greeks in the electorate of Norwood through the Greek Senior Citizens of Norwood. The Greek community has made a major contribution to our State in business, medicine, law and the arts, particularly in theatre. We have Theatro Oneiron, to which the State Government gave \$10 000 recently to produce a play called *Cafe Cavafy*. It also received a further \$60 000 to produce the play called *The Trojan Woman*.

I also acknowledge the contribution Greek people have made in government and in politics. One honourable member, Mr Steve Condous, is Greek and some Labor politicians are also of Greek heritage. Another person I should mention is Basil Taliangis. He is a leader in the Greek community and is Chairman of the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission. He has made a great contribution not only to the Greek community in this State but to South Australia as a whole.

I am not a member of the Greek Orthodox community. I have the advantage of looking from the outside in. I assure His All Holiness Dimitrios Archontonis Bartholomeos I that his flock is well looked after by the clergy of the Greek Orthodox Church in Australia and I assure him also that this Government is committed to the welfare of his church and the Greek people.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.53 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 12 November at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 5 November 1996

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

1. Ms WHITE:

1. What is the breakdown of how levied fees under the Construction Industry Training Fund Act have been distributed since the fund commenced?

2. What are the reasons for the proportions of the funds distributed between regions?

3. What are the guidelines for determining whether an organisation will receive funding and how are these allied in practice?

4. What rights of appeal does an unsuccessful applicant for funds have?

5. Are metropolitan group training schemes treated in the same way as non-metropolitan schemes when consideration is given to funding applications and if not, what special factors are considered?

6. Is any consideration given to the amount of training levy collected in a particular region when funding applications are considered from schemes operating in the region?

7. What is the breakdown of the proportion of fees levied for each region?

8. Does the current demand on training funds exceed levy collections and if so, what priorities have been identified for allocation of those funds available?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH:

1. The CITF Act 1993, Section 32 states 'A training plan must be prepared on the basis that money from the fund for the provision of training will be allocated to each sector of the building and construction industry in approximately the same proportions as the resources of the fund have been contributed by that sector.'

Thus total funds are distributed to sectors based on the proportion of funds collected from each sector. The distribution of these funds from 1 September 1993 to the end of June 1996 is as follows:

Housing	Commercial	Civil
\$'000s	\$'000s	\$'000s
3 051	2 185	1 312

2. Whilst funds collected from each sector are distributed back to the sectors in the same proportions, the specific distribution of funds between regions will be significantly dependant upon whether the regional members have applied for funding assistance and have met the required selection criteria.

Again, as outlined earlier, the CITB responds to the training priorities determined by the industry in the annual training plan.

The CITB responds to recommendations from the industry in the development of training priorities through the members of the sector standing subcommittees and the specialist service working party in accordance with the legislation. The membership of these committees is open to all industry participants and includes representatives from employer and employee and trade associations which have regional membership.

During 1995-96 the CITB approved funding of over \$110 000 to support the training of 1 440 persons resident outside of the metropolitan area.

This does not include individuals travelling to the metropolitan area to undertake training and apprentices employed by group training schemes who are located in regional areas.

This also does not include other indirect funding, e.g. skills centres, which also deliver training services to the regions.

3. When a particular organisation requests funding assistance for training, reference is made to the following:

- The budget available against the relevant priority in the annual training plan determined by the sectors;
- The type of funding requested, the associated policy guidelines and the merits of the application.

The CITB provides funding assistance for the following:

- Skills centres' operational and capital funding;
- Entry level training;
- Training rebate (for those attending training courses);

- Provision of funding for training providers who wish to run training programs;
- Research;
- Access and equity.

The CITB has developed comprehensive policies and procedures in all of the above areas which are referred to when assessing applications. These policies and procedures have been developed with full consideration of the importance of public accountability, flexibility and fair and equitable treatment.

4. In the event of an applicant being unsuccessful, they may appeal to the board of the CITB. The board consists of 11 members, including one independent presiding member, eight representing employer and employee organisations in the building and construction industry and two persons with experience in vocational education and training.

Each appeal is considered individually by the board with reference to and input from the sector standing subcommittees to ensure full and fair treatment.

5. Whilst all group training applicants must meet the general selection criteria, specific consideration is given to the special needs of regional areas. The CITB policy for funding of entry level training specifies, as one of its general principles, that the special needs and costs of regional areas must be considered in the assessment of applications.

It is important to note that those group training schemes which currently receive funding from the CITB operate statewide schemes, i.e. employ apprentices/trainees who are resident in various locations throughout the State of South Australia.

The board has developed a comprehensive policy for the funding of entry level training, whereby all applicants, irrespective of their location, are assessed against the selection criteria outlined at 3. above. At all times the board is cognisant of its fiduciary duties and in all situations public accountability has been of paramount importance.

6. Funds are specifically allocated against the training priorities developed by the sector standing subcommittees which represent the industry and form the basis of the annual training plan. These priorities are based on information from research, individual consultation and workshops. Funds are always allocated against priorities and not according to the amount of funds collected by a particular region or individual organisation. In the development of the priorities, any special needs of regional areas are considered and incorporated.

The level of building and construction work undertaken in many regional areas in South Australia is relatively low in relation to the levy funds collected in metropolitan areas. To allocate the funds on any basis other than strategic priorities would mean that regional areas and individual building and construction industry members would not receive necessary training funds and therefore be seriously disadvantaged. If the CITB were to allocate funds on a regional basis according to the amount of funds collected from a particular region, this would be contrary to the Act and would severely disadvantage those in regional areas.

At the time of the development of the priorities for funding within the annual training plan, specific attention is paid to ensuring that the needs of disadvantaged groups, including those in regional areas are addressed.

7. For the purposes of the response to this question, the Australia Post classification of regions has been used. The following analysis is based on a sample of \$4.3 million levy income collected from July 1995 to June 1996.

Region	Percentage
City	7
Metropolitan areas (North West, South West, East and Outer)	70
North (Covering Eyre Peninsula, Nullarbor Plain, Aboriginal Lands, Simpson Desert, Strzelecki Desert etc.)	4
Mid North (Covering Yorke Peninsula, Flinders Ranges and the Eastern border of SA)	2
South (Covering Fleurieu Peninsula, Kangaroo Island and the Coorong through to the Southern most point of SA)	13
Barossa and Riverland	4

8. In most program areas where funding assistance is requested, the current demand on training funds does exceed levy collections.

In the 1996-97 annual training plan a number of priority training programs have been determined including:

- Entry level training;
- Research and development;
- Access and equity;
- Upskilling and cross-skilling.

Under the program for access and equity, the board has put in place strategies to ensure that a minimum of 10 per cent of training places be delivered to people from the regions, direct input from the regions is obtained through workshops and seminars and relevant self-paced learning resources be produced to assist regional workers.

Within all programs specific priorities have been identified.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT INFOLINE

8. **Mr ATKINSON:** Why does the Passenger Transport InfoLine close at 8 p.m. when services continue until almost midnight?

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

During the mid 1980's the opening hours of the Passenger Transport InfoLine were 6.00 a.m. to 10.30 p.m., but the volume of calls was assessed as being too low to warrant the cost of providing an early morning and late night service. Consequently, since the late 1980's the InfoLine has been operating from 7.00 a.m. to 8.00 p.m. There have been very few requests made to the InfoLine for services to be provided outside the present operating hours.

A customer research survey of the Information Services is being planned for early next year. If the survey suggests that it is warranted, then the Minister for Transport will ask the Passenger Transport Board to examine the option of extending the hours, including a cost/benefit analysis.

GRANTS FOR SENIORS PROGRAM

18. **The Hon. M.D. RANN:**

1. What funding will be available for distribution to seniors groups as part of the Grants for Seniors program in 1996-97?

2. When will applications for this year's program be called and when will grants to successful applicants be distributed?

3. Why are applications no longer called for in May with funding distributed in October of each year during Seniors week as was the case up until 1994?

4. Is the Government in the process of revising the application process and if so, why and what are the expected changes?

5. Is the Government in the process of revising the eligibility criteria and if so, why and what are the expected changes?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:

1. The State Government has again allocated \$197 000 to the Grants for Seniors Program for 1996-97. However the \$45 000 grant for 1996-97 to the Council on the Ageing (SA) (COTA) for Seniors Week was paid last financial year leaving a balance of \$152 000 for allocation to community groups in 1996-97.

2. In July this year the Grants for Seniors Program was transferred to the Office for the Ageing from the Community Services Division, Department for Family and Community Services.

The Office for the Ageing is currently in the process of making the necessary arrangements for administering the program. The office expects to advertise the program early in 1997 and successful applicants will be notified of their grant soon after.

3. The timeframe for calling and distributing the funds has changed to fit in with other workload demands and priorities.

4. The Government is not planning to revise the application process for 1996-97.

5. No, the Government is not revising the eligibility criteria for 1996-97.

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

19. **Mr LEWIS:**

1. How much has been collected in levies and other charges for the Construction Industry Training Fund to date?

2. How much has been spent directly on training to date?

3. What criteria are used to determine eligibility of a training agency to receive funding for training?

4. How much was spent in each of the past three financial years on office rent, board and staff salaries, travel costs for the board and for the staff, and all other costs related to the board and staff such as entertainment, education, seminars, etc?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH:

1. As at 30 September 1996 the Construction Industry Training Board had collected \$12 708 000 in levies and other charges.

2. As at 18 October 1996 the Construction Industry Training Board had expended \$5 721 303 on the facilitation or conduct of training. In addition, as at 18 October 1996, the Construction Industry Training Board had awarded training contracts valued at \$9 039 000 to conduct various training programs over the next 12 months.

3. The Construction Industry Training Board has a policy which establishes the guidelines against which training programs, and thus training providers, are considered for approval to receive funding from the Construction Industry Training Board. The criteria stated in the policy include:

- (a) the providers ability to deliver the training and the outcomes expected,
- (b) are the proposed outcomes to be achieved by the program consistent with those detailed in the annual training plan,
- (c) the cost effectiveness of the program,
- (d) the experience and reputation of the provider,
- (e) the availability of funds.

4. The Construction Industry Training Board has spent the following in each of the past three financial years on those matters referred to in the honourable member's question:

Category	FY 93-94	FY 94-95	FY 95-96
Office Rent	\$22 763	\$26 008	\$31 200
Board and Staff Salaries, including Superannuation	\$259 590	\$350 210	\$429 889
Travel Costs, including motor vehicle expenses for the board and for staff	\$11 253	\$14 345	\$21 822
All other costs related to the operation of the board	\$248 822	\$183 904	\$298 640