

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 14 November 1996

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

### MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER: Order! Yesterday the member for Spence raised as a matter of privilege part of an article in the *Australian* which he said reflected on the impartiality of the Chair. I thank him for bringing the article to my attention. It is certainly ironical in content (as is the whole article) and indicates a somewhat misplaced cynicism about the parliamentary process. However, I am not convinced that it fits the test of my earlier ruling and, even if it did, I take the view that it would be beneath the dignity of the House to deal with it. I therefore decline to give the matter further precedence.

### SUMMARY OFFENCES (PROSTITUTION) AMENDMENT BILL

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Summary Offences Act 1953 and to make related amendments to the Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act 1986 and the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988. Read a first time.

Mr LEGGETT: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

Last month, I spoke on the final report on prostitution of the Social Development Committee, of which I am Deputy Chair. On that occasion I said that I would be introducing a Bill to implement some of the recommendations of the South Australian police to update South Australian prostitution laws. I am pleased to be able to introduce that legislation today. I introduce it for the sake of the young women and young men of South Australia, especially those who are still in their teens. They are the ones who are particularly vulnerable in these tough economic times. The South Australian Government is successfully working on the unemployment problem, but it also needs to work at helping the South Australian police tackle the exploiters in our community who take advantage of the weakness and vulnerability of others to trap them into damaging lifestyles.

The South Australian police have told us that the laws relating to prostitution, many of them in the Summary Offences Act, have not been updated since 1953 so that they are now not suited to the high-tech credit card world that prostitution traders are able to exploit. This Parliament is renowned for updating other laws that need amendment because of changed circumstances. This matter is no different.

I have discovered that many people are not aware of the principles underlying our present laws on prostitution. They do not realise that in 1864, in the middle of the reign of Queen Victoria, brothels were legalised in Britain. In what is often considered a prudish period in history, the British Government was persuaded that legal brothels plus licensed, regularly inspected prostitutes would stop the spread of sexually transmitted diseases. There are similar arguments put forward for legal brothels today. The only trouble was that legal brothels did not solve the disease problem in Queen Victoria's time, and they will not solve it today, either. Syphilis and gonorrhoea increased rather than decreased after

brothels were legalised. In addition, there was a great increase in the exploitation and corruption associated with the prostitution trade. A 20 year campaign led by Mrs Josephine Butler, wife of an Anglican vicar, was eventually successful in repealing the 1864 Contagious Diseases Act and establishing the principles of prostitution law known as the Suppression Model, which underlies our present laws and also United Nations resolutions.

There is no South Australian law against the act of prostitution when it is confined to a private arrangement between two people without advertising, nuisance or any third party involvement. However, as soon as prostitution becomes a part of a regular commercial business with third parties profiting from the act or nuisance being caused, the law steps in. The biggest penalties are reserved for the exploiters—those who procure prostitutes for the use of others; those who run organised prostitution businesses such as brothels; and people, including pimps, landlords and publishers of prostitution advertisements, who profit from the prostitution of others.

The Bill before us today updates the Summary Offences Act in response to the report on prostitution laws by the South Australian police, which was tabled in this House in March last year. That report did not consider the moral issue regarding the sale of sexual acts but noted:

Attempts by other Australian States, Victoria in particular, to decriminalise or regulate prostitution appears to have had only limited success.

The South Australian police recommended against decriminalisation because of the criminality associated with the sex industry, but recommended that the Summary Offences Act be updated to make the Act more enforceable.

The Bill before us addresses these concerns in its amendments to section 28 of the Summary Offences Act (where the term 'money' would include credit cards) and section 32 (where police would be authorised to use reasonable force to enter suspected brothels). The only change to section 21, which is currently used by police to prosecute both prostitutes and clients found in brothels without reasonable excuse, is to require that those prosecuted under this section do not have to go to court. Male clients and others would, if they so chose, be able to plead guilty and pay a fine in a manner similar to the procedure with some traffic offences.

The purpose of this amendment is to make a clear distinction between this type of minor offence and the more serious offences of keeping a brothel, procuring, pimping and so on. Police prosecute persons under section 21 of the Summary Offences Act only on the second occasion of finding the person in breach of the Act. A caution is given on the first occasion, and there is no discrimination on the basis of sex. It is my hope that the South Australian Government will support a task force, drawn from community groups with a record of successful rehabilitation of prostitutes, to liaise with the police so that people cautioned or charged under this section could, if they wished, be helped to leave the prostitution industry and be rehabilitated. In Norway and Sweden counselling of clients has resulted in considerable success and a significant decline in their use of prostitutes.

I now come to perhaps the most significant aspect of the Bill, the new section 32A, which would make advertising prostitution, directly or indirectly, a specific offence. At present, those who profit from the prostitution trade by receiving money for prostitution advertising are indirectly in breach of the law. Section 32A would remove any doubt about the situation. A considerable number of witnesses to the

Social Development Committee's recent inquiry into prostitution mentioned their concern that some 75 per cent of the South Australian prostitution trade is now carried on by escort agencies, which were not around in 1953 when our prostitution laws were last amended. Some people have argued that escort agencies are more dangerous for the prostitutes than brothels because the women have less protection from abusive clients, and it is supposedly easier to enforce blood tests and Pap smears on women in brothels. I am not convinced by these arguments. A woman who worked in many different brothels and who grew to hate them told me that the competition between prostitutes in brothels can do a lot of psychological—not to mention physical—damage.

The fact remains that under our present laws, the incidence of sexually transmitted diseases among South Australian prostitutes is remarkably low. Part of the reason for the low incidence of disease is simply because prostitution is minimised in this State and is, therefore, a seller's market. The prostitute can impose his or her terms on condom use and what acts she or he will or will not do. It is in the highly competitive situation associated with legal prostitution that buyers can shop around for particularly dangerous and offensive practices. Another reason was mentioned by the member for Playford on 17 October. He said that if the potential for contracting a transmitted disease such as HIV/AIDS does not deter a person from not wearing a condom, he did not think a fine or any other penalty would make much difference.

I am concerned about escort agency prostitution as well as brothel prostitution. The South Australian police told the Social Development Committee that the most effective way of minimising escort agencies would be a crackdown on advertising. That is what section 32A aims to do. This section would not affect those who did not intend to publish an advertisement for prostitution. It provides for police to give a written warning to the effect that a particular advertisement or an advertisement of a specific type is capable of implying that prostitution is available. Many parents have complained to me about the extent of escort agency advertising in the *Yellow Pages*, which suggests but does not say outright, that sexual services are available. These offensive ads go to virtually every South Australian home.

Section 32A of my Bill would enable police to issue a warning to the South Australian representatives of *Yellow Pages* that this type of advertising is unacceptable so that hopefully the next edition would exclude it. There are additional amendments to other Acts listed in the schedule of the Bill, which extend the circumstances in which the assets of criminals involved in the prostitution trade may be confiscated and which ensure that prostitution convictions and penalties cannot be waived arbitrarily.

I have received many responses since I announced my intention to oppose the recommendations of half the Social Development Committee to legalise the prostitution trade and to introduce my own private member's Bill to update the present law along the lines suggested by the South Australian police. The vast majority supported my proposal. However, I did receive one letter in opposition. The writer said that he would rather have a brothel than a deli next door and demanded to know how many brothels I had visited and how many prostitutes I had talked to in the course of the Social Development Committee inquiry. I have talked to a number of prostitutes and madams as, indeed, have all my colleagues on the Social Development Committee. A brothel madam in Canberra confided her concern that, with brothels legal there,

the police never came near them. All sorts of unsavoury things were going on about which she was unhappy but no action was being taken. A former prostitute from Melbourne said she had worked alongside under-age prostitutes but police never came to check.

It was clear from evidence we received that drugs are a real problem in prostitution. We were told that some women enter prostitution to pay for their drug habit, while others take up drugs, including marijuana and alcohol, to take their minds off what is being done to their bodies. I was also very interested to hear on Adelaide Radio 5AA one Sunday night last June when talkback compare Father John Fleming interviewed a young woman criminologist from Norway, Dr Liv Finstad. Dr Finstad said she had been involved in prostitution research for a number of years and had helped to write a book called *Backstreets: prostitution, money and love*, published a few years ago. Dr Finstad said that she and her colleagues had found that even though all the prostitutes they followed up said initially that they had enjoyed their occupation, this was not the case.

After the researchers had formed a relationship of trust with the women, they discovered that the prostitutes hated what they were doing and tried all sorts of physical and psychological mechanisms to distance themselves emotionally from their clients. The prostitutes always insisted that clients use condoms, for example, because condoms provide a barrier. Their boyfriends did not have to use condoms. However, these mechanisms the prostitutes tried to use did not solve their problems. Dr Finstad reported that each of them suffered severe personality damage as a result of their occupation. She described prostitution as a form of violence against women. There are increasing calls today for stronger laws to protect women against violence and my Bill would be a step in that direction.

I have also received a number of letters from representatives of South Australian local councils. Most have been unimpressed by the draft Bill from the Social Development Committee's final report on prostitution, which would not allow councils the right to veto any brothel in their area. Councils want to be able to continue to telephone the police about problem brothels in their area and have the matter dealt with promptly. This is what the member for Playford said in the House last month.

I have also received letters and telephone calls from many church leaders indicating support for my proposals and, in particular, an emphasis on rehabilitation of prostitutes caught in the trade, possibly due to circumstances beyond their control. I record my appreciation of the numerous community groups who have put in long hours needed to get alongside the young men and women involved in prostitution, show them real love and friendship and, in some cases, successfully rehabilitate them. Such groups need Government encouragement and practical support, of which they are not receiving enough at this time. However, I am not naive enough to believe that rehabilitation services alone will minimise the prostitution trade. If the trade is legal, procurers will entice a new teenager into the trap to replace everyone who is helped out of it.

It is not good enough to have an ambulance service at the bottom of the cliff to pick up the pieces and rehabilitate all the people who fall off. You need a barrier around the top of the cliff. In the case of prostitution and many other social evils the law acts as that barrier. The law has a two-fold function: first, it punishes wrongdoing; and, secondly, it educates the community. It sends a message which says that

this action is wrong: do not do it. Someone once said that you cannot legislate morality, but in fact legislation is entirely about morality. Legislation punishes immoral actions, whether they be murder, stealing or fraud. They are immoral actions and the law warns people not to do it. No such law has ever eradicated murder, stealing or fraud, but there is no doubt that life would be much more precarious for us all if we did not have laws against these things.

At present a protective barrier at the top of the prostitution cliff—the prostitution law barrier—has significant defects: it is not working as well as it ought. My Bill aims to strengthen those weaknesses and correct those defects and I urge all members to support it.

**Mr BRINDAL** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: PORT ROAD**

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I move:

That the forty-first report of the committee on the Port Road widening, Phillips Street to Gaol Road, be noted.

The Department of Transport proposes to widen the Port Road at Thebarton from Phillips Street down to Gaol Road at an estimated cost of some \$6 million. This section of Port Road is one of the most heavily utilised arterial roads in Adelaide, with traffic being congested for most of the day. The proposal attempts to combat these congestion problems by widening Port Road at Thebarton to three create lanes of traffic in each direction. There is also an intention to enlarge the various road intersections along that strip of roadway. This project will extend from those works already approved and undertaken in conjunction with the replacement of the Hindmarsh Bridge and will complete the road widening project from Park Terrace to the rail overpass adjacent to the Thebarton Police Barracks.

The proposed works are necessary due to the high traffic volumes carried by this road and extensive delays experienced by the intersections. The traffic volume now is approximately 48 500 vehicles per day, making it the most utilised four-lane road in South Australia. In fact, the level of congestion and delay has been calculated to exceed acceptable limits for up to three hours each working day. Furthermore, the Public Works Committee is mindful that accident rates on this stretch of road are well above the Adelaide average and, as such, members of the committee consider that the safety improvements associated with this proposal will assist in reducing this risk for commuters.

The responsibility for this section of Port Road between Phillips Street and Gaol Road is shared by the City of Adelaide and the Department of Transport. More specifically, the Department of Transport is responsible for the sections between Phillips Street and East Terrace, and the Adelaide City Council is responsible for the section between East Terrace and Gaol Road. It is therefore proposed that funds for this project be provided individually by the Department of Transport and the City of Adelaide, with each contributing to the works for its portion of the road. In summary, the Public Works Committee is very supportive of the proposed upgrade to Port Road at Thebarton. Therefore, pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the committee recommends that the proposed public works proceed.

Motion carried.

### **EXECUTIVE SALARIES**

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** I move:

That this House requests the Economic and Finance Committee to investigate all public sector salaries of \$100 000 or more, regardless of how they are constructed, and the salary fixation methods which underpin these salary determinations.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to move this motion, because in the past two or three years I have been somewhat concerned about salary package arrangements. In fact, when the Economic and Finance Committee last examined this area four years ago it found that it was a problem within statutory authorities. We now find that some individuals in the Public Service are being paid a salary up to \$.25 million. There was debate earlier this year about the provision of plain-plated Government vehicles to some members of the Public Service. I understand that sales tax must be paid on plain-plated Government vehicles supplied to State Government personnel and, as a result, in many instances, the cost of salary packages has risen dramatically. I understand that there are about 200 such vehicles; therefore, I expect that within the Public Service there are about 200 salaries or more in this bracket. Heaven knows what some employees of statutory authorities now earn.

I eagerly await the release of details in respect of executive salaries paid to multifunction polis bureaucrats. In previous times we found that 12 people, who achieved little or nothing for South Australia, cost \$2.1 million. Witnesses who appeared before the Economic and Finance Committee yesterday said that that number has dropped, but I will bet that the dollar value has not. We also discovered that one of these bureaucrats, whom we could be excused for not knowing about because he is never in Australia, earned over \$300 000. I will busily peruse the records from last year to discover whether or not we were told that this individual existed—I do not think we were.

I move this motion because it is appropriate that Parliament scrutinises the executive salaries earned by public sector employees, all of which are well and truly in excess of what a backbencher earns. It is also appropriate that we consider wage fixation methods. When the Economic and Finance Committee last looked at this problem, it was made aware of two groups of consultants who set the salaries. One group set salaries for banking people in Australia, and most banks paid into this organisation. Indeed, we discovered that, when the State Bank of South Australia was at the point of collapse, this group had recommended salaries for State Bank executives which were, in general, 75 per cent higher than those paid to executives of any other bank in Australia—regardless of size.

We found a similar consultancy operated in respect of SGIC. Interestingly, after the consultants had appeared before the committee, they were brought back the next week and they had given themselves another pay rise. We had to bring them before the committee again to sort the whole thing out. Now we find that the group that advised banks on salaries is now advising the Government and the public sector on salaries—and surprise, surprise, we find that those salaries have increased not by a small amount but by an enormous amount. Certainly, there are many public servants who would like these people fixing their wages because they would do an awful lot better than Jan McMahan and her crowd.

At the end of the day the motion should not take up too much time of the Parliament. It stands to reason that the Opposition expects the Government to support it because it

is appropriate that we should look regularly at this issue which is of considerable public interest. Indeed, it is an area where we can make a difference as a legislature over the top of a very arrogant and out of touch Government that said one thing several years ago in respect of Economic and Finance Committee recommendations and then went off and totally ignored them.

**Mr BASS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MONTAGUE ROAD**

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Oswald:

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

(Continued from 7 November. Page 469.)

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** The roads in question in this motion are located in my electorate, and the issue stems from a number of representations and speeches I have made in the House. The Montague Road issue has gone on since I was elected to this place, and I am told that it was a hot issue before that in the 1980s. The issue was made all the worse because in 1992 significant Federal funds—from memory \$14.6 million—were made available to do up the intersection of Montague Road and Main North Road, build a new six lane dual carriageway all the way to Port Wakefield Road and do up the Port Wakefield Road intersection with Montague Road.

I had no problem with that, except that, in the morning, it was a road that took people to where they did not work and, in the afternoon, brought them back to a place where they did not live. At the end of the day there was no great necessity to have this dual carriageway, but the Feds provided the money, so we accepted it and built the road. I have no problem with that. The real problem lies to the east of Main North Road and not to the west. Therefore, I want to put on record that a number of problems were associated with the thin strip of Montague Road that stretched between these two dual carriageways post the 1992 extension of Montague Road down to Port Wakefield Road.

The first problem was accessibility to Montague Road for those people living both to the north and to the south at Pooraka and at Montague Farm, which is off Montague Road. The second problem was the safety of both pedestrians and vehicular traffic on Montague Road at Pooraka. The third problem was the heavy volume of traffic on that road, most of which turns off before the extension road built four years ago. It is a nuisance to the residents of houses immediately on Montague Road to the southern side.

Numerous delegations resulted in a number of positive things being done. First, the intersection of Montague and Bridge Roads was redeveloped in 1993, and that certainly improved things. An extra turning lane was added at that intersection, which made a bit of difference. However, a number of other changes, which were based on all the best intentions in the world, made it a particularly dangerous strip of road. At Cowan Drive and Henderson Avenue, a turning lane was added, and what appears optically from Main North Road or Bridge Road to be a straight road is not: there are a number of dangerous intersections along that road. In fact, two people were killed at the intersection of Henderson Avenue and Montague Road at the western end about 14 or 15 months ago. That sad event brought home the problems

relating to this road in my electorate. This three-lane dual carriageway narrows into a thin strip of road that is not even properly kerbed, and then, 700 metres further on, it widens into another dual carriageway with three lanes and a 90 km/h speed zone.

This measure is a result of the Minister for Transport's seeing the problem for herself, and I thank her for taking the time to do so. She came to my electorate office, we drove down there and I showed her the problem firsthand. Department for Transport officials were also present, and they were well aware of the problems of Montague Road. Stemming from those meetings, I put forward a temporary proposal to try to solve the problem for 10 years, which is what I believed was all I would get. I want to thank the Minister for coming back with what can only be described as a Rolls Royce proposal to fix the problem once and for all.

I understand that the member for Florey had something to do with that as well. He looked at the road, too, and he is well aware of the problems because the road connects his electorate to mine and down into the whole port region. It is a very useful road.

*The Hon. R.B. Such interjecting:*

**Mr QUIRKE:** Both of us, on our various field trips as the gun control committee, went down that road on numerous occasions, protecting your interests, Minister, and those of others in this House. I fully support the measure before the House, and I thank the Minister for Transport for finding the funds to sort it out. It is a tragedy that it took a couple of deaths—

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** What about Barton Road? It must be the way you approached it.

**Mr QUIRKE:** I think it must be. This is not the Barton Road of Playford. This piece of road is in need of these works. I thank the committee for being part of the approval process, and we look forward to the work commencing.

Motion carried.

#### **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 7 November. Page 472.)

**Mr BECKER (Peake):** The Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium is located in the electorate of Peake and some years ago, following the 1993 election, I represented the Premier at the commencement of the season and was handed a set of plans for what was considered to be the ultimate redevelopment of Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium at an anticipated cost of about \$20 million. So, I am delighted that the Government and the two major national soccer league clubs have agreed finally to commence the first stage of the redevelopment at a cost of just over \$8 million. I am pleased that something is being formalised that will lay a strong foundation.

I was quite concerned about the redevelopment of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium and I took the opportunity, when given the chance to attend a conference in Hong Kong for the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, to go to Germany to look at a purpose built soccer stadium. I was shown the Cologne Stadium, which is similar to Football Park but which has an athletics track in the middle of it, and I then went to Leverkusen and saw what I believe is the ultimate in soccer stadiums—purpose built, excellent facilities, seating about

25 000 people and including medical science rooms, training rooms, committee rooms and club facilities all incorporated in a site similar to Hindmarsh. I was most impressed and I hope that ultimately we can come up with something like that at Hindmarsh.

Soccer has proved to be an extremely important and valuable contributing sport enjoyed by not only the ethnic communities but also everyone in this city, this State and this country. Australia has done very well when you consider the population and the youth of this country compared with other soccer nations around the world. It will not be long before we will see Australia at the top of the list with other soccer nations. I anticipate that it will not be long before there will be world championships and Pacific region championships in which Australian soccer will be heavily involved, and there will be the opportunity to play soccer at Hindmarsh on an international level. I believe that this will be done through the good graces of cable and satellite television: in other words, the entertainment people realise that sports entertainment is far better and far cheaper to record, film and use as an entertainment than full-length movies.

So, I believe that sport will be given a much greater profile as cable television—or pay television as we know it—expands. It puts us on the map internationally. I am delighted to think that the first stage will be of international standard and will also allow Adelaide to bid, hopefully successfully, for some of the events leading up to the finals for the Sydney 2 000 Olympics. I have spoken to some people looking after our office in Sydney to obtain the business contracts and establish our good name and reputation in New South Wales for the Sydney Olympics, and that has been very well done. I compliment and congratulate everybody associated with that. The tragedy is that as the local member I was not made aware formally or officially that the Public Works Committee was looking at this stadium proposal.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** That was very disrespectful.

**Mr BECKER:** As the member for Giles says, it was very disrespectful. Nor was I aware that the decision had been made and that an announcement would be made in the local newspaper. I have never had any argument with any of the Public Works Committee's work or decisions. As the member for Giles says, whenever any matter arose in my electorate under Labor Governments, the Minister always made sure that he or the committee advised me. I remember that the Minister, Geoff Virgo, used to ring me, saying, 'Now listen, I'm coming down to your electorate. We're doing something down at West Beach: be there, because I want to hear what you have to say and whether there are any problems; otherwise, that is the end of the issue.' That is why I felt a little put out when I read about it in the local newspaper when I had not been advised that the committee was looking at it or that the decision had been made.

The decision in relation to car parking is one of my concerns, because I surveyed my constituents in that area some time ago. Only about 80 were involved, but at least I wanted to know their views about car parking. I think we can resolve that issue. If major events are held in that area, temporary road closures can easily overcome some of those problems. What really annoyed me was the article in the *Public Service Review* written by Randall Ashbourne headed 'Sweet revenge over sour deal'. The financial operation and so on had nothing to do with me: all I did was fax to the Acting Chairman my point, as follows:

It is common courtesy and decency to let your own colleagues (if there are any) know you are releasing a press release affecting their electorate.

I was being facetious, but I was letting him know. The article continued:

Public Works handling of Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium issue relating to local MP leaves a lot to be desired. I have to field the complaints—thanks. Revenge will be sweet—I'm not up for re-election!

Then follows, 're headlines this week *Weekly Times*', which were attached. The headlines were 'Worries over Hindmarsh \$8 million plan' and 'Committee questions parking pending ownership'. The committee is quite capable of making those decisions and looking after that side of it. Before I copped a couple of phone calls, it would have been nice to know what was going on so that I could say, 'That is the committee's decision; the Government has a month to respond to it and, if you have any concerns, contact the committee.' But, as far as I am concerned, I am delighted to see the thing going ahead. I have been smeared, slandered and God knows what in this article by Randall Ashbourne, who ought to know better. Somehow he has jumbled up the whole of the article.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** That is interesting. The shadow Attorney-General says I have been libelled. It does not make much difference to me; I do not believe in throwing good money after bad. I believe that I am owed an apology over that article. It is unfortunate that the article incorporated that attitude, as well as criticism of two of my colleagues, which is most unnecessary. I believe that the allegation is false anyway, because the information I have received is that the allegation simply does not stack up. As I see it, the people who are involved and who are doing all they can to assist and gain a benefit for the community, unfortunately, have been subject to allegations that are not true. We want the best for soccer. Here is an opportunity to give soccer and all the soccer clubs in this State, as well as the people involved and associated with soccer, a first-class facility.

That is all we want to see built. There are problems with car parking, but I think we can solve those problems without much difficulty. The Hindmarsh Woodville Council has been most cooperative with the soccer organisation and clubs and the Government in ensuring that, eventually, this facility is something of which we can all be proud. I hope that each and every person has the opportunity to witness many games in the lead up to the Sydney 2000 Olympics. In other words, we will have the chance to see some of the most brilliant European soccer teams play at Hindmarsh, because they know of our facility through their association with soccer in this State, and we should now take every opportunity to show them we care.

**Mr De LAINE** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### **SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: PROSTITUTION**

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Leggett:

That the final report of the committee inquiry into prostitution be noted.

(Continued from 17 October. Page 224.)

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** I am the only survivor of the Social Development Committee that started investigating the prostitution reference—

**Mr Quirke:** No, you're not.

**Mr ATKINSON:** —from the other place in 1992.

**Mr Quirke:** I am, too.

**Mr ATKINSON:** On the committee. Upon the failure of the Gilfillan Bill to win a majority in the other place in 1992, it was referred to us—rather like a stale loaf is referred to a dust bin. The committee did not deliberate on prostitution for four years continually: it was interrupted by references on HIV, family leave from employment and rural poverty. The member for Unley's criticism of the committee for procrastinating was always unjust. The committee had six members, and it brought down a report with a majority position adhered to by three members, a minority report supported by two members (including me), and a minority report of one member.

I should add, however, that the Hon. Sandra Kanck does not support the majority Bill or the majority position: she is, in fact, a supporter of free availability of prostitution, and has said so many times. In fact, the real split is 2-2-1-1. However, I think this is a reasonable outcome. One could have taken six South Australians at random, put them on the same committee and expected six different reports, given the array of possible legislative models and the differing values in our society. The majority position would be more correctly called the plurality position, but it became the majority position partly because the Presiding Officer, the Hon. Dr Bernice Pfitzner, cast two votes on the committee to make her position prevail, that is, a deliberative vote followed by a casting vote. The fact that Dr Pfitzner had those votes affected the deliberations of the committee because we all knew she had them in any dispute.

If there were a just criticism of the committee's marathon inquiry into prostitution it would be this: our prostitution law is essentially a law prohibiting brothels and soliciting in a public place, and our current law dates from 1907, and earlier, when telephones, let alone mobile phones and escorts in motor vehicles, were not contemplated by legislators. Adelaide's escort agencies run more than three-quarters of the sex trade in our State. The escort agencies are happy with the current law because it does not affect their operations: indeed, it boosts their share of the trade at the expense of brothels.

It follows that, when the Social Development Committee advertised its inquiry, the escort agencies saw no point in making a submission about changing the law. The people who ran Adelaide's brothels, however, were keen to change the law, and it was they who gave a disproportionate share of the evidence to the committee. Some of the evidence from the brothel owners and their employees was that escort work involved a serious risk of being assaulted by the customer in his home or hotel room whereas brothel work was comparatively safe owing to the presence of other workers in the brothel. This line was accepted by the Hon. Dr Bernice Pfitzner and me.

After our reports were published and I explained their main points on radio, the escort agencies telephoned me to deny that their work was significantly more dangerous than brothel work. They all regretted not giving evidence to the inquiry. Indeed, they asked me whether I could organise members of Parliament to visit some escort agencies and go out on some jobs with the driver and the escort. I had been intending to do this, but I detected among my fellow members of Parliament a weariness and impatience with prostitu-

tion law reform. It seems to me that, although the committee's report, including the two dissenting reports, is a good one, rich in evidence and useful analysis, Parliament has never before been so tired of the prostitution debate—and this is especially so among Government members.

I am not optimistic that Parliament will act on the report, although in my opinion it should. A Parliament in which one Party has a record majority is a good Parliament in which to change this outdated law. Members of Parliament are unduly nervous about prostitution debates. It is my experience that hardly any voters switch their votes about prostitution compared with, for instance, euthanasia. This is an appropriate place to recall the allegations that male members of the committee questioned some witnesses too harshly and were guilty of 'intellectual harassment'.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** Thank you. I am pleased to say that members of the committee paid careful attention to what the witnesses had to say and sometimes questioned them at length and persistently. That was our duty, and the Hon. Terry Cameron was outstanding in that respect. Ms Helen Vicqua, Ms Alison Partridge and Ms Debra McCulloch's objections to being cross-examined by the committee were the complaints of people whose evidence had been tested and found wanting, especially by the Hon. Terry Cameron. The Hon. Sandra Kanck's criticism, during debate on the noting of the interim report, of male members of the committee for their cross-examination disappointed me. The complaints against male members of the committee evaporated when it became known through the grapevine that the Hon. Terry Cameron would support a legalisation model. The criticism of male members of the committee was not really of their conduct but of their values and gender.

In the past, I have had the political support of the Festival of Light, the Christian organisation for moral standards that takes a traditional protestant approach to many social questions. The Festival of Light has strongly disagreed with minority report A, of which the member for Hartley and I are the authors, because it regards it as much too liberal. I am sorry that the Festival of Light regards our minority report A as a breach of my undertakings and my previous position in prostitution debates. After two years of taking evidence from brothel owners, prostitutes, a former prostitute, police, churches, a customer, an accountant, the Australian Taxation Office, academics and others, and after touring brothels and street beats in Victoria, New South Wales, the Australian Capital Territory and South Australia, one can hardly remain impervious to the evidence.

Of course, like all members of the committee I brought values and expectations to the hearings, but these had not merely to be applied to but tested against the evidence. I do not think I have changed my position radically but I have changed it somewhat, and if members want to crow about that and if the member for Unley wants to know why I have changed, the answer is: 'Events, dear boy, events'—I had the benefit of the evidence.

I thank the committee's writers: first, Mr John Wright; secondly, Ms Anna McNicol; and, thirdly, Ms Margaret McColl, who wrote most of the majority report and did it well. I thank Ms McColl for reading the draft of minority report A and I am ashamed to confess that she found a grammatical mistake. I thank the committee's Secretaries: first, Ms Victoria Evans; and, secondly, Ms Robyn Schutte. Ms Schutte and I had, on occasion, a full and frank exchange of views about the hearings, but I agree with her exclamation

on one occasion that an employee of the committee would have had to be brain dead not to have a personal opinion on the topic. Ms Schutte organised well the witnesses, hearings, transcripts and visits. The committee was never inconvenienced in that respect. I enjoyed the company of my fellow committee members, the members for Hartley and Hanson, the Hon. Terry Cameron, and the Hon. Sandra Kanck, with whom I enjoyed a lovely stroll around Kings Cross, Darlinghurst and Surry Hills and a tram trip, together with the Presiding Officer, to the Sexually Transmitted Diseases Clinic at Carlton, to the street beat at Inkerman Street, St Kilda.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** Did you get an offer?

**Mr ATKINSON:** No, as a matter of fact not one. I have had the advantage of reading the remarks of the Presiding Officer (Hon. Dr Bernice Pfitzner) about minority report A. The key to the member for Hartley's and my report is that, although we regard prostitution as a vice, we regard the employment of prostitutes by escort agency and brothel bosses as a much greater vice. By contrast, the Pfitzner Bill is a charter for employers in the trade and it is not surprising that the prostitutes themselves through the Sex Industry Network (SIN) have rejected it. The Pfitzner Bill forces prostitutes to work for an employer instead of themselves. If a prostitute tries to work for herself under the Pfitzner regime, she faces the insult of having her name entered on a public register as a prostitute, which employee prostitutes do not, or, in the alternative, having her work effectively criminalised for the first time in the State's history.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I remind the honourable member that he should not be canvassing the potential merit of the Bill.

**Mr ATKINSON:** The Bill is part of the report, Sir. A draft Bill is attached to the report. The Hon. Dr Bernice Pfitzner makes the untruthful allegation that the member for Hartley and I have not read the report and the Bill. As anyone who has served on the Social Development Committee with me knows, I am meticulous about the drafting of reports. I must have driven Margaret McColl to distraction with my reading and editing of the draft report. The Presiding Officer's allegation is false. The Hon. Dr Bernice Pfitzner criticises the member for Hanson's minority report B on the basis that:

The legislative recommendation here is a suppression model. In my experience, suppression of any human behaviour never leads to a better outcome. In fact, suppression always seems to lead to the opposite of the desired effect.

Examples of human behaviour such as murder, theft and looting spring to mind immediately. The Hon. Dr Bernice Pfitzner accuses the member for Hartley and me of being prudes because we say in our report that we think the public's opposition to prostitution would be stronger if people:

... were aware that what is practised in the legal trade interstate is rarely kissing and traditional missionary position sex but oral sex, anal sex, schoolgirl fantasies, male to male sex and sex with transsexuals.

The Hon. Dr Bernice Pfitzner then asks:

What is the traditional missionary position?

I am too shy to tell the Hon. Dr Bernice Pfitzner on the record, but I hope members of the parliamentary Liberal Party will remedy my omission at the next Party meeting. I should like to say much more about this motion, but alas my time has run out.

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** I note with interest the report of the Social Development Committee on the matter of prostitution. It was very long in the making and rather tedious in its deliberation—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** Tedious in the time taken in its deliberation. It is most interesting to note that the conclusions reached in the report were the conclusions that were canvassed in this House in terms of other Bills presented to this Chamber. One wonders at the time and effort taken by a committee to reach exactly the same—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** Sir, the member for Spence has had adequate time to present his case. I wish the honourable member would keep his mouth closed.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member's own comments were heard in polite silence by members of the House. The member for Unley has the floor.

**Mr BRINDAL:** The committee rather belatedly—as the member for Spence did interject—came to exactly the same conclusion as that forming the premise for a Bill previously before this Parliament. It is interesting to note that in the committee report there are three recommendations for a different Bill.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Spence again interjects and says 'And only three': I would contend that, given there were only six people on the committee, it is remarkable that we have an average of one Bill for every two members of the committee. In fact, the Bill which forms the majority report of the committee is one which the member for Spence has much delight in pointing out to the Chamber as very closely resembling—page after page, word after word, clause after clause—a Bill previously dealt with before this House.

The member for Spence has publicly given great credit to this Chamber for having previously considered the matter, and uses that as the excuse for his Bill. I am not disappointed, and I do not think any member of this Chamber should be disappointed, with the work and the effort that the Social Development Committee has put in. The evidence which it took and the thoroughness with which it looked at the matter is to be commended. I said that it was tedious, and I stick by the point that it was tedious. I stick by the point that it came to conclusions that we probably already knew it would come to. Nevertheless, it put in the honest and academic endeavour to reach those conclusions and came to them based on the evidence which it received.

Unfortunately, though, when it came to its conclusions, they were three different conclusions proposing three different solutions. Already this morning we see one of those solutions introduced in the Chamber, in the form of the Bill proposed by the member for Hanson. Whilst I cannot canvass that Bill, I can canvass, I believe, what is said in this report. He says in the context of this report that what he believes in most—and what I believe in most and I think what every member of this Chamber believes in most—is a chance for prostitutes to be able to go through rehabilitation if that is their choice. So, the member for Hanson says we should therefore have a Bill. What the member for Hanson does not say is that when I introduced the Bill previously I tried to achieve the same aim. I think the Hon. Dr Pfitzner tried to pursue the same aim. If this Parliament is ever capable of coming up with a form of words that can legislate for rehabilitation, I will be the first to support it, because the fact is that you cannot legislate for rehabilitation.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Spence says it is a budget matter. I put to him that he is being rather trite. It is not a budget matter; it is a matter of desire on the part of a person to rehabilitate and, no matter how much money you make available, you cannot compel someone to want to change a way of life, to want to change. So, the aim of rehabilitation is laudable. The chance of this or any other Chamber in this country ever being able to legislate for rehabilitation of prostitutes or of criminals, to legislatively come up with a form of words that enables rehabilitation is, I think, very doubtful.

The member for Spence in his part of the report has a diabolical little plan, which he purveys to his electorate willy-nilly, which is that we will remove all the planning controls from matters related to brothels so that they can spring up in the leafy suburbs of Burnside, Unley and other places. The member for Spence is not very well informed, because there are already brothels in the leafy suburbs of Unley. They are as big a problem—

**Mr Atkinson:** Exactly. That is my point. Pfitzner wants to shift it—

**The Hon. M.D. Rann:** There is one right near a school in Black Forest.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, members.

**Mr BRINDAL:** The Leader of the Opposition, as he is yesterday's man, again proves it. He is quite right. There was one opposite—

**The Hon. M.D. Rann:** Right near the school.

**Mr BRINDAL:** —opposite the school.

**The Hon. M.D. Rann:** And you were proud of it.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I ask the leader to withdraw that comment.

**The Hon. M.D. Rann:** I withdraw the comment.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, Leader. It was not an appropriate comment to make.

**Mr BRINDAL:** If the Leader did his homework he would well know that I made sure that that was given the attention due to it under the current law and was closed almost immediately. It has not been in existence for some time. The fact is, as the Leader points out, against his own member, planning controls are necessary under any regime, under any form of law. It is not acceptable to have a tannery in certain areas.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** It is not acceptable to have an oil refinery in certain areas. The member for Spence says, 'What noise does it make?' I would remind—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Spence, as I said before, is quite out of order.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I remind members of this House to read some of the previous contributions of the member for Spence who, railing and fulminating against these establishments, claimed that they were noisy; claimed that the only problem with them was the noise they were making. Now he sits there saying—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The interjection was, 'It's not the brothel that makes the noise, it's the customers.' I put to the member for Spence that often it is the machines that make the noise, not the factory. What is the difference? Some of his contributions are inane.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Unley has the floor.

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Spence said, 'Every place has an equal chance of getting one.'

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The Leader of the Opposition says that I am obsessed. I am not showing any obsession with this at all. I happen to believe in social justice and a fair go for all, and that people should not be unfairly penalised. We have a law that is abhorrent and unjust when a woman can be penalised for providing a service to a man that the man seeks, and the man walks away without penalty. If the Leader of the Opposition sees that as obsession, then I plead guilty. I have an obsession, and it is an obsession towards justice, social justice and a fair go for all. Therefore, I propose to move the following amendment:

After the word 'noted', insert the words 'and in particular, that all members of the committee agree on the need for change in the current laws. However, given the divergent views of the committee and those expressed in the debates in the Chamber during this session, this House resolves to encourage further community consultation and commends it to the early attention of the Forty-Ninth Parliament.'

**Mr LEWIS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### **EQUAL OPPORTUNITY (APPLICATION OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT PROVISIONS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Second reading.

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

*That this Bill be now be read a second time.*

We are dealing with a clear case of it being important for the Parliament, the Government and for all political Parties to act in a bipartisan way and get cracking on extending sexual harassment laws to cover politicians, judges and local councillors. All of us are concerned at reports that this could again be delayed more than two years after a recommendation had been received that they be included. At the moment, members of Parliament, judges and councillors are immune to sexual harassment prosecution because they are not regarded as being the employers of their staff. The people who work for them and for us are employed by Government departments and, therefore, are answerable to the department's Chief Executive Officer or to the Commissioner for Public Employment.

This loophole in the law, which did not apply only in South Australia, was discovered in 1994, when the then New South Wales Police Minister (Mr Terry Griffiths) resigned over allegations that he sexually harassed female members of his staff. A report to the South Australian Government—this Government—in 1994 by Brian Martin QC recommended changes to the State's law to cover MPs, judges and local government.

The Attorney-General, who then referred the Martin report to another committee for examination, said in August this year that he hoped to have legislation to Parliament by the end of the year. However, I am pleased that rather than more delays the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council (Hon. Carolyn Pickles) introduced legislation in July to ensure that MPs and judges were covered by existing State sexual harassment laws.



Whilst it appears that the Attorney seems to agree with the principle underlying the Bill, he concedes that Mr Martin QC, in his review of the equal opportunity legislation, recommended that acts of sexual harassment against staff by MPs, members of the judiciary and members of local government should be prohibited, but goes on to echo Chief Justice Doyle in warning that there could be difficulties in implementing the Equal Opportunity Act provisions and processes to cover the judiciary.

The Attorney also had concerns about the erosion of parliamentary privilege or at least the implications of the Equal Opportunity Act processes applying without qualification to members of Parliament. According to the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council, in relation to what the Attorney says in relation to this:

Along with the public at large I find it totally unacceptable that a select group of a few Parliamentarians should be the enforcement officers for breaches of the sexual harassment provisions. The public will not cop this at all.

People say that equal opportunity or sexual harassment laws apply to them in their workplace and therefore should equally and on the same basis apply to members of Parliament. I make very clear in introducing this Bill that the Hon. Carolyn Pickles and the Opposition are not in any way reflecting on any past or present member of Parliament. We are simply saying that Parliamentarians should not be the ones judging their own behaviour in respect of sexual harassment and neither should members of the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee. To borrow a phrase from the legal fraternity, no-one should be the judge in his or her own case. It is therefore vital that the Equal Opportunity Commission and tribunal have jurisdiction to cover offences by the classes of people to be covered by the legislation introduced by the Hon. Carolyn Pickles, just the same as has any other citizen. That is what it is all about: making sure that the same law applies to us, to judges and to members of local government as it does to everybody else in our society.

This issue of parliamentary privilege I find somewhat nonsensical. After all, we acknowledge that parliamentary privilege is there for a reason, but all members would be concerned that that privilege could be abused without effective sanctions. Parliamentary privilege can be no excuse for sexual harassment. Any sensible person in the community—the public jury out there—would regard that as nonsensical. Beyond legislative amendments, which the Attorney may wish to move to address the issues of parliamentary privilege, the point is also made that a particular protocol and processes should be developed to resolve complaints against judicial officers and members of Parliament. That may well be appropriate and the Opposition will be happy to work with the Attorney-General to ensure that proper processes are put in place. That should be a natural consequence of this Bill being passed. It should not be a stumbling block for that Bill. Fair, practical processes can then be worked out in due course.

The Attorney has indicated that a preferable approach would be for the recommendations made by Mr Martin QC to be dealt with as a package, comprehensively dealing with equal opportunity legislation. I hope that the Attorney-General will forgive me when I point out that we have now been waiting for more than two years for such a comprehensive reform package to appear. It has not yet materialised. But I am glad to hear that the Attorney has indicated that he has instructed Parliamentary Counsel in this regard in recent times. Obviously, the preference for a comprehensive

approach is commendable, but it should not stop this Bill being passed. It may be that the Government would wish to incorporate the provisions of this Bill into a comprehensive Bill to be introduced imminently. It comes down to the bottom line, that is, we in the Labor Party believe that we should set an example rather than following behind. The same provisions and penalties that apply to members of the public in their places of employment and elsewhere should apply to members of Parliament.

**Mr BASS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### **ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: BOARDS AND COMMITTEES**

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Becker:

That the eighteenth report of the committee on boards and committees—information systems and a public register be noted.

(Continued from 17 October. Page 229.)

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles):** I have made many speeches in my time in this Parliament, but I have never made one which has had such a devastating effect as the one I commenced on this subject on 17 October. If members cast their minds back, they would remember that the Premier attempted to keep confidential the boards and committees information system and refused to have a public register. I, along with every other member of the committee, said that this was not on. I railed against this at about 12 noon on that date and by 2 p.m. that afternoon we saw total capitulation by the Premier. I congratulate all members of the committee for hanging tough on this very important issue. It is pleasing to know that, at times, committees can be effective. On this occasion we had a 100 per cent victory over the forces of evil.

Motion carried.

#### **SELECT COMMITTEE ON PETROL MULTI SITE FRANCHISING**

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Caudell:

That the report of the Select Committee on Petrol Multi Site Franchising be noted.

(Continued from 17 October. Page 231.)

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** At the outset I want to make some acknowledgments. First, I thank the Chairman. When I joined the committee I had no knowledge of why petrol was dearer from one day to the next or why it was better to buy it earlier in the week rather than later—or of any of the dynamics of the industry. The Chairman did a very good job. He anticipated that the committee's hearings would finish within two months. I told him it would be 12 months: I was right and he was wrong. But, at the end of the day, a good report has been delivered. There are a number of key recommendations in this report to which I will draw members' attention. It would be remiss of me not to say that it was an invaluable learning experience for me and the other members of the committee. We have not had the experience in this industry that the Chairman, the member for Mitchell, has had. The exercise itself was worthwhile from that point of view if nothing else.

The report has made a number of key recommendations and I shall address some of those. One key issue is the need to introduce a further degree of competition into an industry which is extremely competitive. It is competitive now with

only four oil companies and with a further source of competition coming from the independent chain of petrol stations. Sadly, in South Australia, the independent petrol stations represent only 18 per cent of outlets (the average across Australia is 32 per cent). The committee heard all sorts of evidence.

When the Scorposes appeared before the committee, they used it as a sounding board for their own purposes. At the end of the day, what Scorpos was really after was a better deal from Shell, as were a number of other people who sought to use the committee process. In the end the committee came down with a very useful finding that there should be far greater transparency in petrol pricing in South Australia, that pricing ought to be monitored by the Government, the RAA and, above all, by the public. It is an absolute disgrace that petrol sold in metropolitan Adelaide for between 67¢ and 74¢ is sold at 82¢ or 85¢ a litre in country areas. The committee recommends that that process be exposed, that the door be opened and that light on all these transactions be clearly shown in our metropolitan daily publication so that everyone can see what is going on.

Another recommendation is that the number of independent resellers—currently 18 per cent—is increased significantly. We are of the opinion—and most members would agree—that the more resellers there are the better the process will be in South Australia. That will ensure that the discounting that we have all come to love—although many of us do not understand it—will continue. It is worth noting that, towards the end of the committee's deliberations, the Woolworths' proposal was announced, which will see a useful increase in the number of independent sellers in the market. Woolworths proposes to source its spirit from outside Australia which, in effect, means that we will have a fifth oil company in South Australia, which I believe will be extremely useful. I hope that move is implemented by the Government.

There was a suggestion by the committee that the Motor Fuel Licensing Board be abolished. I fully support that. The board has been used as a way of preventing any movement into the industry by independents and has become a court of last appeal for the industry to ensure that there is no competition within the industry. Frankly, the board is holding up competition in the petrol reselling market in South Australia. It will hold up developments by the oil companies and by others—including Woolworths—for new petrol stations in South Australia, so the Government should dispose of it at the earliest opportunity.

The report contains a series of other recommendations dealing with retail tenancy, franchise arrangements and a whole range of other issues. I want to provide an overview of the industry because I believe the oil companies made their case strongly: profitability levels in Australia are at such a point that there is only a 3 per cent or less return on investment. As a consequence, because the motoring public, including me, do not want to spend any more for fuel, it has to be sold in all sorts of different ways.

The multi site franchise, which triggered this debate, is one of those devices that is being used to try to restore a more acceptable level of profitability. A lot of franchisees would prefer things to be different. A lot of them are making a profit of 2.8¢ per litre, on average, on which they are lucky to pay their rent, and they have to make their money out of bread, milk and a range of other products. Hopefully, the new arrangements that are emerging will restore profitability and there will still be a role for people with an individual franchise to continue to work in this industry.

I commend the report to the House. I think that the committee did an extremely good job. The recommendations address most of the problems before the industry. Like all sets of recommendations, they will not make everybody happy, because the world changes and things move on. There are some landmark recommendations in the report, and the end of the Motor Fuel Licensing Board, greater competitiveness, far greater penetration of independents in the reselling market, the creation of a fifth oil company bringing in spirit that is sourced away from the four other oil companies in Australia, and a range of other measures will bring more profitability and greater security to the industry. We learnt that it is an extremely tough industry.

I thank the Chairman for the knowledge that he imparted to me and other members of the committee. He did an excellent job of guiding us through this process. I hope that the Government picks up the main findings of the report and sails ahead with it, because millions of dollars in investment depend on the Government's implementing the recommendations of this report. I commend it to the House.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### **ALMONDCO AUSTRALIA LTD**

**Mr ANDREW (Chaffey):** I move:

That this House congratulates the Riverland based almond processor Almondco Australia Ltd for its recent success in being named top new exporter at the 1996 South Australian Export Awards, which recognises that company's commitment to excellence and example to other South Australian exporters.

This award was presented at the South Australian Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry annual dinner on 18 October this year. In order to be eligible for the new exporter award, nominated companies have to have started exporting in the past three years. Speaking on behalf of Almondco at that presentation, the Managing Director (Mr Robert Bastian) said that the company was very proud to accept the award which vindicated its decision to focus on exports, and he said:

Australia is not the biggest almond producer in the world. Therefore we have to strive to be the best.

One of the strongest impressions that I have gained from dealing with Almondco and from reading its annual reports over the past couple of years is that this is a company with a firm focus on quality as the single most important means of differentiating it as a company from its competitors, both internationally and nationally.

During 1994, marketing presented some real challenges for the company. That year, Almondco processed more than 4 000 tonnes of almonds, which accounted for approximately two-thirds of the Australian crop. To get production into perspective, I point out that the USA crop in that year was about 327 000 tonnes and, as a result, Australian sales and prices suffered. Some 70 tonnes of almonds were exported from Almondco and a commitment was made for that company to participate in the Hong Kong Food Exhibition in May 1995.

Highlights of 1995 for that company, as well as the new plant being in operation and the achievement of ISO accreditation, were exceptionally good market prices and an increased penetration into export markets. The combination of a poor United States crop and the timing of Almondco's entry into the export market was very fortuitous. As a result

of the Hong Kong Food Exhibition in May, Almondco gained particularly good orders and the quality of the product and the ability to supply fresh, clean almonds meant that exports became a significant part of company sales for the 12 months to 30 June 1996. During this period, about 2 500 tonnes of almonds worth \$20 million were exported to European, Asian and Middle Eastern countries.

Another highlight was the visit to Australia by members of the Japanese Nut Association, which resulted in subsequent export orders. The ISO award has provided Almondco with immediate recognition from quality conscious customers and has certainly opened doors that otherwise might have been closed or just not available to that company.

The report dated May 1995 referred to the objective of attaining International Standards (ISO 9002) accreditation by mid 1996. In April this year, the company received that accreditation, which guarantees that the factory will operate and produce goods of a high and specified quality. To retain this accreditation, Almondco will need to undergo six-monthly quality audits. The underlying strategy in the quality program is to offer products of superior quality in comparison with those of the major international competitor, the United States, and in doing so create a real preference for Almondco's Corella brand almonds over all other products. On the domestic markets, its products are retailed under the 'Ducks' labels, which members would recognise on the supermarket shelves today.

The 1994-95 year was a substantial challenge for the almond processor. It was the company's first full year of operation as Almondco Australia following its formation 50 years ago as a cooperative. The change to the new company structure was, in itself, a significant challenge for the company. It was decided that a dedicated, modern, technology plant was needed to take the growing enterprise into the next century. Construction of a new \$3 million processing plant near Renmark began in 1994 and was completed the following January. It was opened by the Premier in June 1995 and I had the pleasure to be there and participate in completion of the construction project. Without doubt, we could certainly say that it is one of the most modern almond producing factories in the world.

As well as undertaking changes in personnel and management structure during that year, the company employed a complete new work force for its Renmark factory. Most of the employees engaged in processing activities were employed and trained with the assistance of the CES and the State Government's most effective Kickstart program. Indeed, I also had the pleasure of escorting the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education through that plant some months ago and I must say that it was very heartening to see the new employees who have worked through the Kickstart program very happily, energetically and efficiently employed.

Mr Bevan Shearer retired as Chairman of Almondco at the end of the June 1996 and he has been succeeded by Mr Ken Dingwall. Mr Shearer took the old Almond Cooperative from a difficult period 10 years ago and turned it into an organisation that is now dedicated and focused on exports in conjunction with its growers and its processor effort. The company concedes that it was challenging to have to handle a record crop in 1995 plus a carry-over from the 1994 production year, with its newly commissioned plant. This task was also exacerbated by a then untrained work force operating the new plant, but this has since changed with the Kickstart scheme to which I have previously referred.

Almondco has achieved remarkable export growth in the past 12 months, increasing the tonnages sent to overseas markets from 70 tonnes to 2 500 tonnes. The value of these exports has grown from about \$100 000 to \$20 million. I particularly applaud and congratulate Almondco on this achievement and on its whole approach to developing this new export penetration. I know that the Riverland as a region is particularly proud of this success, and the reason I have moved this motion is that all South Australians can also share in this pride in the success of a South Australian company.

This has been accomplished in many ways. Certainly, I recognise that the State Government has contributed to this achievement by offering assistance to the new factory, through export incentives available statewide to companies exporting from South Australia and through the training programs to which I have referred. More particularly, I emphasise that it has been achieved through the management and the board of Almondco effectively bringing together its growers, skilled staff and new technology to produce a quality product. They believe, and I would argue, that their almonds are the best in the world.

On 19 November Almondco will go on to compete in the national awards in Canberra. I certainly wish the company well in this event and also wish it all the best for its future success as a leading light here in South Australia. I commend the motion to the House.

Motion carried.

#### NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** I move:

That this House congratulates the joint recipients of the 1996 Nobel Peace Prize, Bishop Carlos Belo and Jose Ramos Horta, recognising the work done to establish a just and lasting peace for East Timor.

The Opposition places on record its support of the Nobel peace prize being awarded to Bishop Carlos Belo and Jose Ramos Horta, recognising their work in establishing a just and lasting peace for East Timor. It is sad that in the past 10 days the Malaysian Government sought to end a conference being held on this issue. The plain fact is that the skeletons in Indonesia's closet will just not go away. Indonesia needs to sort out some of these problems, speak to some of these officials and ensure that a proper policy of human rights is established in East Timor.

We were all shocked when we saw that terrible massacre that took place in Dili some three or four years ago. The international community has made clear that this is totally unacceptable, and that could not have been indicated in any stronger fashion than to award the 1996 Nobel Peace Prize to two of the East Timorese great champions. I will say no more today than that it is about time Governments around the world and particularly in Australia started to pay more attention to the East Timor situation, as has the international community because, despite the fact that the Indonesians do not like this, the problem will just not go away.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles):** I support the motion and congratulate the Nobel Committee on these two awards. I have been ashamed of very little in my political life, but there is no doubt that we all ought to be ashamed of the policy of Australian Governments, both Labor and Liberal. I think that—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** No. The member for Spence suggests that, because I am ashamed of the actions of Australian Governments, the only solution to the present position was invasion, and that that would not be acceptable. I agree. Invasion from Australia was not acceptable, but I do not accept what was behind the interjection: that invasion was the only option available at the time. It was not. There is absolutely no reason why Governments of this country have adopted the position they have. I think that Australia is the only Government in the world that has adopted that position. There may be one or two others, I am not sure.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I agree completely.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** We support decolonisation, too. I do not want to waste my time debating with the member for Spence, but the honourable member is assuming that decolonisation can take place only by the colonising power walking away and somebody else walking in.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Well, that can be inferred from the honourable member's interjection. I believe that Australia's policy has been appalling. The United Nations agrees that our policy is appalling, and the fact that Australia stands virtually alone, maybe even alone in the world, in its appalling attitude demonstrates just how wrong we have been in relation to East Timor. I do not know how that position can be retrieved. I have no idea. I believe that the international community will keep up the pressure with regard to East Timor, and the Nobel committee has ensured that that pressure will continue.

Contrary to what the member for Spence might believe, the United States does not go around the world defending democracy at all: it does only what is in its best interests; but on this occasion there is no doubt that the United States has picked it correctly. There is no doubt about that, and we have picked it incorrectly. Whilst I am ashamed of the actions of Australian Governments since 1975, I am particularly proud of the action of my own union—the Maritime Union of Australia. That union imposed bans on shipping to and from Indonesia for a couple of years up to 1975.

Recently those bans have been reintroduced as a result of the actions of the Indonesian Government in arresting, detaining and generally harassing free trade unionists within Indonesia. That is not just a legitimate action but an action about which the MUA ought to be proud, and I am sure is rightly proud. I know that those bans have recently attracted some criticism, as one would expect, from members opposite who, I am sure, will have no objection in passing pious resolutions of this nature in here, and will have no hesitation in condemning anyone actually doing something about it, particularly if a union has done something about it.

We will be condemned, as, indeed, we were condemned by Mr Reith, the Prime Minister and others. That was expected, that meant nothing, but I noted that the MUA was also condemned—granted, in much milder terms—by Kim Beazley, the Leader of the Opposition. So, the Leader of the Labor Party also did not agree with the actions of the MUA. I would not waste my breath reminding Mr Howard or Mr Reith about the record of the Maritime Union of Australia (formerly the Waterside Workers Federation and the Seamen's Union of Australia). The record of those unions in attacking trade that Australia has had from time to time with some of these countries which commit atrocities is absolutely 100 per cent.

**Mr Atkinson:** What did they do in Poland? What did they do in Hungary in 1956?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The member for Spence always gets uptight in these matters. If he wanted to generate some activity amongst the trade union movement in support of the events that took place in Poland, he was free to do so, but he did not. Probably the best thing that the member for Spence can do is to think through his position before he interjects.

I draw to the attention of the House that members of my organisation, the MUA (formerly the SUA and the WWF), have taken industrial action in support of Indonesia in breaking the Dutch colonial shackles, and the French who were conducting nuclear testing in our backyard. They have taken action against the Vietnam War, which even MacNamara, former President Johnson and everyone else except the member for Spence agree was wrong. My union took action against the Japanese before the Second World War with regard to Australia's selling them steel to manufacture bullets to kill Australians. I want anyone to tell me where the SUA and the WWF (now the MUA) have ever picked it wrong.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Well, they picked it quite right, and apparently every member of this House with the exception of the member for Spence and the Premier agrees. I am not sure what weight one would give to that.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Yes, I wouldn't give it a great deal of weight at all. So, for Kim Beazley to suggest that the MUA should not take industrial action in a principled way against some of these activities of overseas despots and others is a great disappointment. The Australian Democrats in a deal with the Federal Minister for Industrial Relations are attempting to outlaw these kinds of industrial disputes with some of the great oppressors of the world. I forgot the Greek Junta. For many years, the Greek Junta oppressed workers in Greece, particularly seamen, and we took a great deal of action against that oppression and the apartheid regime in South Africa.

So, for Kim Beazley to say that the Maritime Workers Union is doing the wrong thing is sad indeed. Despite the deal that has been done between the Democrats and the Liberal Party to outlaw these strikes, I can say that the Maritime Workers Union will continue to take international action in solidarity with oppressed workers in other parts of the world. Any sleazy deal between the Democrats and the Liberals to try to prevent that will fail. I commend the motion to the House. I commend the Nobel Peace Committee for its wise choice of the people on whom it has bestowed its award, and I say, 'More strength to the arm of the Maritime Workers Union of Australia in its action of international solidarity.'

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** I also add my support to the motion. However, if I were East Timorese, I would not trust any political tendency in Australia in regard to liberating their East Timorese homeland. It is noteworthy that the Australian Labor Party was in Government when the Portuguese revolution broke out and when, as a result, the Indonesian Army invaded East Timor from West Timor, which was already part of Indonesia. I can well recall the Labor Prime Minister (Gough Whitlam) being interviewed about the impending invasion at the time and saying, 'Oh, well, East Timor is part of the Indonesian archipelago.' Of course, when the Liberal Party came to power the approach was no

different. So, there is a policy of bipartisanship about Australia's policy towards Indonesian occupied East Timor and that is not about to change. I do not think anyone in Australian politics has much virtue on the question of East Timor.

It is noteworthy that the Communist Party of Australia regarded East Timor as part of Indonesia, just as it regarded Dutch West Irian as part of Indonesia. In the 1960s the Communist Party of Australia in its publication *Tribune* supported the incorporation of both those European colonies into Indonesia.

It is most appropriate that this award should go to Bishop Carlos Belo, because he is trying to maintain an indigenous East Timorese culture in East Timor against the Indonesian occupation. So long as the church rallies the people of East Timor for their Christian and European heritage and as long as it continues to organise churches, schools and a civic life independent of the Indonesian Government, there is some hope that something of old East Timor will remain—and where there is life, there is hope. I think the award is entirely appropriate and I commend the motion to the House.

**Mr BASS (Florey):** I also support the motion and concur with the member for Playford, the member for Giles and, in some way, the member for Spence. What is happening in East Timor is without a doubt a tragedy. I congratulate Bishop Carlos Belo and Jose Ramos Horta on receiving the Nobel Peace Prize. It is a recognition by the international community and the Nobel Peace Prize committee of the work done by Bishop Belo and Jose Horta.

There probably is not an easy solution to the East Timorese problem, but I believe that all persons and all countries must continue to pressure Indonesia to stop the cruelty that has been inflicted upon the East Timorese people. The world community put pressure on South Africa and, although it took many years, it did eventually, I have no doubt, assist in the end of apartheid, and I believe that this matter involves all countries in the world, no matter whether it is East Timor or anywhere else. I believe that pressure from different people and different countries in the world stopped the situation involving the Tiananmen Square massacre from proceeding any further than it did. We should look at finding some resolution to the East Timorese problem: it does not have to be armed suppression and the cruelty that has gone on. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

### MULTICULTURALISM AND ABORIGINAL RECONCILIATION

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** I move:

That this House calls on the Premier to support multiculturalism and Aboriginal reconciliation by—

- (a) intervening in the Government's decision to close The Parks High School;
- (b) visiting the school to see at first hand how it operates; and
- (c) entering into meaningful discussions with the school community on options they have developed for the school's future,

and to assist in the retention of this excellent multicultural school for the benefit of the multicultural and Aboriginal population of The Parks area.

I refer to the Premier's comments made in this House on 16 October when moving his special multiculturalism and Aboriginal reconciliation motion, and I quote the Premier's motion, as follows:

That this House—

(a) affirms its support for policies relating to multiculturalism and Aboriginal reconciliation being based upon the principles of non-discrimination, racial harmony, tolerance and the Australian concept of a 'fair go' for all;

(b) recognises that South Australia is a multicultural society which places value on the significant contribution which continues to be made to the development of this State by all South Australians irrespective of ethnic or racial background;

(c) reaffirms its support for the ongoing process of reconciliation and achieving a greater understanding between Australians of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal background and recognises the special needs of the Aboriginal communities, especially in health and education; and

(d) calls for the conduct of public debate concerning multiculturalism and Aboriginal reconciliation to be undertaken according to these principles.

The motion was a very worthy one and the Premier spoke very well to it. The views he expressed and the motion itself were fully supported by the Opposition. One could ask: 'What is the problem?' The problem is that the Premier did not mean what he said. His motion and his remarks were hypocritical. Proof of this is that the Premier leads a Government that will close The Parks High School at the end of this year. I have spoken many times in this House recently about this outrageous decision but now, bearing in mind the large multicultural component of The Parks High School and the very large ethnic and Aboriginal population of The Parks area, I deem the Premier's motion and his and other Government members' speeches as being worthless.

I challenge the Premier to give support for his motion by intervening in the Government's decision to close the school and to visit the school to see at first hand how this unique educational institution works, to enter into meaningful negotiations with the school community on options they have developed for the school's future, and to assist in the retention of this excellent multicultural school for the benefit of the multicultural and Aboriginal population of The Parks area.

The Minister for Education has made a grave error in deciding to close the school, and his ego is too big for him to admit he is wrong. We have therefore given him up as a lost cause and now look to the Premier of the State to intervene and to bring some sense into the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### YAN TAI NURSING COLLEGE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Scalzi:

That this House commends the University of South Australia for establishing the first international university link with the Nursing College in Yan Tai in Shandong Province, People's Republic of China, and congratulates Professor Fran Sutton and the first 14 nurses who graduated on 11 September 1996.

(Continued from 17 October. Page 235.)

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** On behalf of those university students who graduated from Yan Tai University I would like to read from a speech of one of the students who will be a fee-paying student next year at the University of South Australia. This is what she had to say:

On behalf of the students I want to express our many thanks to both organisations because the program offered and which we have just completed has contributed significantly to the development of nursing in China. The Yan Tai Nursing College affiliate of the University of South Australia has become the first independent nursing college in China to offer a western nursing degree and as such offers a bridge between Chinese nurses and western nurses. In addition, together these organisations offer a pathway for Chinese nurses to obtain the very best and the most up-to-date information about modern nursing.

It is an important achievement for the University of South Australia to have such a link with the Shandong Province in China. I would like to congratulate all those involved. It is only one of three universities that have similar links. The University of South Australia has 44 international active links throughout the world and is playing an important role in communicating what we in South Australia have to offer. Reciprocally, we are receiving much from other universities throughout the world.

In 1994, 2 680 international students were enrolled in South Australian universities. Expenditure by these students includes an expenditure on fees, which represents export income for South Australia. In 1994, the universities generated \$50.3 million in export income for the State. This was made up primarily of \$26.2 million tuition fees for overseas students and a very conservative estimate of expenditure of at least \$9 000 *per annum* on living expenses for each overseas student while living in Australia. The amount is equivalent to approximately 1.3 per cent of South Australia's total merchandise export in 1994. Even if we look at it from the economic aspect, these international links are very important.

As I said on the day, many dignitaries throughout the Shandong Province attended this important occasion. I would like to acknowledge the work of Kathy Crockett, who did a lot of the organisation on the day; Professor Ian Davey, who represented the University of South Australia; and Professor Jan Pincombe, who is the dean of nursing at the University of South Australia. It gives me great pleasure to move this motion as a member of the University Council of South Australia and a State member of Parliament, and to show my respect for the nursing profession. I commend this motion to the House.

Motion carried.

#### COMMONWEALTH-STATE HOUSING AGREEMENT

Adjourned debate on the motion of Ms Hurley:

That this House expresses its grave concern regarding the Commonwealth Government's interim and long-term funding proposals under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement and the consequent impact on the housing construction sector, market rents and homelessness.

(Continued from 24 October. Page 356.)

**Mr BASS (Floreys):** The reason the Government is reforming the public housing system is that the previous Labor Government's mismanagement of the trust has meant that the South Australian Housing Trust has been heading on a road to nowhere, with waiting lists continually increasing and tenants waiting extraordinarily lengths of time to acquire public housing. During the Labor Government's term in office the waiting list for trust tenants more than doubled. In 1981 there were 20 854 people waiting and in 1991—a decade later—the list had grown to 43 520 people. During the same time frame the percentage of tenants made to wait more than five years for housing also doubled. In 1992-93 the percentage of people waiting this length of time was 4.9 per cent and in 1991-92 the number exploded to 11.1 per cent, and this trend cannot continue.

The Government is willing to explore the reform because it could reduce the increasing waiting list and provide greater options and opportunities for existing and future tenants. The reform is aimed at turning around the trust and getting it

headed in the right direction again. If the financial answers cannot be resolved, the new structure could clearly outline responsibilities, provide equity between tenants living in community, public and private housing and can provide direct rent subsidies from the Federal Government. This will see public and private tenants having more equitable levels of subsidy. The Housing Ministers' conference in Darwin clarified many of the issues, but obviously some of the finer details are still being determined by the task force and, most importantly, the financial viability of the proposal needs to be agreed.

The main benefits reform aims to achieve are improving housing opportunities for low income earners; improving the choices of tenants, allowing tenants to choose housing in the area most suited to their needs; and reducing the current tenants' waiting lists for Housing Trust homes. The reform is not about cost savings but about alternative ways to use the national budget. I have been assured that the level of Federal funding for housing is not to be reduced. I also expect the Prime Minister and Federal Minister for Housing to honour their assurance.

The Opposition scare campaign does not help reform and unnecessarily distresses tenants, particularly the elderly. Members opposite should be ashamed to use the disadvantaged to attack a policy initiated by their own Government. The Commonwealth has given undertakings that it will support all forms of social housing including community housing, crisis accommodation and Aboriginal housing. Relevant stakeholders will be consulted as the reforms develop, which is most important. A rental subsidy model will provide regional variations in public housing costs to provide a fairer model. Changes will be phased in over the next three to five years for easy transition.

Community housing in South Australia has a very good record of achievement, and its future will be an important issue in negotiating the reform program. Growth in this area will come from the transfer of trust stocks, the co-ventures program, the group self-build scheme and the HomeStart Equity Cooperatives. The motion put by the member for Napier does not consider the reason why action is being taken by the Federal Government and this Government and, if she takes a long hard look at what is happening, she will know that it was caused by her support for the incompetent previous Labor Government.

Motion negated.

#### AUDITOR-GENERAL

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. M.D. Rann:

That this House expresses its confidence in the professionalism, integrity and independence of Mr Ken McPherson in his role as Auditor-General, an independent officer of this Parliament.

(Continued from 17 October. Page 233.)

Motion carried.

#### FAMILY SUMMIT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Scalzi:

That this House congratulates the Government on its initiative to hold a family summit in November.

(Continued from 17 October. Page 235.)

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** I agree with the member for Hartley that this family summit, held two weeks ago at the Adelaide Oval, was a very good idea. But it will be of value

only if this Government is prepared to take note of the deliberations and recommendations from this summit and to allocate sufficient resources for investigating and implementing initiatives to address the problems which were raised and discussed in this forum. I was pleased to attend but was surprised to see that the member for Hartley, who moved this motion, did not attend. In fact, it was so important to the Government that not one Government member attended the whole summit. The summit was opened by the Premier and closed by the Minister for Family and Community Services. Also in attendance at the first part of the opening session were the Minister for Education and Children's Services, the Attorney-General, the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education and the member for Mawson. These Government members were at the summit for only the first short session and then they departed. The ALP was represented by the Hon. Paul Holloway, from another place, and me. We found the summit to be most thought provoking and informative.

In his opening speech the Premier indicated how supportive he and the Government were of families and said how eager he was to receive a copy of the deliberations and recommendations so that the Government could look at developing strategies to address the problems facing South Australian families. I certainly hope that the Premier meant what he said and that the Government will be prepared to allocate the necessary funds to drive these initiatives.

In the first session, 15 people from a wide range of family-orientated agencies were given a few minutes each to speak about any issue of their choice. This was a very valuable session and a new innovation. It meant that speakers got straight to the point rather than speaking at length and skirting some of the problems. Because they got straight to the point of their concern it had more impact. Many were justifiably critical of the funding cuts inflicted on them by the Brown and Howard Liberal Governments.

Eight key areas were identified as the focus for the summit. Participants were asked to contribute to any or all of the key areas and, afterwards, select one key area through which to participate in separate discussion groups or workshops. The eight key areas were: family relationships, families in rural communities, families and education, families and health, strengthening communities, families and economics, families and work, and family support. I selected and took part in the 'strengthening communities' group as I thought that was very appropriate to my electorate and the problems facing families in my electorate. Each group was asked to consider the priority points in each key area and to answer the following questions: what should we do about these issues at the policy level? What should we do about these issues at the agency level? What should we do about these issues at the community level? What other comments do we wish to make?

The summit participants reflected a cross-section of the community, with 150 representatives being invited from peak community groups, government and non-government agencies, service providers, family interest groups, social interest groups, academics and members of Parliament. Among the most important issues discussed were the dreadful impact of unemployment on families, domestic violence, physical and sexual abuse of children, education, health, community safety, marriage breakdowns, poverty, lack of information, family support, and the plight of rural families in the community. I found this summit most worthwhile but was most disappointed that not one Government member

attended the main sessions. Now it is up to the Premier and the Government to honour the Premier's promises and fully support initiatives to support families and their quality of life.

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I commend all the people responsible for the organisation of the summit. The member for Price is correct that unfortunately, because of other commitments, I could not attend the summit. I thank him for his contribution and support for the motion. However, I place on record my sincere thanks to all those involved because summits such as these are important and we should review and work out what are the best ways to deal with demands put on families.

Motion carried.

### THESSALONIKI

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

That this House calls on the Federal Government to establish a consulate and trade office in the Greek Macedonian city of Thessaloniki.

In September 1995 and again in September 1996 I was fortunate to visit the city Thessaloniki in Macedonia, Greece. My 1995 visit was to attend Helexpo and various ceremonies connected with Helexpo, including dinners and receptions hosted by the then Prime Minister, the late Mr Andreas Papandreou and also to meet with the Minister for Macedonian Thrace, who was then Mr Kostas Triarides. While I was in Macedonia and Greece I was able to visit not only Thessaloniki but Vergina, which is the site of the royal tombs of Phillip II of Macedon. At the time there had been a persistent campaign by people supporting FYROM, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, in order to steal the symbols of Greek Macedonia such as the Star of Vergina and also to try to appropriate the history of Greek Macedonia, including the role of Alexander the Great.

The Australian Labor Party has condemned this approach and I was pleased that there had been some progress in negotiations between the Papandreou Government and FYROM in order to ensure the integrity of Greek symbols and Greek history. I visited Macedonia again this year at the same time as the Premier was visiting to attend Helexpo and functions organised by the new Prime Minister, Mr Simitis of the Pasok Labor Government, and also had meetings with my good friend Mr Petsalnikos Nikos, the Minister for Macedonia Thrace. One matter that came up during my discussions with the Pasok Administration, which was recently elected, was how important it would be for Australia to establish a consulate in Thessaloniki because of that city's key strategic and trade position.

Australia is now lagging behind most nations by not having a consulate or trade office in Thessaloniki and, after meeting with the Minister for Macedonia-Thrace, I issued a public statement calling on the Federal Government to establish a consulate or trade office in the area. A large number of countries, such as the United States, France, Russia, Bulgaria, Italy, Yugoslavia and Romania, have consulates in the city. Other countries, including Britain, South Africa, Holland, Hungary, Canada and Finland, have honorary consuls in Thessaloniki.

Australia has a massive Greek Macedonian population. Thessaloniki is central to the Balkans and even to the Black Sea. It is an important international trade centre and it will be the centre for the Black Sea economic development zone. I

congratulate South Australian exporters for their participation in Helexpo, an internationally important trade fair. I was disappointed to see that Victoria pulled out, but I am delighted that South Australian businesses, in cooperation with the Hellenic Australian Chamber of Commerce, continued their hard but important work despite cuts to Austrade.

This whole push into Thessaloniki by the South Australian Government and business was pioneered by former South Australian Premier Lynn Arnold, who led the first Helexpo delegation. It is important for South Australia and Australia to continue to raise its profile in a very central trade city, which is basically the economic hub of the Balkans. I will continue to raise this issue. Last weekend, together with Tom Koutsantonis, who is the ALP candidate for Peake, I launched nationally a petition addressed to Alexander Downer, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Parliament House, Canberra, which states as follows:

Dear Mr Downer, We the undersigned urge the Australian Government to establish a consulate and trade office in the Greek Macedonian city of Thessaloniki given the city's growing economic and trade importance in Greece and as the economic hub in the Balkans region.

We have had a tremendous response already to that petition, and I hope that will increase in coming weeks, following the Dimitria festival here in Adelaide. Recently, we had the visit by the Minister for Macedonia-Thrace, and we have just welcomed the Ecumenical Patriarch to Adelaide. I hope that we will be visited soon by my good friend the Mayor of Thessaloniki (Mr Kosmopoulos), because I have invited him to come to Adelaide and I hope that he can do so.

We have to realise that not only will Thessaloniki be the trade hub of the Balkan region and also the centre for the Black Sea economic development zone but in 1997 it has been designated as the European city of culture, and a year-long festival of culture will be held in Thessaloniki. Next year, it will be highlighted as the city with the most attention in the European union, and it would be a fine signal of support for Greek Macedonia and in terms of improving our trade with the Balkans if Australia established a consulate or trade office in the region. I hope that we can do so.

I am disappointed to note that there have been cuts to the Australian embassy staff in Athens. We cannot depend on Helexpo and occasional visits by Australian embassy staff from Athens to fly the Australian economic flag in the area. This area has strategic economic and trade importance to Australia, and I think that we should get cracking. I hope that Macedonian Greeks and all Australians will respond enthusiastically to our petition. We will need to demonstrate strong support to convince the Federal Government to open an office in Thessaloniki. I commend my colleague Tom Koutsantonis, who is the coordinator of our national campaign to win support for this Thessaloniki initiative, and I hope that we will get a positive response from the Prime Minister (Mr Howard) and the Foreign Minister (Alexander Downer) to our proposal for an Australian consulate and trade office in that city.

**Mr MEIER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### **ADELAIDE AIRPORT CURFEW**

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** I move:

That this House disagrees with the Minister for Infrastructure's call for the Federal Government to reconsider the 11 p.m. to 6 a.m.

curfew at Adelaide Airport and calls on the Federal Parliament to entrench the curfew in statute law.

Leaving aside Sydney Airport, Adelaide Airport affects more residents by the noise of its aircraft than any other airport in Australia. It affects thousands of people living in suburbs such as Brooklyn Park, Cowandilla, West Richmond and Netley on the north-eastern side of the airport, and West Beach and Glenelg North on the south-western side. The take-off and landing of aircraft at Adelaide Airport is like thunder to the suburbs I mentioned, and some types of aircraft cause vibrations that shake houses in the vicinity. Mile End resident and radio announcer Ray Fewings speaks ironically about the older model 'whispering T jets' that rattle his neighbourhood and the bigger jets that are followed by a rush of air at ground level. Other residents report noise so loud that they cannot hear their radios or televisions and interference with TV signals that puts electrical snow on their screens.

Then there is the intense noise of jet pilots using the reverse thrust to slow their planes when they have landed. People in the electorate of Peake complain that they cannot hear telephone conversations and cannot talk outdoors. They also complain of sleeplessness. The noise is so bad that Brooklyn Park and West Richmond are the only suburbs in Australia outside Sydney to have sound insulation batts and window double-glazing projected to be installed in some of their dwellings at Government expense as part of an aircraft noise abatement program. Those who live near the airport now enjoy a respite between the hours of 11 at night and six in the morning when the curfew applies. The curfew is highly prized by the residents of the suburbs I mentioned because it promises them the opportunity of a good night's sleep which the rest of us take for granted. I acknowledge the sterling role of the member for Peake in obtaining and keeping the curfew.

The Adelaide Airport curfew is not a complete curfew; the curfew applies only to turbo jet aircraft and then there are 17 exceptions for certain types of turbo jet between those times. There are many other exceptions to the curfew, most of them sensible, such as allowing aircraft delayed by headwinds, thunderstorms, heavy traffic and so on to land at Adelaide Airport after 11 p.m. Other exceptions include flights that have an in-flight medical emergency; mercy flights; special passenger hardship (Liberal Senator Bronwyn Bishop knows about that); humanitarian reasons; and flights that are carrying a visiting head of State, the Governor-General or the Prime Minister. In addition to those exceptions, the airport is currently experimenting with landings of four freight jets a week at 4.20 a.m. The Federal Airports Corporation is able to do that because the curfew is not law. It is neither an Act of Parliament nor in the regulations.

As members can see, the curfew is flexible. The residents of Brooklyn Park, Cowandilla, Torrensville, Mile End and Thebarton are not being unreasonable in expecting their short-night respite to continue. Some would say that the free take-off and landing of aircraft, even deafening jets, at all times of the night benefits the South Australian economy. Some would say that the people who live near the airport knew about the airport and its attendant noise before they chose to reside there so they must live with the noise. The parliamentary Labor Party does not agree.

One of the people who argues for the take-off and landing of all jets at all times of the night is the Minister for Infrastructure and the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development. The Minister attended



a forum of the Building Owners and Managers Association, now known as the Property Council, earlier this year where he said that he hoped the Federal Government, which is responsible for Adelaide Airport, would reconsider the curfew. What he meant by that was 'lift the curfew'. This was reported in an edition of the *Weekly Times Messenger* in August, and the Minister has not sought to deny the report.

Another participant in the forum, Professor Mike Burns, said:

I don't think people will notice after a few months of you having quite a few flights coming in late at night or the early hours.

I wonder where Professor Burns lives? The Minister who called for the curfew to be reconsidered lives in the south-eastern foothills suburb of Lynton—about as far away as it is possible to get from aircraft noise in metropolitan Adelaide. The Minister's call is consistent with the attitude of most members of the Brown Liberal Government to the western suburbs and to the people who live there.

Debate adjourned.

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

### C.H. CLUTTERHAM, RELOCATION

A petition signed by 51 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to assist in the relocation of C.H. Clutterham Pty Ltd of Glanville to a non-residential site was presented by Mr Foley.

Petition received.

### OMBUDSMAN'S REPORT

**The SPEAKER:** I lay on the table the report of the Ombudsman for 1995-96.

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

That the report be printed.

Motion carried.

### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Commissioner for Consumer Affairs—Report, 1995-96

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

Chiropractors Board of South Australia—Report, 1995-96

The Radiation Protection and Control Act—Report on the Administration, 1995-96

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

Local Government Act—Regulations—Superannuation Board

South Australian Housing Trust—Report, 1995-96.

### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN STEEL AND ENERGY PROJECT

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I inform the House of a significant development in the South Australian Steel and Energy project to develop coal and iron ore deposits in the State's Far North. In April this year I announced that two Indonesian companies would join the venture. PT Maritosa Coalindo, a

private company in the resource sector, had signed a memorandum of understanding to subscribe \$US5 million for a 10 per cent equity in the SASE project. In a separate agreement announced at that time, the Indonesian Government-owned PT Krakatau Steel agreed to provide engineers and technical experts to work with Ausmelt in the establishment and operation of a demonstration pig iron plant. Since that announcement, there have been ongoing discussions between the Indonesian companies and the existing joint venturers, that is, Meekatharra Minerals Ltd, Ausmelt Ltd and the South Australian Government through Mines and Energy SA.

Building on those previous agreements, I advise the House that both PT Maritosa Coalindo and PT Krakatau Steel (in addition to its agreement to provide technical expertise) are now taking a participating interest in the venture, with each subscribing \$US7.5 million (in other words, about \$A9.5 million each) to become joint venturers in the SASE project.

This is an exciting development for Australian technology and has the potential to unlock vast iron ore and coal resources in the Far North of South Australia. Should the demonstration plant prove to be successful, South Australia can expect a multi-billion dollar investment in its resource sector. Under the new joint venture agreement, PT Krakatau Steel and PT Maritosa Coalindo each have a 15 per cent interest in the venture, with Ausmelt and Meekatharra each holding a 28 per cent interest and Mines and Energy SA holding a 14 per cent interest. This \$A19 million investment by the Indonesian companies will be used to fund the demonstration phase of the technical and commercial viability of the Ausmelt submerged lance smelting iron-making technology. The demonstration phase will include the establishment and operation of a demonstration pig iron plant in the Upper Spencer Gulf region.

The South Australian Steel and Energy project is an initiative to develop an industry based on the iron ore and coal resources that co-exist in the north of the State, about 100 kilometres south of Coober Pedy. Both the coal and iron ore deposits are located within close proximity to the Adelaide to Alice Springs railway line. The State Government's contribution to the SASE project is limited to \$1 million. Krakatau Steel, which currently produces about 2.5 million tonnes of iron and steel products *per annum*, anticipates a threefold market increase in demand for iron and steel products over the next six years. The largest integrated steel products manufacturer in South-East Asia, Krakatau Steel, is well known for innovative technology development and brings a wealth of steel industry experience to the venture.

The involvement of the Indonesian partners is a significant step in the development of South Australia's economic ties with Indonesia and I would like to commend all parties involved for their efforts to boost resource development in this State. The joint venture partners are working towards the demonstration phase beginning in early 1997, including testing bulk samples of coal and iron ore from the Coober Pedy region. In recent months, Mines and Energy SA has delineated an iron ore resource in excess of 500 million tonnes resulting from drilling anomalies identified by the South Australian exploration initiative. The information gained during the demonstration phase, which could take up to two years, will provide data for a full feasibility study into a possible commercial pig iron plant. I will keep the House informed of developments of a project which promises significant benefits to South Australia.

## POLICE EFFICIENCY INITIATIVES

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I have previously referred in this House to the ongoing restructuring of police operations, to make sure that we are deploying police and police assets in the most effective way with public safety the priority. This includes a review of what might be called non-core support areas of SAPOL. To this end, SAPOL has already contracted out its motor vehicle workshop activities and closed its Novar Gardens operations. This has enabled the redirection of significant resources to core policing operations, improved accessibility of vehicle servicing to the field and thus reduced vehicle down time from operational activities.

Only this week I have signed a new contract for the commissioning and decommissioning (fit and strip) of police vehicles. It is now appropriate that I inform the House of progress with some other initiatives that are under consideration. The first of these is the SAPOL courier services. This service includes the collection, scanning, sorting and distribution of mail within police headquarters and to police stations. Earlier this year a registration of interest was sought for these services. Subsequent evaluation of responses identified potential for improved services and cost efficiencies. As a result, a short list of registrants have now been invited to respond to a formal request for tender with a closing date of 4 December 1996.

The second initiative relates to the Police Air Wing, and this has been the subject of several reviews in recent years. Some cost efficiencies have already been achieved through a reduction in aircraft and pilot numbers. This was facilitated by increased use of commercial flights for non-operational travel, with the Air Wing focussing on satisfying operational requirements for search and rescue, surveillance and other essential police services dependent on the use of aircraft.

SAPOL recently offered the private sector an opportunity to provide these services by inviting tenders from the marketplace for provision of fixed-wing aircraft services, with the option to purchase SAPOL's aircraft and hangar facilities. The outcome of the evaluation process was that the private sector did not demonstrate that it could provide the required services at a lesser cost than the in-house operation. Accordingly, it has been decided to retain the Police Air Wing (albeit with downsized structure), to concentrate on the provision of aircraft services for essential police operations. There will continue to be greater use of commercial air services for general passenger transport. Thus, both SAPOL and the private sector will benefit from the changes.

The third initiative relates to photographic processing. SAPOL also sought registrations of interest from the private sector for its centralised photographic processing activities, which include speed and red light camera film processing (traffic photograph processing), and other film processing relating to criminal and accident investigation and specialist forensic work. Following an evaluation of the information provided by respondents, it is now proposed to seek public tenders for the traffic photographic processing component only. Costs savings are expected to result from contracting out this part of the operation. The rest will remain in-house.

**Infringement notice processing:** A registration of interest was also advertised publicly by SAPOL for the processing of infringement notices. The evaluation of responses has also had to consider the impact of the new 'fines' legislation to

come into operation in January 1997. It was concluded that contracting out of this function was not viable and that processing should continue to be undertaken by SAPOL, with cost efficiencies to be pursued by re-engineering. As I have already said, SAPOL has been progressively reviewing its core business operations. Within this context a number of areas have been assessed for contracting out. In some cases this has led, or will lead, to the private sector providing services which have traditionally been undertaken by SAPOL. In other cases every opportunity is being taken to achieve cost efficiencies in the delivery of the in-house services.

Regardless of who provides the services, the prime objective is to ensure that effective support to operational personnel is maintained. I can advise the House that the four current initiatives alone are expected to result, either through contracting out or re-engineering, in ongoing savings to the SAPOL budget of about \$750 000. This is on top of the savings in excess of \$1 million per annum and the net sale proceeds of \$3.5 million from the contracting out of workshop activities and the closure and sale of the Novar Gardens property. The initiatives I have outlined today indicate that positive benefits are flowing from the restructuring efforts within SAPOL.

## QUESTION TIME

### HEALTHSCOPE

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** Why did the Minister for Health tell the House yesterday that shares in Healthscope now owned by the Motor Accident Commission were bought by the former Labor Government when Healthscope did not enter the agreement to issue these shares until February 1994 and the shares in question were not issued until April 1994? Yesterday the Minister told the House:

The shares in Healthscope were bought by the former Labor Government.

The 1993-94 annual report of SGIC records that SGIC disposed of the issued capital in SGIC Hospitals Pty Ltd through a cash and equity deal with Healthscope on 29 April 1994. The 1993-94 annual report of Healthscope says:

On 29 April 1994. . . an additional 8 850 000 shares of \$1 each were issued at a premium of 69¢ as part of the settlement of an acquisition.

The annual report of Healthscope also says:

In February 1994, Healthscope entered into an agreement to acquire SGIC hospitals.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** In essence, this whole sorry deal brings up the sorry deal that began in February 1993—and we were elected in December 1993—and it brings back a whole lot of very nasty memories for the people of South Australia who have been left with this huge debt by the previous Labor Government. The whole matter of these shares stems from the fact that many hospitals were purchased and a whole lot of sorry dealing was going on and, basically, it was propping up State institutions in which we should never have been involved. The essence of this is that the dealings to see the end position of these shares began in February 1993.

A memorandum of understanding was signed between SGIC and Healthscope during that period when negotiations were continuing right throughout that year. The finality of the agreement may have been signed in the early days of our

Government, but the memorandum of understanding was signed—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** It is the end result of negotiations that started approximately 10 months before we were even elected.

### NEWS BUILDING FIRE

**Mrs KOTZ (Newland):** Will the Minister for Emergency Services provide details to the House on the resources and personnel used, together with the cohesive team work of the State's emergency services, to combat yesterday's fire at the site of the soon to be built Playford Hotel or the old *News* building?

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** Earlier today, the Premier and I had the opportunity to visit the site of yesterday's fire and to speak personally to and congratulate those officers who were on-site cleaning up after yesterday's serious fire incident. I now take the opportunity to place on the record formally the Government's congratulations to those many officers who obviously worked hard through yesterday's incident and through the night and who are now taking a well deserved rest from their huge effort.

The officers involved in yesterday's incident come from across all emergency services—the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service, Country Fire Service, State Emergency Service, South Australian Police Force and South Australian Ambulance Service. The way in which they responded, coordinated and undertook the task of tackling an incident of yesterday's magnitude was a credit not only to themselves but also to the emergency service agencies they represent. The fact that there was no loss of life and no serious injury through this fire incident is itself a credit to the training and preparedness of our emergency services personnel. All South Australians can be secure in the knowledge that they have one of the best trained, best resourced emergency service forces in all Australia, if not the world.

The Metropolitan Fire Service was alerted to yesterday's incident at approximately 4.50 p.m. by a 000 telephone call. On arriving at the scene, fire crews were well aware that the fire had firm control of the vacated *News* building and was also threatening the adjoining Grosvenor Hotel. In the first instance, fire crews attempted to combat the fire from inside the building but were driven back by the sheer size of the flames in the interior of the building. I am advised by fire officers on the scene that quantities of paper and office materials that were left behind by the previous users of the building had contributed significantly to the fire and provided a fuel for it. They contributed to a rapid spread of the fire through that building.

The adjacent Grosvenor Hotel has suffered some damage. I am advised by management of the hotel that they have to prepare again 100 rooms for occupancy. Indeed, the way in which hotel staff conducted themselves and helped emergency services personnel evacuate guests, as I am told by emergency services personnel, was a credit to the hotel management and the staff involved. The fire was contained by the Metropolitan Fire Service in just 50 minutes and was totally controlled by 7.17 p.m. Crews maintained a vigil at the site throughout the night to ensure that the fire did not recur. In addition, the fire service also provided a three-phase power generator which has been used by the hotel to ensure that

power is provided for cleaning equipment, and they have also assisted staff with salvage and cleaning operations at the hotel. At the fire itself, in all 23 appliances attended, including one Country Fire Service unit, with a further six Country Fire Service units standing by at South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service stations.

During the course of the blaze a CFS crew on standby at a suburban Metropolitan Fire Service station responded to a fire alarm at Port Road, Thebarton. The Police Department supplied support and assistance with traffic and crowd control, and the Ambulance Service was also called in at the start of the blaze, should it be needed. Some on-site treatment of fire officers was necessary in a small number of cases. I am pleased to report that none of the injuries was serious, no officer is in hospital and those who have been injured are taking a well deserved rest. All members would wish them a speedy recovery from their minor injuries.

At 5.30 p.m. brigades from the CFS were called to assist the Metropolitan Fire Service as back-up crews at suburban stations. The CFS appliances from Belair, Blackwood, Eden Hills, Athelstone, Tea Tree Gully and Burnside responded to assist either directly at the scene in the city or to be on standby at MFS locations. The Burnside CFS crew was called in to assist the MFS crew in the city.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** How did your new snorkel go?

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** In all 40 CFS officers and firefighters responded with these appliances. The fire was extinguished. The honourable member on my left asked how the new snorkel went. I am pleased to report that the Bronto appliance that I previously advised the House was purchased at a cost of approximately \$1 million performed exceedingly well. It was shown in the media—the elevated platform above the fire. A number of members from both sides of the House who went out onto North Terrace and observed the fire-fighting commented on the bravery of the officers combating the fire above the flames and smoke. They are a credit to the service.

Once the fire had been extinguished the State Emergency Service was called in. These people, often under recognised by our community, also put in a significant effort. They were called in to help with the relocation of 300 guests from the Grosvenor Hotel. The hotel was booked out, as indeed are most others in the city, because of the number of people wishing to attend the tattoo. The SES personnel provided stretchers and equipment to enable the patrons of the hotel to be put up at the Exhibition Centre overnight.

On behalf of all members of Parliament, particularly the South Australian Government, I thank all emergency service personnel for a job well done.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I think the Minister has adequately answered the question.

### HEALTHSCOPE

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** My question is directed to the Premier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not want any interjections: the Chair cannot hear.

**Ms STEVENS:** Given that the State Government's Motor Accident Commission is the largest shareholder in Healthscope, did the Treasurer or any other Minister withdraw their chair from the Cabinet table when Cabinet was making the

decision to grant the \$700 million contract to manage the Modbury Public Hospital to Healthscope?

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I do not thank the honourable member for her question as it is ludicrous. It is indicative of the quality of questions coming from the other side. We do not make those investment decisions. I do not tick or cross those decisions unless they exceed the 10 per cent rule, as the member for Giles could inform the House.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Giles is not involved.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The member for Giles is involved because he was there when 333 Collins Street went down for the count, and he was also there when the Healthscope buy-out of the hospitals was negotiated. The honourable member should ask the member for Giles, as he was there and he was involved. Those investment decisions were taken by SGIC, I presume with the knowledge of the Minister. The agreements were signed and it was only consequential on the raising of the capital. I finished up signing off on the deal as a result of that capital being raised. If the honourable member had asked the member for Giles, she would know that. The decisions taken on those shares were made by the former Government. If the honourable member wants to ask whether the former Government pulled back—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** The member for Hart was involved: we had very good advisers in those days. If the member for Elizabeth wants to check anything, I suggest that she ask the member for Giles and save our time.

### MITSUBISHI

**Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell):** Will the Premier advise the House of the export success of South Australian car manufacturer Mitsubishi, and what does the export success mean for jobs in the South Australian car industry?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Mitsubishi has just launched the first 4 000 cars made in South Australia onto the United States market. Here is the first major international launch by any company of vehicles made in this State. We should be proud of the fact that in Adelaide the Diamante vehicle is the only point of manufacture for the United States of America, all areas of Asia (except Japan) and the whole of Europe. It shows that our car industry in this State truly is of world class. I understand that the launch of the 4 000 vehicles last week went down extremely well indeed with dealers and customers in the United States of America. Of course, Mitsubishi also announced earlier this year that it will considerably expand the production of the Lonsdale engine plant. As a result, about 70 per cent of the production (the grey engine blocks) from that plant will now go to Japan.

Yesterday, Mitsubishi announced that it is taking on an extra 100 employees: 70 at Lonsdale and 30 at the assembly vehicle plant. I highlight that that is on top of the 900 employees that Mitsubishi increased its work force by over the 1995-96 year. So, that is a very substantial increase—about 1 000 jobs over 18 months by Mitsubishi. It highlights the success of Mitsubishi's new vehicle on both the domestic market and the export market. Mitsubishi expects to export about 25 000 vehicles a year from the plant in Adelaide. I can understand why, as the local member of Parliament, the member for Mitchell would want to raise this issue and highlight how successful Mitsubishi has been.

I point out that General Motors- Holden's has been very successful as well. In fact, although its employment has been static, it is effectively taking on additional employees, because a lot of the work previously carried out at the Lonsdale plant has been outsourced to the Lear Corporation and other companies. GMH has also had success in increasing employment and in the production of vehicles. Of course, one issue of concern to me, the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development and other members of the Government is the motor vehicle plan and the current review of that plan. This Government has put forward a proposal that ensures that we protect motor industry jobs in this State. We hope that the Federal Government heeds those warnings and ensures that once the inquiry is out—whatever it decides—it makes motor industry jobs in South Australia absolutely number one in terms of priority.

### HEALTH MINISTER

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** In accordance with his published code of conduct for Ministers, did the Premier grant the Minister for Health in 1994 any exemption from the requirement to divest shares held by the Minister's spouse?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I point out to the honourable member that, by mentioning a member's spouse, she is treading on very dangerous ground.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I will name the honourable member, because I regard this as a very serious matter. The honourable member is entitled to ask the question; however, I suggest that it is not a good practice to adopt. The Chair will listen very carefully.

**Ms STEVENS:** Did the Premier appoint another Minister to act in relation to the Healthscope contract?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Minister for Tourism and the member for Spence.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** In terms of the holding of any pecuniary interest by a Minister, that is not held by my office but by the Cabinet Office, and it is handled by the Cabinet Office as required under the handbook. The returns have to be given by the Minister to the Premier, and the Premier immediately passes them onto the Cabinet Office. Off the top of my head, I am not familiar with the shareholding of any individual Minister or their spouse, and it would be inappropriate to be so. That matter is handled by the Cabinet Office.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair has already indicated—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Spence is warned for the second time.

**Mr Venning:** He is a clown.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Custance is also warned for speaking while the Chair is addressing the Chamber. I want members to conduct themselves in an appropriate manner.

### NATIONAL ACTION

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** Is the Minister for Police aware of a move by National Action to set up an information souvenir shop in the southern suburbs? What can we do to ensure that this group does not prey on our youth or intimi-

date our migrant community? The National Action group has led a ferocious campaign against Asian immigrants and any other group of people who do not meet the ideal criteria of the National Action version of Australian. This group preys on young people and others who can be easily influenced and, when people like me stand up against them, National Action supporters run an ongoing intimidation campaign to keep us quiet.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister is out of order. I do not want any further interjections across the Chamber.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** I thank the honourable member for her question, because the activities of National Action are becoming an increasing concern. National Action represents the ugly side of Australia, and each member of this Parliament would totally repudiate the actions of such people. I am also aware that, if any MP speaks out against National Action, consequences will follow. The members for Reynell, Torrens and Unley have all been subjected to particularly vicious campaigns which have involved posters placed across their offices, threats and abuse. I do not believe that anyone in this Parliament holds National Action in high regard: quite the opposite.

Importantly, that group is in the process of spreading divisiveness and hatred throughout the community. It particularly targets our Asian community, which is held in very high regard. It also targets other groups, including the Jewish community. I know that we as a Parliament totally repudiate the activities of National Action. Over the past three years, it has been involved in a number of incidents and some of them have become very nasty. Members may recall that, on Saturday 22 April 1995, an unauthorised March at Glenelg led to the arrest of its leader, Mr Michael Brander.

The difficulty with a group such as National Action is that, while we repudiate and show contempt for its activities, it is able to carry on with those activities. The capacity for that group to carry on its activities really depends on the people that it attracts to its ranks. While I cannot use anything within my offices or within government to outlaw this group, all I can hope is that, if it decides to settle in the southern suburbs, the people of the south will repudiate it in the same way that this Parliament repudiates it. As far as everybody in this Parliament would be concerned, the further away that groups is, the better. I cannot offer the honourable member any comfort in regard to what action can be taken but, the sooner that National Action is wound up, the better it will be for South Australia.

#### HEALTH MINISTER

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** During the period in 1994 when the Minister for Health was negotiating the contract for Healthscope to manage the Modbury Hospital, did his spouse have any investment in the ANZ Bank?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The House will come to order. The Chair has already issued a caution to the honourable member. If the Parliament goes down this track, I will be surprised if compliments are not returned across the Chamber.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**Ms STEVENS:** Pecuniary interest statements lodged by the Minister in 1994 and 1995 indicated that the Minister had

an investment in the ANZ Bank. The 1995 register indicates that the ANZ investment is held by the Minister's spouse, and a check with the company's share registry in Melbourne today confirms that that is correct. In 1994 ANZ Nominees, a wholly owned subsidiary of the ANZ Bank, was the second largest shareholder in Healthscope after the State Government's Motor Accident Commission.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The House will come to order.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I am absolutely appalled that a Party which has made a great play of ostensibly (and I underline 'ostensibly') supporting women in the community would deign, would stoop so low as to impugn somebody who has a completely separate career from mine and who has been the national President of bodies to do with the Securities Institute—which involvement I would have thought the Opposition would be proud of for a South Australian woman—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:**—but, no, as the member for Gordon says, not that lot: they will try to bring everything down to the absolute lowest common denominator.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I am not going to those depths. As certain members of the Opposition know only too well, right now there is an avenue on that side of the House through which I could drive a D10, but I choose not to do so, because I do not believe it does anything for the parliamentary process to bring people's wives or spouses into this sort of forum. In answer to the question—

*Mrs Kotz interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** Indeed, as the member for Newland says, or partners. In answer to the question, my pecuniary interests have been religiously declared absolutely and totally according to the Standing Orders and the requirements of the House.

#### INVESTMENT INCENTIVES

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** Will the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development report to the House the implications of the disclosure of confidential information by any of its members? Yesterday in a public meeting with the Economic and Finance Committee, the member for Hart disclosed information about incentives to firms to invest in South Australia. This information had been given on the grounds of commercial confidentiality to the Industries Development Committee of this House.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** We are clearly seeing some members opposite throwing conventions to the wind.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I will get onto that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I will not tolerate any further interjections.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Tourism has been warned already, and he knows the consequences. The question has been asked and I expect the House to have the courtesy to allow the Minister to answer it.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I was surprised and disappointed that the member for Hart has broken a convention of the members of the Industries

Development Committee of the Parliament in disclosing current commercially sensitive information. This deliberately and wilfully undermines the bipartisan charter of the IDC to confidentially review requests for assistance from companies of the Government. One could question the accuracy and import of some of the figures that were referred to. One could take the view that there has been a cheque or cash ordered up to some of these companies. That is not true. A whole range of incentives were put in place and, as the member for Hart knows, in several instances a building property is concerned which we would continue to own in any circumstances in the future.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I could stand up in this House today and give a similar list of packages and incentives offered by the previous Labor Government. That would be relatively easy for me to do, but in my view it would lead to a destructive public slanging match in relation to the way in which this Government and those of the past and future have done and will do business in South Australia. I would hope that we could use the forums and committees of this Parliament to build up, not tear down, South Australia's reputation and credibility with companies with which we would want to do business.

Statements such as this can and will scare off potential investors, knowing that any incentives or commercially sensitive information can be broadcast by any politician at any time in the political heat of the moment or for politically motivated reasons. It also weakens our negotiating position. What about those companies with which we have been negotiating for months, and with which we are in the final stages of closing a deal? We now have a benchmark: every one of those companies will come back to the Government saying, 'We see in the paper that you gave X dollars; we want X plus one.' That is the prejudiced position in which we have now been placed in negotiating with a whole range of companies.

Additionally, it weakens our position to the following extent. If you are a major company or a South Australian based company and you supply information in good faith on the basis that it is commercial and confidential, upon which we make a judgment about an incentive package, and you run the risk of that being disclosed publicly, we will see those companies either retreating from being forthright in the information they give or simply not turning up or negotiating with us to finalise some deals.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** This matter needs to be corrected in the public domain, and the reports we have seen in recent times reinforce this false perception in the community that the Government is interested only in the 'big end of town' or interstate companies. South Australian based companies receive 61 per cent of investment support dollars paid by this Government; 221 of the 228 companies we have assisted in the course of the past year are South Australian based companies. So let it not be said that we are interested only in interstate, overseas or 'the big end of town' enterprises. The track record, performance and injection of funds clearly indicate that the majority of support is going to existing South Australian based industry. While we are on incentive packages, let me defend them to this extent—and I know that interstate Governments have had a shot at us from

time to time, as well as various industry commissions, and the like.

Let us take, for example, Singapore. You could not say that the Singapore economy was anything else but booming. But what does it do: this year it has a \$5 billion Singapore incentive program, with a \$1 billion Singapore incentive program for the IT industry alone (and I am glad the Treasurer is taking note of that fact). They are the odds we are battling against every day of the week to attract new investment and new jobs to South Australia. We do not have the luxury of having everything rolling with us to bring about those investments in South Australia. The statement made yesterday—whether it was made off the cuff in the political heat of the moment, or whatever the circumstances might be—is damaging to South Australia. It impedes and restricts our capacity to negotiate investment to South Australia in the future, and that is not in this State's interests or in the interests of creating jobs here, which is the fundamental policy priority of this Government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Over the past year or two, I have been asked by way of interjection from the Opposition, 'Will you send it to the IDC?' and the Opposition has gone to the media on a range of deals saying, 'Ask them whether they will take it to the IDC'. We have replied, 'Yes, we will'—and we have. We have given the IDC briefings when we have not had to do so, and we have given the IDC background information when we have not had to do so. However, if we are going to deny South Australia the opportunity it ought to have, we will simply have to retreat to the position of taking to the IDC only those matters we are obliged to put before it, and those matters relate to a guarantee given by the Government of South Australia. That is not in anyone's interests. We cannot have the set of circumstances exposed yesterday.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** That set of circumstances is designed to pull us back from our efforts to get new investment, to crank up the economy and be successful in new investment and new jobs. That is what it is about—to pull us back.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Yes.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** That is really the position. Let the Opposition do what it wants: we will concentrate—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** —on the main game, and the main game is new investment and new jobs.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

## HEALTH MINISTER

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** My question is directed to the Premier. Given the circumstances of the ownership of ANZ shares by the Minister for Health's spouse, the ANZ—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister is out of order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mawson is out of order, I think, for the second time—and I do not need hand signals from the member for Spence, either.

**Ms STEVENS:**—Bank's interest in Healthscope and the requirements of the Premier's ministerial code of conduct—

**The SPEAKER:** There is a point of order. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Because of the interjections halfway through the honourable member's first sentence, I did not even hear the first part of the question.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Would the member for Elizabeth care to repeat the question?

**Ms STEVENS:** Given the circumstances of the ownership of ANZ shares by the Minister for Health's spouse, the ANZ Bank's interest in Healthscope and the requirements of the Premier's ministerial code of conduct, will the Premier now request the Minister for Health to resign his portfolio?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Elizabeth has the call.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The ministry will come to order. The Deputy Premier is included.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair has already issued the caution. Members must now accept the responsibility for whatever happens.

**Ms STEVENS:** On 17 October the Premier told the House that his Government's rules on disclosure went further than those in the Federal Parliament. The Premier also said that if Ministers did not disclose fully their shareholdings there would be no option other than dismissal. The Premier's code of conduct states:

A Minister shall be taken to have an interest in any matter on which a decision is to be made or other action taken by the Minister in the exercise of his or her responsibilities of office, if the possible decision or action could reasonably be capable of conferring a pecuniary or other personal advantage on the Minister, or his or her spouse or children.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The member for Elizabeth's use of this Parliament under protection in the manner she has used it this afternoon would constitute some of the shabbiest politics I have ever seen in this Parliament since I entered it in 1973.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I have never seen, since 1973, members of an Opposition stand in this place and use the protection of the Parliament in this manner, and the Labor Party—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I am amazed that the Leader of the Opposition, who obviously is party to this question, has allowed one of his new members—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are too many interjections.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:**—to use the process of the Parliament in this way. The Leader of the Opposition is fully implicated, obviously, in these questions this afternoon, and he shares with the member for Elizabeth the shabbiness for allowing this question to be asked. Let me make it quite clear: no member of Parliament could be expected to know what shares are held by any public company, because they could change hour by hour or day by day, and to try to link together, by some spurious means, a cross-shareholding between public companies would mean automatically that no member in this Parliament could hold any interest in a superannuation fund.

I have interests in an AMP superannuation fund. It is declared on my pecuniary interests; I have declared it to the Cabinet Office, but I would have no idea from one day or one hour to the next what shares are held by AMP. Therefore, the standard the member for Elizabeth is trying to suggest should be upheld is absolutely impossible. It would mean that no member of Parliament could hold superannuation funds in any private superannuation fund throughout the whole of Australia; nor, in fact, could we even hold superannuation funds in a Government superannuation fund. The trite cross-connection that the member for Elizabeth is now trying to establish is absolutely ridiculous. The big disappointment, though, is that the Labor Party has allowed itself to stoop into the lowest of gutters this afternoon, trying to suggest some link through this.

This is a national bank that has literally tens of thousands of connections throughout Australia, from private companies to public companies. How can any Minister be expected to know what shares or interests are held by a national bank? That is how ridiculous the whole issue and innuendo of the member for Elizabeth is this afternoon. I suggest that she go off and sit down, take a Bex and think about what she has done this afternoon in the House, because it is a public disgrace.

## WINE INDUSTRY

**Mr ANDREW (Chaffey):** Will the Minister for Primary Industries outline what long-term plans are being implemented for the burgeoning wine industry? The wine industry has experienced excellent growth in the past few years. There have been substantial plantings of vines throughout all the wine producing areas in this State, particularly in the Riverland and, as a result, I understand the wine industry is looking well into the next century with its planning.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** At the risk of lifting the standard of debate, we will turn to something that might be of interest to jobs in the State. I think that all members are well aware of the massive growth undergone by the wine industry during the 1990s. Not only has that been seen in massive increases in vineyards but also in the very important value adding that wine provides for the State. It really is one crop which can add much value and which gives us big export dollars. Certainly, because of the increase in the size of the industry, the focus has had to turn very strongly to exports, and with the turn to exports has come a realisation that quality is absolutely paramount to the future of that industry. In South Australia we have the potential to have 42 000 hectares of grapes by the year 2010.

Strategy 2025 has been developed by the Australian Wine Foundation to chart a course for the wine industry to follow for the next 30 years. Yesterday morning, I had the pleasure of addressing a seminar on the strategy and was impressed by

the commitment and the dedication to a vision that has been demonstrated by the industry. The vision outlined by the Australian wine industry in Strategy 2025 is to have annual sales of \$4.5 billion by the year 2025. To achieve that vision the industry wants to be the world's most influential and profitable supplier of branded wines, and it is going well down that track. Importantly, Strategy 2025 also seeks to exploit and enhance our competitive advantages, and that certainly includes, as with many other industries, our clean, green environmental image associated with grape production and the winemaking process in this country, which was very much the focus of yesterday's seminar.

The industry wants all growers to commit to achieving world's best practice in environmental management both in the vineyard and at the winery level. Recognising that commitment and the value of the wine industry to the State, the South Australian Government has formed a collaborative partnership with the local wine industry in response to Strategy 2025 and also the wine industry's five-year plan. At present that is being coordinated by the South Australian Development Council. It aims to facilitate export driven growth and to strengthen South Australia's position within the national wine industry.

This Government considers that this is an important project for the industry, the community and the State. It clearly demonstrates a commitment of providing leadership in self-regulation and the adoption of best practice. It is also a clear demonstration of a very effective partnership between both the industry and Government. Within my portfolio area both Primary Industries SA and the South Australian Research and Development Institute are working very closely with the grape and wine industry to achieve the desired outcomes. We want to play a major part in maximising the sustainable economic contribution that the wine industry is offering the State both now and into the future.

As with the case involving aquaculture about which I spoke on Tuesday in terms of creating many jobs for people of Eyre Peninsula, already many of our young people are finding a range of jobs in regional South Australia because of the growth in the wine industry. The wine industry, like aquaculture, is largely about regional development in this State and is supplying jobs in areas where it is very hard to create other jobs. We can continue to build on the successes achieved thus far in the 1990s. Strategy 2025 is a tremendous example to other primary industries of an industry that has developed critical mass to provide a collective vision. Currently, we are encouraging and working with other industries likewise to develop some vision and gain control of their future as the wine industry has done.

### COAG MEETING

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Premier give an unequivocal assurance that his Government will not accept any deal with the Commonwealth Government that would allow it to make further cuts to funding for essential services in South Australia? The Council of Australian Governments is due to meet in Brisbane tomorrow, so we hear, and recent media reports say that the Howard Government wants to transfer additional responsibilities to the States with less Commonwealth funds. Reported areas for cutting include health, education, housing and child care. On 26 March the Premier stated—and I want members to recall what he said:

Now that there is a new Government in Canberra the States have a golden opportunity to ensure that we have a much more effective Commonwealth-State relationship than occurred under the previous Labor Government.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I point out to the House that it was the Keating Labor Government that ripped more than \$400 million a year out of the South Australian Government's finances—

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:**—and at the same time then incurred an \$8 billion deficit for the Federal Government.

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition is warned for the second time.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** If ever there was any Government at Federal level that deserves to be criticised for short changing the States, it is the Federal Labor Government, which the Leader of the Opposition tried to have re-elected and, fortunately, failed to do. The Leader of the Opposition, as usual, is wrong: he is always wrong, it would seem. There is no COAG meeting in Brisbane tomorrow. Once again, the Leader of the Opposition has jumped to his feet well behind the eight ball and does not even know that there is no COAG meeting in Brisbane tomorrow. It has been the role of the States to ensure that they get a fair deal. There is nothing on the agenda of the next COAG meeting at this stage—and the date has not yet been set—that specifically indicates a cut in funds. I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition go off, check his facts and look at what the Keating Labor Government cost South Australia.

### DEPOSIT 5000

**Mr BECKER (Peake):** My question is directed to the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. Following the overwhelming support for the Government's Deposit 5000 scheme to assist new home buyers, will the Minister comment on the announcement made by Pioneer Homes this week about a complementary scheme for home buyers?

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** Yes, I am delighted to answer the honourable member's question because the scheme, as he has pointed out, has gone extremely well. Not only have we been inundated by many who want to take advantage of the scheme to enable them to buy a home but also it has been very warmly welcomed by members within the housing industry. I commend Pioneer Homes for the step it has taken. For those who qualify for the Deposit 5000 scheme, that organisation has said that it will offer an additional rebate of \$5000 off the cost of a Pioneer home to any such customer. That means, therefore, that those eligible for the Deposit 5000 scheme, if they purchase a home through that company, will be given \$10 000 toward the cost of that home. Again, just as with the Government scheme, the Pioneer scheme is also on a first come, first served basis. I can only emphasise again to those in South Australia who are looking to buy a home that they must move quickly, because the scheme is being taken up very rapidly.

Importantly, the scheme is helping small business in South Australia. Far too often we have heard from members opposite that allegedly the Government is not interested in small business. Earlier today in Question Time we heard my colleague the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development mention the assistance



that is being given to small business. I can assure all members that the small business industry which is involved in housing is absolutely delighted with what the Government has done. It is not only the small businesses involved in the building work itself but also small businesses that support the building companies—for example, the subcontractors. The advantage to so many who are involved in building homes just cannot be underestimated. Again, I thank the honourable member for his question. I commend Pioneer Homes for its initiative, and I hope that other building companies will take up the challenge, because all-in-all we are stimulating an area in the South Australian economy which will have a major impact on the future of this State.

### TAFE PRIVATISATION

**Ms WHITE (Taylor):** Does the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education agree with the contents of a TAFE minute circulated to staff of TAFE institutes, which says, of an article in last weekend's press that includes comments by the Minister in relation to a privatisation proposal by Serco for parts of TAFE, 'the article appears to be a complete fabrication' and, if so, will he rule out consideration by the Government of the Serco proposal? The Opposition has received telephone calls from concerned staff of TAFE institutes. It has been given a copy of a detailed proposal by Serco for the provision of facility management services in TAFE. The proposal includes the management of confidential student records and states that the proposal will give the facilities manager the freedom to 'trade off equipment and people as economic advantage dictates'. The Minister is reported as saying that 'we are interested in hearing what firms have to offer.' An internal TAFE memo denies having received a proposal from Serco but says:

The department is undertaking a project concerning the contracting out of the physical resources functions of institutes.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The appropriate Minister is attending a ministerial conference today. I will be pleased to refer the member for Taylor's question to the Minister and have him bring back a response.

### ABORIGINES, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**Mr LEWIS (Ridley):** What initiatives is the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs pursuing to foster economic development in Aboriginal communities?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I thank the member for Ridley very much for his extraordinarily important question, given that our Aboriginal population so clearly needs to be stimulated to have economic independence. The Government's overall goal is obviously to foster economic development in the State on the basis that economic prosperity underlies many facets of social development and social cohesion. This is especially true of Aboriginal communities. As Aboriginal communities achieve economic independence and become more financially secure, they are able to provide better housing, schooling, health facilities and so on for their children, and that is a fine concern for them.

Much of the breakdown in Aboriginal communities is because of a lack of self-respect. Much of the time, that comes from a lack of purpose in life through not having a job. The Government recently held an economic development forum to foster Aboriginal economic enterprise and, in particular, to build better networks between the State

Government's economic development agencies and many Aboriginal enterprises.

Recently, it was a great privilege for me to visit such a community and enterprise and to provide tangible State Government support. The Bungala community development employment program in Port Augusta was given \$55 000 to provide a brick and paver making machine. That is expected to create about 20 jobs in Port Augusta's Aboriginal community. I was there when the first bricks and pavers came out of the machine, and they are already destined for the enterprise's first customer. They have an order for 10 200 pavers from Mega Build Builders. The Housing Trust has confirmed its intention to use Bungala to upgrade 15 houses at Copley; and Urban Ecology Australia, in conjunction with the Whyalla campus of the University of South Australia, wishes to use Bungala's product in the Whyalla eco-city development.

This initiative will boost the district's coffers and, in turn, the State's coffers, provide jobs and employment training and, importantly, increase confidence within the Aboriginal communities. Bungala is already showing that it is an excellent corporate citizen with its new asset, in that it has indicated it will carry out a range of restoration projects with the local cemetery as part of a community enhancement project. The Government is keen to encourage Aboriginal people to be given economic independence and employment opportunities, and in this tangible way we have done just that.

### PRISON, NEW

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** Will the Minister for Correctional Services categorically rule out the construction of the Government's new private prison at Pelican Point, Outer Harbor, on Lefevre Peninsula and within my electorate of Hart?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr FOLEY:** A number of residents within my electorate have contacted my office today concerned at media reports in today's *Advertiser* that the Pelican Point site at Outer Harbor has been selected by the Department of Correctional Services as the location for the State's new private prison. This follows senior officers of the MFP confirming yesterday that they had shown correctional services officers the site in recent months.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** I am interested to see that the member for Hart is at last standing up in this place and representing his electorate. If the media advised me correctly, I understand this question was asked yesterday during a meeting of the Economic and Finance Committee. The media advised me that the member for Unley asked the question. At least there are members in this Parliament who take an interest in the member for Hart's electorate. I assume it was that questioning by other members that finally motivated the member for Hart to take an interest in his electorate instead of busily knocking positive projects in this State. As I said before, and I will say it again, I will not confirm nor deny the likely site of a new prison for South Australia. The site will be determined by Cabinet. When that site has been determined by Cabinet, an announcement will be made. I would expect that announcement to be made by the end of the year. The only thing that I will categorically rule out is that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:**—contrary to some media reports, a new prison will not and never has been considered for any land that is presently owned by the MFP.

---

### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I note that the Government gave us eight questions today rather than the normal 10 questions. Basically, it gets a bit petulant, particularly if it feels some heat. I wish to deal with some of the issues raised by the Premier yesterday on the Morgan and Banks survey that received some publicity earlier this week. I do not know whether all members of the House understand what Morgan and Banks does with this survey.

It surveys a number of companies across Australia, and all States are represented. It simply asks whether or not each company intends hiring or laying off staff, in the very bald sense. It does not aggregate the total employment figures, so if 65 per cent of the companies say that they believe they will hire more staff, and 35 per cent will lay off more staff, it comes to the conclusion that 15 per cent or so more companies will hire employees than lay them off, and that is good news. The only problem is that, although the total number of extra employees hired by companies might be 200, the number of employees to be laid off could be in the thousands, even though the total number of companies in this category is smaller. So, you do not get any reliable information whatsoever from the Morgan and Banks survey.

According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, in this State since the election of the Brown Government we have seen that, between December 1993 and October 1996, South Australia has had a total job growth rate of 3.4 per cent compared with the national growth rate in jobs over the same period of something like 7.5 per cent. When we hear the Morgan and Banks survey figures, we need to keep firmly in mind that they do not mean much in the overall scheme of things.

I looked at the various press releases put out by Morgan and Banks in each State and, remarkably, every State has a wonderful headline. Even though Victoria, in terms of the number of companies planning to hire staff as against the number of companies planning to sack staff, is the same as us at 15.3 per cent, the Morgan and Banks press release in Victoria claims 'Victorian jobs turnaround'. Queensland, which fell below the figures for South Australia, had a headline in its press release for this Wednesday, 'Queensland job market on the up'. Basically the Morgan and Banks surveys can be largely discounted. Morgan and Banks is an employment promotion agency which does what it is in the business of doing, namely, promoting its own self-interest, which is fair enough. However, the rest of us should not get carried away, and the Premier and the Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs should be aware of the true facts and not delude themselves and the people of South Australia into thinking that we are doing wonderfully well.

A much better document is the briefing put out by the chief executive of the Metal Trades Industry Association on

the Australian economy, current conditions, prospects and implications for wages. While this is a national survey, South Australia is nonetheless a major manufacturing State and still employs something like 15 per cent of our work force. The MTIA makes a national comment, although it obviously impacts more severely on South Australia. It states:

MTIA's September quarter survey of business conditions for the metal and engineering industry confirms these weak conditions. In the 250 market leader companies surveyed, production activity levels are at their lowest level in three years for the sixth successive quarter. More than a third of those surveyed are retrenching labour, while 40 per cent have recorded falls in sales and forward orders. The outlook points to the subdued conditions persisting at least until the middle of the next year despite a seasonal pick up in the December quarter.

I commend the document to all members. It says that the ABS statistics reveal that some 60 000 jobs Australia wide have been lost in the metal and engineering industry over the past six years. That affects all States, particularly South Australia with its heavy reliance on manufacturing. The picture is not as rosy as the Premier paints.

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

**Mr ANDREW (Chaffey):** I compliment the South Australian Ports Corporation for its current success. In working closely with the Minister for Transport I recognise that over recent months, particularly over the past year—because it has been its first full year of operation in that capacity as a fully corporatised body—it has put many progressive runs on the board. The Ports Corporation of South Australia manages South Australia's public commercial ports and related facilities. These ports include Port Adelaide, Port Giles, Wallaroo, Port Pirie, Port Lincoln, Thevenard, Klein Point, Cape Jarvis, Penneshaw and Kingscote.

As reported in its most recent annual report for the 1995-96 year, the Ports Corporation has shown an operating profit in the order of \$5.995 million before abnormals and after tax on total revenue in the order of \$45.326 million. This will mean that, because of the surplus and profit, a dividend in the order of \$3.369 million has been paid to the State Government to go to the provision of efficient and valuable services, whether in health, education or other important areas. This is obviously an excellent result for the first full year of operation of the Ports Corporation, and no doubt it is partly due to the record grain crops of last year that helped give the Ports Corporation a good start to its first formal financial year.

The Ports Corporation has made significant progress in waterfront reform and in attracting new business in the past financial year. I refer to the Premier's comments in Question Time today when he mentioned the strong cooperation and production success of South Australia's Mitsubishi plant and its success in the export of the Diamante car. This is an example of the continuing cooperation with the Ports Corporation. Its success in exporting and growth has been not just with the production of the new plant and car that is being exported to Europe and the USA but also with the expansion of its engine blocks. In fact, about 70 per cent of those engine blocks will be exported. This also contributes to the cooperation between Ports Corporation and Mitsubishi. Together they have invested about \$1 million extra in infrastructure to provide for this export out of Port Adelaide.

There are a number of other examples where export growth is taking place at the moment and being assisted and facilitated by the Ports Corporation in South Australia,

whether it be the significant growth happening in the citrus industry, which I have detailed a number of times, the growth in the meat industry or the growth in the wine industry. Much of this is going through the operation of the Ports Corporation, particularly out of Port Adelaide.

South Australia is seeing unprecedented growth in shipping services out of South Australia. A specific example is the 6 979 containers exported in June this year. This unprecedented growth is continuing. July saw 7 900 containers exported through Port Adelaide, and this growth is continuing. New shipping services that have been achieved include a six day service with Singapore. In addition, Australia's first fixed date service to Singapore by Pacific International Lines (PIL) and Overseas Orient Container Line (OOCL) has been instituted. There is also a roll-on roll-off general cargo service to South-East Asia, operated by the NYK Line, and a Mediterranean shipping company service which stop at ports in South Africa, the UK, Europe, the Mediterranean and the east coast of the USA. It is the most efficient port in Australia, and that continues to be demonstrated.

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

**Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna):** I refer to access handover centres. We all acknowledge the heartbreak that occurs not only for the adults but the children of a family during a broken marriage. The heartache is much worse when violence or abuse is evident during the separation and as part of the marriage when it existed. Domestic violence harms the children during the marriage but, unfortunately, it also harms them in the access process if it is not handled properly.

Currently, if there is a long history of domestic violence in a marriage, the Family Court will usually stipulate that the handover of children take place at a police station. I do not believe that a police station is the appropriate place for child access to occur. There is no available evidence at this stage that a handover at a local police station lessens the potential for further violence to parents or children. If violence occurs, it places the police in a compromising position. Police stations are neither physically set up nor manned to handle such situations.

The situation is completely aggravated if one of the parents is arrested for disorderly conduct (or worse), because that paints a picture for the children which is completely distorting and which warps their sense of what is right and what is wrong. We should be most concerned about the children: they deserve the access for which both parents have been deemed entitled, and they should have access that is as enjoyable and fulfilling as possible. A fulfilling access visit is impossible if there is violent conflict at the time of handover. Handover at police stations emphasises to children all the wrong aspects of a situation between the parents, and the children get a very biased opinion about police and what they are there for.

In contrast to this situation, the Bowden Brompton Community Service provides a children's access program, which was started in July 1995. The service provides an alternative handover point to police stations so that the stress to children is minimised as it ensures no contact between the parents. Obviously, centres such as this must be staffed with qualified workers who know how to handle violent situations if and when they occur. What makes the centre and service successful is that it is children-centred. The other important function recently started at Bowden Brompton is supervised

access on Saturday afternoons for Family Court orders of this type.

There is a very high demand in the southern area for both an access handover point and supervised access. Supervised access also protects children from abduction, physical harm and possible emotional abuse—emotional abuse where one parent is more interested in having a go at the other parent (as it has been described) than having genuine access with the children. Unfortunately, it is a fact of life that some parents need to be controlled. If the Family Court sees fit to allow these parents access to children, measures must be put in place to allow this access to be as positive as possible for both the child and the parent.

I question strongly whether busy, 24-hour police stations or small country police stations are appropriate places to start such a fulfilling experience. A range of people come and go at police stations, and they are not always the best of society. Children will compare the parents who cannot get on with those less savoury characters being charged, being abusive or being drunk and disorderly. This is totally inappropriate for those children. I have requested Minister Wotton to approach the Federal Attorney-General on our behalf to seek funding for a supervised access centre in the southern area. To put this in the words of the Commissioner of—

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

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** Yesterday, in answer to a question, the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations repeated a comment he has made before, that is, that the changes to the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement were 'well and truly introduced by the previous Federal Labor Government'. As I said, the Minister has made this statement a number of times, and I have ignored it, because I did not think it warranted a reply. But he said it this time in the context of attacking the Labor candidate for Reynell for not telling the truth. I place on record the truth in respect of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement.

The former Federal Labor Government, as part of the Working Nation documents, put forward a position paper on the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. The Federal Government highlighted a model whereby more equity in the housing market and more assistance for people in private rental could be provided. That model—and this is well known—had to be subject to a long consultation period of more than a year before any definite plans could be drawn up. People were to be consulted right around Australia through the auspices of the national housing lobby group, Shelter. Shelter had already started this process by conducting a large and successful public meeting in South Australia. This was to be ongoing throughout the coming year.

However, when the Liberal Party won the subsequent election, it took that policy and decided to push it through as quickly as possible, fashioning it according to its own values. Instead of wide, general public consultation over a long period, bureaucrats have formed a working party and are discussing it with their Ministers at COAG meetings. One can be sure that a Federal Labor Government would have listened to the consultation and to the people who pointed out any difficulties with the proposed scheme. One can be sure that the current Federal Liberal Government will listen to its bureaucrats, who will propose a scheme that, hopefully, cuts costs even if it does disadvantage tenants or proposed tenants of the Housing Trust. It is common knowledge that the

Federal Treasurer, Mr Costello, hoped to use the renegotiation of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement as a means to cut millions of dollars from the Federal Government's housing budget. After the furore that that created, we have subsequently been promised that that is not the case but that it will be revenue neutral for both Federal and State Governments.

Given the nature of the scheme, that is almost possible. Something in housing will have to give. Liberal Governments, State and Federal, continue to deny this and continue to put off the day when they will have to come clean and admit to the public that they cannot do what they say they will do within the existing funding limits. But they want to put off that evil day for as long as possible. I am sure that this State Government wants to put it off long after the next State election.

The Minister says that Ms Gay Thompson is not worried about the truth, because in a letter to people in Reynell she said that it is still difficult to get information on exactly what will happen to Housing Trust tenants as a result of changes introduced by the Liberal Governments at State and Federal levels. In one sense she is right, because we are not being told what these secret bureaucratic negotiations are about. But we do know that the changes introduced at State level have disadvantaged Housing Trust tenants in the area in which she is campaigning. We know that, because we have had numerous complaints from people in that area about the steep rise in rents as a result of the change to market rentals.

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** We will no doubt hear many references to sport in the lead-up to the Olympic Games in Sydney in the year 2000. Nevertheless, it is good to remember that Australia has many more top sports people than the elite who represent our nation at the world level of Olympic competition. I am proud to have in my electorate of Flinders the top Australian secondary school sailing teams, who victoriously represented our country against New Zealand in September. Students from Port Lincoln High School defeated students from New Zealand's Keri Keri High School 11 races to seven to win the 1996 Epiglass Interdominion Secondary Schools Sailing Teams Championship.

We were privileged to have Premier Dean Brown toss the coin to start the 1996 series. It was a good omen that the Premier was able to start the series that marked another win by our local teenagers. The team members, whose ages range from 14 to 17 years, were: captain Paul Buckland, Alina Haldane, Aaron Matulich, Louise Buckland, Matthew Octoman, Tim Walker and Simon Growden. The coach was Brett Young and the managers were Tiffany Evans and Gary Walpole.

Port Lincoln High School and Port Lincoln's St Joseph's School, which also has sailing teams, hosted the State heats on Boston Bay in 1995, and now Port Lincoln has hosted the 1996 interdominion on Boston Bay. Port Lincoln has won four successive Epiglass Australian Secondary Schools Teams Racing Championships since the national series began in 1990 and three interdominion titles over the same period.

With a coastline as long as Tasmania's, it is perhaps not surprising that sailing is strong in my electorate. We have some of the best inshore waters for yachting in Australia. When we promote this State, that is surely worth all the promotion we can give, because it has the potential to attract many more international as well as national visitors. Like any sport, training is an important factor in success. Over the years, Port Lincoln yachtsmen who have experience in

competition sailing at world level have freely given of their time to coach teenagers for this prestigious competition. That means a significant cost to the individual.

I again draw the attention of the House to Constable John Hookings of Streaky Bay, who has revived sailing in that district through the development of the Blue Light Sailing Club. At his own expense, Constable Hookings travelled with two members of the club to Hamilton Island in Queensland in August this year for the boys to participate in the Hamilton Island race week. These two students, Eric Elliot and Paul Elliot, would never have accessed such an experience without the initiative of Constable Hookings, who is Chairman of the Streaky Bay Blue Light Sailing Club, in developing sailing and his considerable personal cost to get them to the event.

I commend the Government, Premier Dean Brown and the Minister for Sport, Recreation and Racing (Hon. Graham Ingerson) for establishing a sport and recreation fund from gaming machine revenue. I am excited about the possibility of the sports grants for clubs and individuals made available through these grants, which will significantly benefit country people, especially young people in my electorate. These funds will bring a measure of social justice to the youth of my electorate, by going some way towards covering the heavy cost of travel when a person is selected for a State team.

More than 20 young people in my electorate who are involved in sports such as hockey, Australian rules football, callisthenics, swimming, netball, BMX, softball and sailing currently represent the State in some way. These grants will help to overcome the significant travel costs that people in my electorate face when competing at State level, aiming to get to the stop of their chosen sport. Travel is a costly item when a child has to fly to Adelaide each weekend for training in a State team and, subsequently, there is the cost of attendance at the competition. The cost of travel is unavoidable for, without that training, the person is ineligible for the team. I look forward to the day when more of the young people in my electorate will have the opportunity to emulate Keiran Modra, who won gold at the 1996 Paralympics in Atlanta, or Dean Lukin, who won gold at the 1984 Olympics in Los Angeles.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** It is unfortunate that I have to take up the time of the Chamber this afternoon to complete my grievance speech that was interrupted yesterday by frivolous points of order from the Opposition. As I said yesterday, while I did not in any way highlight any member on the other side, clearly the member for Hart is a very sensitive person when it comes to the issue with which I was dealing. I should like to pose a couple of questions to the Chamber in continuation of my speech about a public meeting that was held Friday evening at Old Noarlunga.

Does the Labor Party of today support the standard sewerage connection policy of the previous Government, which was put into place by the Hon. Don Hopgood in 1987? If it does not support it, will it repeal it? What is its policy, because it is not shown in the 200 pages of propaganda that were released at its recent conference. If the Labor Party believes that standard sewerage connections should be free, why did it not offer that to my constituents (and I hope I will be the member for Mawson after the next election) and those of the District of Kaurana?

I had far too much respect for the community than to try to pork barrel that night, and I had enough of pork barrelling when I worked in the private sector, trying to create jobs in the State of South Australia. As I have said on other occasions, that is one of the reasons why I wanted to come into

Parliament. I will not become involved in pork barrelling but I am committed to seeing a fair go for the south and a sustainable future for our State.

This scheme is very important for the community and for the environment, including the magnificent estuaries of the Onkaparinga River that run through Old Noarlunga. According to SA Water, a lot of information about the sewerage connection was provided 18 months ago, but interestingly, an unsigned, important notice went out to the constituents of Old Noarlunga. I have now been informed that that was Labor propaganda, which was circulated purely to mislead the people before that meeting. That is most unfortunate.

It is an important program and it is one that the Government would like to see proceed, but only if that is what the community wants. My colleague the member for Kaurua has indicated to me that, on numerous occasions while doorknocking, she has heard strong support for this scheme. I have met with the Minister and the member for Kaurua, and a questionnaire will be issued to the community in the near future to clarify a number of issues once and for all.

In the six years that I have been working with this community, I have done extensive doorknocking. Indeed, I have virtually doorknocked the whole electorate on two occasions. I am putting in 80 or 90 hours a week, and I do that because I enjoy the work I do in my community. I want to listen to what all the people in my electorate have to say. I encourage those people to let us know what they want, and we will do the best we can to make the necessary representations to have their voice heard. That is our job. I will not mislead the people or anyone in this Chamber and say that all their wishes will necessarily be granted, because that would be a straight out pork pie, and I am not prepared to do it. However, I offer my most energetic commitment to make strong representations on their behalf to the Minister.

The shadow spokesperson indicated that the 1¢ levy that is collected concerns privatisation and profitability. There is no privatisation with SA Water. It has been purely some insourcing of management. As a result of that insourcing, profit savings have been made which have enabled the establishment of filtration plants in areas that desperately need them. Unfortunately, this State has a big debt and we have had to look at insourcing where appropriate to redress the problems caused by that financial debacle.

What is the Labor Party saying? If its members are opposed to the 1¢ per kilolitre levy which is specifically designated for the clean-up of the Murray River, they need to be condemned. That is the main artery of South Australia. It is in a deplorable condition and that 1¢ per kilolitre levy is essential.

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

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT (CITY OF ADELAIDE)  
BILL**

Returned from Legislative Council with the following amendments:

- No. 1 Page 1, lines 6 to 8 (long title)—Leave out all words in these lines after "Commissioners" in line 6 and insert "to prepare a report on the future governance, structure, powers and functions of the Corporation of the City of Adelaide; and for other purposes".

- No. 2 Page 1, line 14 (clause 1)—Leave out "Local Government (City of Adelaide) Act 1996" and insert "City of Adelaide (Governance Reform) Act 1996".
- No. 3 Page 1, line 16 (clause 2)—Leave out ", other than schedule 1,".
- No. 4 Page 1, line 18 (clause 2)—Leave out subclause (2).
- No. 5 Page 1, line 21 (clause 3)—Leave out the definition of "associate".
- No. 6 Page 1, lines 25 and 26 (clause 3)—Leave out the definition of "period of administration".
- No. 7 Page 1, lines 27 and 28 (clause 3)—Leave out the definition of "relative".
- No. 8 Page 2, lines 1 to 3 (clause 3)—Leave out the definitions of "relevant interest" and spouse.
- No. 9 Page 2, lines 4 to 16 (clause 3)—Leave out subclause (2).
- No. 10 Page 2, lines 17 to 21 (clause 4)—Leave out the clause.
- No. 11 Page 3, line 2 (Heading)—Leave out this heading and insert "APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONERS".
- No. 12 Page 3, line 3 (Heading)—Leave out the heading.
- No. 13 Page 3, lines 4 to 10 (clause 5)—Leave out the clause.
- No. 14 Page 3, lines 12 to 17 (clause 6)—Leave out subclauses (1) and (2) and insert new subclauses as follow:
  - (1) There are to be three Commissioners for the purposes of this Act.
  - (2) Of the three Commissioners—
    - (a) one must be a person who has significant knowledge of and experience in urban planning; and
    - (b) one must be a person who has significant knowledge of and experience in local government; and
    - (c) one must be a person who has significant knowledge of and experience in business."
- No. 15 Page 3 (clause 6)—After line 19 insert new subclause as follows:
  - (3a) At least one Commissioner must be a woman and at least one Commissioner must be a man.
- No. 16 Page 3, lines 24 and 25 (Heading)—Leave out the heading.
- No. 17 Page 4, line 5 (clause 7)—Leave out subclause (4).
- No. 18 Page 4, line 7 (clause 7)—Leave out "Governor" and insert "Minister after consultation with the City of Adelaide".
- No. 19 Page 4, lines 8 and 9 (clause 7)—Leave out "paid by the City of Adelaide" and insert "defrayed by the City of Adelaide and the Crown in equal shares".
- No. 20 Page 4, line 11 (clause 8)—Leave out "of the City of Adelaide or".
- No. 21 Page 4, lines 15 and 16 (clause 8)—Leave out "or the City of Adelaide's".
- No. 22 Page 5, lines 2 to 28 (clause 10)—Leave out the clause.
- No. 23 Page 5, lines 30 to 45 and page 6, lines 1 to 19 (clause 11)—Leave out the clause.
- No. 24 Page 6, line 20 (Heading)—Leave out the heading.
- No. 25 Page 6, line 22 (clause 12)—Leave out "the City of Adelaide" and insert "the Commissioners".
- No. 26 Page 6, line 25 (clause 12)—Leave out "of the City of Adelaide" and insert "at a meeting".
- No. 27 Page 6, line 27 (clause 12)—Leave out "City of Adelaide" and insert "Commissioners".
- No. 28 Page 6, lines 31 to 38 and page 7, line 1 (clause 12)—Leave out subclauses (5) and (6).
- No. 29 Page 7 (clause 12)—After line 1 insert new subclause as follows:
  - (6a) A meeting of the Commissioners should be open to the public unless the Commissioners are hearing, considering or determining a representation or matter that, in the opinion of the Commissioners, should be dealt with on a confidential basis.
- No. 30 Page 8, lines 1 and 2 (Heading)—Leave out the heading.
- No. 31 Page 8, lines 3 to 20 (clause 13)—Leave out the clause.
- No. 32 Page 8, lines 21 to 23 (clause 14)—Leave out the clause.
- No. 33 Page 8, lines 24 to 33 (clause 15)—Leave out the clause.
- No. 34 Page 9, line 1 (Heading)—Leave out this heading and insert "PART 3".
- No. 35 Page 9, line 5 (clause 16)—After "governance," insert "structure,".
- No. 36 Page 9, line 6 (clause 16)—Leave out "31 March 1998" and insert "31 January 1997".
- No. 37 Page 9, lines 10 to 12 (clause 16)—Leave out subclause (4) and insert new subclauses as follow:

- (4) In preparing a report under this section, the Commissioners must take into account—
- (a) the objects of the Local Government Act 1934; and
- (b) the objectives for the governance of the City of Adelaide set out in the schedule.
- (5) The report must specifically address the following issues—
- (a) how the City of Adelaide differs or should differ from other local government areas in the relative prominence that is or should be given to issues of State wide significance; and
- (b) the appropriate boundaries for the City of Adelaide; and
- (c) the appropriate qualifications for enrolment as an elector for the City of Adelaide; and
- (d) how to ensure fair and equitable representation of resident and non-resident ratepayers; and
- (e) the composition of the council.
- (6) The Commissioners should not make recommendations to vary the composition, powers or functions of the City of Adelaide so as to create differences between the City of Adelaide and the other councils in the State except to the extent that is necessary to ensure that issues of general importance to the State may be accorded proper consideration and weight in the governance of the City of Adelaide.
- (7) The Minister must, within three sitting days after receiving the report of the Commissioners under this section, have copies of the report laid before both Houses of Parliament.
- No. 38 Page 9, lines 13 to 35 and page 10, lines 1 to 10 (clause 17)—Leave out the clause and insert new clause as follows:  
Ability to defer 1997 elections
17. (1) The Governor may, by proclamation made before 1 March 1997, suspend the periodical elections due to occur under the Local Government Act 1934 on the first Saturday of May in 1997 for the City of Adelaide.
- (2) Subject to the operation of a proclamation made under Part II of the Local Government Act 1934, if a proclamation is made under subsection (1), the same or a subsequent proclamation must fix a day occurring no later than 31 July 1997 for the holding of the suspended periodical elections under the Local Government Act 1934.
- (3) A proclamation under this section may make any other provision that is necessary, desirable or expedient in the circumstances.
- No. 39 Page 11, line 1 (Heading)—Leave out "5" and insert "4".
- No. 40 Page 11, lines 3 to 8 (clause 18)—Leave out the clause.
- No. 41 Page 11, lines 9 to 12 (clause 19)—Leave out the clause.
- No. 42 Page 11, lines 13 to 19 (clause 20)—Leave out the clause.
- No. 43 Page 11, line 22 (clause 21)—Leave out "30 June 1999" and insert "31 August 1997".
- No. 44 Page 11, line 23 (clause 21)—Leave out "30 June 1999" and insert "31 August 1997".
- No. 45 Page 12, lines 1 to 42 (Schedule 1)—Leave out the schedule.
- No. 46 Page 13, lines 1 to 19 (Schedule 2)—Leave out the schedule and insert new schedule as follows:

#### SCHEDULE

##### Objectives for the governance of the City of Adelaide

The new form of governance should enable the City of Adelaide—

- (a) to work in partnership with the State and the Commonwealth on issues of mutual interest including the necessary response to rapid social and economic change, and growing regional markets—in particular the Asian markets for educational and information technology services;
- (b) to enable the City to accommodate strong and desirable growth within the City and the broader community;
- (c) to provide a focus for the cultural, educational, tourist, retail and commercial activities of the State;
- (d) to increase the residential population of the City and to provide for residential involvement in the governance of the City in an appropriate balance with broader interests;

(e) to achieve appropriate planning and development of the City which complements the planning and development of surrounding areas;

(f) to address social and environmental concerns;

(g) to give appropriate effect to the Adelaide 21 report.

- No. 47 Page 14, lines 1 to 16 (Schedule 3)—Leave out the schedule.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

Given the amendments to this Bill which have been moved by the Opposition and the Australian Democrats in the other place, it is quite obvious that both Parties have completely misunderstood the purpose of this measure. I will therefore attempt to make it clearer to them and address individual amendments. We are all well aware of the powers provided in the Local Government Act to sack councils in cases of irregularities. Had it been appropriate to do so we would have used the relevant provisions of the Local Government Act. But, instead, the Government decided to take assertive action and draft a Bill to satisfy the glaring need to change what is currently an unworkable structure for the future governance of Adelaide. All Parties agree to this need in principle, and the Government's Bill addresses this matter, at the same time providing greater protection for all concerned than would the Local Government Act.

I stress again that the fundamental issue is future structure and direction, not past council performance. The Hon. Michael Atkinson has stated on a number of occasions that he supports the Bill and further restructuring of the council. The honourable member's own words were:

I have been a public critic of Lord Mayor Henry Ninio and the Adelaide City Council for more than three years, and I actually think that Dean Brown is on the right track in talking about sacking the Adelaide City Council, replacing it with commissioners and restructuring the City Council. In fact, I think Dean Brown ought to go further and indulge in some more fundamental restructuring of the council. We ought to support the legislation.

That quote from a front bencher of the Labor Opposition proves quite conclusively that what the Government is attempting to do is supported by the Opposition. The honourable member is not the only one in his Party to voice this sentiment but, unfortunately, the Opposition has been captured—I hope only temporarily—by those with a self-interest in protecting the existing council, and has forced a series of quite unworkable amendments to the legislation. I will take the time to spell out clearly that this Bill has been introduced following the Government's concern that the electoral franchise of the City of Adelaide means that the council does not and cannot represent the interests of the vast majority of South Australians who use the city but who do not either live in or own part of it. The Government wants to change that franchise but is not fixed in its ideas on what that franchise should be. Therefore, it proposes to seek advice from the community, led by three commissioners.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Bass):** Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is out of order.

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** Thank you, Mr Acting Chairman. It appears that this is the common ground between the Opposition, the Democrats and the Government. However, the amendments moved in another place seek to have the commissioners and the council work alongside each other and, as I have said all along, this scenario is just not workable. It is obvious that it is unworkable because of comments

by a former councillor who said she found it 'demeaning to be part of such a dysfunctional body'. She went on to say:

We should flush out the system, give it time for the wounds to heal and develop a proper electoral system that allows us to choose better quality candidates.

The comments—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** If the honourable member wants to keep interjecting I could talk about a telephone call I have received, so I suggest that he just listen.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! Would the Minister continue.

**The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN:** The comments show that the council needs to be removed during the period of determining new governance, simply because it represents and is responsible to the current electorate and is too close to the problem. As I have said many times, in fact it is part of the problem. It was entirely predictable that the councillors would launch a campaign against the Bill, form alliances where none formerly existed and go to the electors to stave off a threat to their positions. More importantly, if left in place the council will fight to defend itself against any recommendations of the commissioners if they are at variance with the council's wishes. Therefore, how can both the council and the commissioners be in place at the same time, with the council actively working not with the commissioners but against them? That is what will occur if the Opposition has its way.

The Opposition has simply played into the council's hands and has not thought through its plan to determine the most productive and the best arrangement for the future of this city and this State. I add that the predictable campaign by the council shows that the Government is right in wanting the councillors set aside and replaced in the interim by commissioners while the new system is developed. It is the only solution. We cannot and will not get balanced public consideration of options while one party to the debate is committed to spending ratepayers' funds to oppose major reform. They will do the same if the commissioners dare to come up with suggestions with which they disagree.

In the debate the Opposition and Democrats have glossed over the major problems facing the council. They have ignored the obvious factionalism in council, the fact that the Lord Mayor is ostracised by the members, that two members have resigned and that one member has described the council as 'dysfunctional'. This situation cannot be allowed to continue. How can such a council effectively contribute to the debate on future options? Again I ask the question I have been asking all along: what vision has ever been put forward by that council?

The Hon. Mike Elliott did not mention these issues, preferring to portray the councillors as without factions and the resignations as unrelated to any factionalism. He applied a similar selective loss of memory to the role of the Adelaide 21 report. No-one has said that the report advocated sacking the council. We said that the concerns over the electoral franchise were expressed strongly by contributors to the Adelaide 21 report, and one of these contributors was the council itself. We said that Adelaide 21 stressed the need for changes to the governance of the city and that it is vital to put in place a new form of governance to give effective representation in the affairs of the city to a broader cross-section of South Australians. We also explained that the change of governance is part of a package that includes the Adelaide

Partnership and a new marketing authority for the city. We drew attention to the widespread support for these proposals.

The Opposition has also moved to require the commissioners to submit a report on the future governance of Adelaide and also to carry out thorough community consultation by the end of January 1997. I ask the rhetorical question: how thorough can any consultation be in such a short period? This is quite simply ludicrous because, even if the legislation is enacted before Christmas, this will leave only a matter of weeks in the least productive time of the year, aptly known as the 'silly season', to build on recommendations to change the governance of the city. We are talking about the authority which governs the heart of this State.

Will the Opposition ask South Australians to forgo their holiday this year if they want to make any input into the future of their city centre? If so, I am sure that this Government does not want to be part of that. This time frame is quite simply inadequate and irresponsible and makes me wonder whether the Opposition really understands just how serious the situation is in the City of Adelaide. To make matters worse, the Democrats also want the commissioners to consider in this time frame changes to electoral boundaries, qualifications for enrolment, the composition of the council and fair and equitable representation for residents and ratepayers.

That is not a bad ask for something to be done in a matter of weeks. The people of South Australia deserve a better city centre, but they certainly do not deserve this inadequate deadline. It is, quite frankly, a sick joke. An Opposition amendment to the Bill gives the Governor the power to defer the council election to 31 July 1997, to ensure that it is within the State electoral cycle. This is still a totally unworkable time frame and, I believe, shows a lack of interest in putting in place some positive changes to the governance of the city that would be in the best interests of this State.

The Opposition also wants to take out the clause that makes the council responsible to the Minister for spending that exceeds \$100 000. I believe that the clause must remain, because it is in the best interests of the ratepayers of the city and the wider community to ensure that any major developments or projects approved by the council or the commissioners also have the support of the Government. Other changes include removing the interrelationship with the Local Government Act to make this legislation stand alone. This legislation must be linked to provide the appropriate protections which the existing Act has in terms of council meetings, accountability and responsibilities.

I cannot understand why this amendment was moved, because all along I have been accused of the fact that the commissioners will not be meeting in an open forum. Yet the Opposition is now saying that it wants to remove this measure from the Local Government Act, thereby removing the openness of these meetings. To take this away would not be good for the wider community's peace of mind. The Leader of the Democrats, on the other hand, has moved an amendment so that each commissioner must have significant knowledge and experience in one of the three prescribed areas of local government, urban planning or business. This amendment would provide us with very narrowly qualified commissioners, without the broad scope of expertise needed to form a good team crucial for this role.

For example, where is the interest in the arts, and so on? Of course, one of the three commissioners we have put forward is very much involved in that area. The Hon. Anne Levy thinks that it is still necessary to insist in law on gender

balance for commissioners. We believe the State is past the need for that coercion, and I have demonstrated my seriousness in this area in terms of the nominees for commissioners, including one very capable and able female.

The Leader of the Democrats also wants the commissioners to be paid in equal shares by the council and the State Government. Absolutely no reason was given as to why the original arrangements for payment needed to be changed. The role of the commissioners will be to help the council overcome its governance problem and set about some plans for the future—plans that it just does not have at the moment—and obviously the payments should be from that source. I again stress the need for this legislation. What confidence can Parliament have in a council, elected on a narrow franchise, accepting a view that the franchise should be broadened? Make no mistake: if the council is left with commissioners, the council will, whenever the commissioners come up with any suggestion with which it disagrees, run its \$50 000 campaigns just as it has done over the past few weeks. What hope do we have of ever resolving anything?

It was predictable that the councillors would be a powerful and emotive conservative force, and they have proven that prediction. The sad part is that they, unfortunately assisted by the Local Government Association, have captured the minds of the Opposition and the Australian Democrats. Emotion has run wild, and the facts and logic of the Government's case have been ignored by the Opposition Parties. I remind members that this council should represent the interests of all South Australians. It is a very different council from any other council in this State.

The argument of protecting democracy simply does not wash. The amendments would protect a small group against the majority. The council has thrown up its defences, brought in its reinforcements and come to the Opposition and the Australian Democrats to help it stave off that threat. In doing this it has spent more than \$50 000 of ratepayers' money to put across its view, conduct a poll and run advertisements. Residents of this council should not be paying for this or future costs of the council's campaign, which will obviously continue if it remains in place. I can assure members that many ratepayers have contacted me and others to indicate how angry they are at what they see as an absolute waste of council's money, that is, their rates.

The council knows it has not done its job and is now scurrying to cover its weaknesses with a misleading and emotive campaign. The Opposition and the Democrats are prepared, they say, to support an inquiry into governance, but they want it done in less than two months; they want it broadened to consider the boundaries of the city; and they want it to consider whether the Lord Mayor should be elected by the councillors. The effect of these changes would be, first, to make the job of the commissioners much more difficult and, therefore, they will need much more time; and, secondly, it would cause this inquiry to overlap and interfere with the work of the Local Government Boundary Reform Board, a board which is universally recognised by all for the successes it is achieving.

That has been recognised by councils, the Local Government Association, and certainly the Government, so why would we want to interfere with that? It would place unreasonable time constraints on the consideration of a complex topic, and it would open the door for the current council to disrupt the process and potentially continue to spend resources unwisely—as it has done in the past couple months—on projects designed to demonstrate its power. Obviously,

these are unwanted complications. The council holds no promise of achieving a rational and focused discussion on the best form of future governance of the City of Adelaide.

The amendments allow no time for the development of a proper solution. The council has been a problem for years, and the solution will have to last for decades. Why constrain such an important solution and decision making process to just a few short weeks? It just does not make sense. The worst aspect of these proposals is that they are based on the misconception that this Bill is just one to sack the council. It is not, and I hope that the reasons for the Government's proposals are now well and truly clear. We have made it quite clear that we need a new form of governance, and we have made it quite clear that we need a direction to be set by the council.

There is no forward planning; there is no vision for the future at the moment and that must come: it is an absolute essential. The amendments, in effect, would transform the commission into an advisory board, which does not need legislation to be set up. This outcome is not acceptable and would be worse than no Bill at all. The Government does not accept the amendments made in the other place, and I hope that the Opposition will reconsider its position, because its own proposals will only cause more problems than they solve. In rejecting these amendments, I understand that we are setting in place a process which it is hoped will lead to a resolution of what is a very serious problem.

**Ms HURLEY:** I congratulate the Minister on finally producing a fairly coherent explanation of why the Government has taken the action it has on this Bill. It has taken a very long time for the Government to get its story straight. Let us go back to where this started. The Premier had a rush of blood to his head and wanted to show a bit of vision and leadership, which the electorate of South Australia is now increasingly saying that he and his Government lack. He thought that one way he might do this was to do what every other Liberal Premier has done around Australia—sack the council.

The Premier rushed forward and announced that the council would be sacked and replaced with commissioners, as every other Liberal State in Australia has done, and this was how it was going to be. Yet the Minister stands up and repeats several times that the campaign by the Adelaide City Council and others has been predictable. If the Government predicted that, it has handled it very badly. All we have had is the Premier grandstanding, first, about the Lord Mayor. When that did not work, he moved on to the council's development record and then, when that proved to be false, he moved on to some other argument.

We have had shifting ground constantly as the Premier has fought to maintain his position. Even when the Bill was introduced in the Lower House, no coherent and logical explanation was given as to why the Bill had to be brought in so urgently at this time, without any real structure or idea of what should happen as a result of the review coming from this Government. Vague complaints were made about lack of development occurring in this city and that somehow the Adelaide City Council should have had this massive development going on within the city when everyone in this State knows that development in South Australia is just about at an all-time low.

The housing industry is just about dead, and every business around this State has noticed a slump in its business, yet, somehow or other, the Adelaide City Council was meant to generate this dynamic centre. Brown was trying to say that



it is not his fault that the State is in a slump, that it is the fault of the Adelaide City Council for not improving things in the CBD. That is just such a joke—

**Mr BRINDAL:** Mr Acting Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I believe it is customary in this place to refer to the Premier not as 'Brown' but either as the Premier or by his electorate. I believe that is disrespectful.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** I accept the point of order and ask the member for Napier to obey Standing Orders.

**Ms HURLEY:** It is just such a joke. The Bill was introduced, debated in this House and also in the Upper House and Opposition members still did not receive a coherent reason why this had to happen. Finally, at this stage, the Minister has arranged for his department or someone else to speak to the Premier's Department and get a coherent line going. I do not blame the Minister for Tourism for being a bit wobbly: this is a difficult issue for the Government, because it has acted badly all the way through. Now we are trying to get logical arguments in response to this so called predictable debate to which the Government and the Minister responded very badly, if at all. If it is true that they predicted the outcome of this debate, one would have thought that they would have developed a better strategy to deal with it. If it did predict it, it shows the Government's incompetence in not being able to provide a proper response right from the beginning. It did not do that because it did not have a decent response.

The Opposition is now being given some reasons why this has occurred. The Minister tried to make a play about the fact that we cannot have the marketing authority on at the same time as the council and the commission because it is all too difficult. He also said that the time lines provided by the amendments are not good enough and that it is very important that we get in and get things working in the council again because everything is going wrong. The Minister said that the Opposition misunderstood his position. The Opposition did not misunderstand his position. The Opposition understood what the Premier was trying to do, but he was deliberately misunderstanding and misrepresenting the Opposition's position.

The Opposition wants to fix the governance of the city council. All the way through the debate the Minister said, 'We want to improve the governance'. The Opposition agrees that the governance of Adelaide City Council needs to change at this time to meet the demands of the next couple of decades. We are clearly saying—and we have always said very clearly—'Let us do it. Let us do it soon and let us get it in place by May.'

The Minister briefly mentioned Adelaide 21, as he did in his second reading response. The Minister glossed over the fact that the Adelaide 21 report was the subject of extensive public consultation and a great deal of agreement. This excellent report was warmly received by the Premier and agreed to by him. It puts in front of the Premier the guidelines for the governance and the future direction of the City of Adelaide. But, no, the Premier wants to throw that away and put in place three commissioners who have very little background in local government to run Adelaide City Council and to be responsible for the planning and development of the City of Adelaide for the next 2½ years. I note that the Minister and every other Government member has skirted around the issue of one of the commissioners saying that he would look at development in the parklands.

The Government has said that it wants these commissioners to run the council. The Government's attempt at fixing

governance is to replace the Adelaide City Council with three commissioners and then go back to the same old scheme and hope that better people are elected next time. What the Opposition is saying is that that will not work and it will never work. If the problems do not surface at the next election, they will surface at the one after that. We need fundamental changes to the City of Adelaide. That is what the Opposition wants, and that is why we wanted to include boundary reform in this legislation. It is no use the Minister saying that it is a bit too difficult for the Boundary Reform Board at this time. If the Minister is serious about changing the Adelaide City Council, he should look at the boundaries, the voting system and the structure of the council.

That is what the Opposition wants. The Opposition does not want grandstanding and any pretence that there is leadership and vision when that is not the case. That is what the Government is doing. We want that structure in place in time for next year's election. The Minister says that that is not possible, but it is possible. Most of the consultation has been done through Adelaide 21, and other reviews of the Adelaide City Council have been undertaken. The report on the proposed structures will be in place in a matter of weeks, even though the Minister pretends to forget what happened after the report was received. There can be public consultation in February, and then the legislation can be introduced into this House. In that way the public can have a say in this House through legislation. Consultation will occur all the way through early next year.

I congratulate the Minister for cobbling together a fairly good excuse by overlooking the cold hard facts of the situation. The Democrats and the Opposition in the other place have put together a very sensible, practical and achievable set of amendments which will result in real change to the Adelaide City Council and which will put in place a council to take this city ahead into the next century. Let us not have the Government pretend any more that that is what it wanted. It only wanted to be seen to be in control, and that meant wresting control of the city from the residents and any other interested groups.

The Government always talks about representation from arts and education groups, but the Bill in its original form deprived not only residents of Adelaide of any representation but interest groups from anywhere else in Adelaide. The Government would have put three people in charge of the City of Adelaide, so let us not talk any more about representation. The Opposition strongly believes that its amendments and those that it agreed to in the other place are the right way ahead for the City of Adelaide, and we will strongly support them.

Motion carried.

#### **IRRIGATION (CONVERSION TO PRIVATE IRRIGATION DISTRICT) AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 November. Page 397.)

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** The Bill on which I speak today is very important. We passed an earlier Bill in this Parliament to set up the irrigation board and districts. In discussions with the Minister and the Minister's officers, the Opposition has been made aware that the Bill is consequential to that earlier legislation. Further work has been undertaken by the various players in the irrigation area in question in the upper river

region, and we understand that they would like to make a change to the arrangements for the irrigation districts.

As I said, in consultation with officers of SA Water and the Minister, these changes are quite reasonable and a quite appropriate way to go. My Opposition colleagues concur with my view on the need to facilitate this Bill. Again, in the true spirit of cooperation for which this Opposition is becoming renowned in this Parliament and around the State, we are working towards constructive reform of the economy of South Australia, despite the rhetoric of the Premier and dare I say that of the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations.

We are a constructive Opposition that is working with the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development to facilitate this Bill. Whilst I am prepared to be a rigorous opponent of the Minister on some issues of water in this State, where I can reach common ground I am all too willing. The Opposition has yet again shown the constructive role it plays for the reform of industry within this State. With those few words, this important Bill has the full support of the Opposition.

**Mr LEWIS (Ridley):** I commend the Minister for the substance of the legislation in its form, for what it does in that respect; and, make no bones about it, I mean that in every way. However, I am disappointed to note that we still see water taken from the Murray River which this legislation addresses as being solely for the purpose of irrigation. To that extent we wear blinkers because we deny ourselves the great benefit that we could otherwise derive from it if the people who diverted it were encouraged to think of using it in more ways than just to put it on plants or trees of the conventional type for which it is currently used. Whether those plants are horticultural or for forage and whether the trees are for fruit production or other herbaceous plants or flowers or even, for that matter, for match wood is all that is contemplated in the term 'irrigation'.

I make this point because I believe that if we were to change this term we might be able to encourage people to think on a broader front and use the water so diverted for farming fish and/or aquatic plants that are part and parcel of aquaculture. It is well established that an aquaculture industry for this State would contribute millions of dollars more than we presently obtain from our exports by selling every kilogram of the tonnes of produce we obtain in that way on the overseas market. There is no reason why we need to regard the production of agricultural commodities as competing with existing production in Australia for Australian markets. It is with those few remarks that I commend the measure to the House.

**Mr ANDREW (Chaffey):** I am pleased to support this legislation, because it will undoubtedly benefit not just irrigators but the State as a whole. It is my duty to place on record that, as an owner of Government irrigation land, I have a direct interest in this matter. The amendments are relatively minor, as they build upon the major changes to the Irrigation Act that the Government introduced in this place in 1994. One of the primary objectives of that legislation was to allow conversion of Government irrigation districts to private irrigation trusts. I spoke at length on that aspect at the time, and particularly on the benefits of conversion from a Government scheme to a private scheme, with all the examples of increased efficiency and reduction in costs and greater accountability, so I will not reiterate those matters.

However, as this will now take place, it is important and appropriate that I reinforce some of the reasons why and how this process has progressed so positively and so smoothly over the past two or three years.

This process has come about because of a cooperative approach at grower level and at Government, departmental and ministerial level. Before I expand on this cooperation, I will briefly put on the record what this self-management is. Given all the beat up that seems to be coming from the Opposition over recent weeks and months about privatisation, I want ensure that it is clearly understood that this process is not privatisation. Fundamentally, the pipes and infrastructure are not being sold off to a third party. It really involves the ownership, management and control of the irrigation system by the growers and landowners of the respective districts.

By forming these trusts, we will be doing nothing more than mirroring what is already in existence and exemplified in South Australia in terms of irrigation operation in this State from the current private irrigation trusts, for example, the Renmark Irrigation Trust, Sunlands or the Golden Heights Irrigation Trust. Also, the growers will democratically elect the local boards of management that will set the priorities for works and management of the trust of their respective district.

I refer, first, to the cooperative process at Government level that has been successfully proceeding over the past two or three years. The Government is being influenced—and we are well all aware of this—by national reforms under Council of Australian Government (COAG) agreements with regard to national water policy reforms for increased efficiency of water delivery and all the things that flow from that, including the need to transfer the management of irrigation districts throughout Australia to respective regional authorities and so give greater management, authority and responsibility from the State to these private areas. The State Government, at both ministerial and departmental level, that is, through SA Water, has been cooperative in this process. It has provided a facilitative process of involvement and service, set reasonable and workable time frames, provided resources with which to work with the local bodies and expertise, and it has also made provision for dollar resources to facilitate rationalisation and the restructuring process along the way.

Secondly, at grower level there has been strong leadership from the grower irrigation boards, which have changed their role from advisory board to a joint management role. The boards have been working hard to improve water services to growers. In particular, this has involved gaining approval for the completion of the current irrigation rehabilitation programs in Loveday, Mypolonga and Cadell, based on the 40:40:20 financing arrangement, that is, 40 per cent Federal, 40 per cent State Government funding and 20 per cent grower funding. They have also been involved in a joint management role with SA Water, which has been successfully worked through to improve management practices and to reduce the cost of irrigation provision to growers since they have been involved at this level. Over 10 years, the Government highland irrigation scheme has had one of the highest costs of delivering irrigation water, and now it is one of the lowest.

For example, for 1989-90, right through to 1995-96, the cost of water provision in Government highland irrigation districts reduced from \$48.90 a megalitre to \$47.30 a megalitre. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a table which is of a purely statistical nature and which reflects the cost comparative with other districts, particularly those interstate and across the border for which, over the same five

year period, the cost of irrigation provision has increased significantly.

Leave granted.

	Price of Irrigation Water (\$/Ml)	
	1989-90	1995-96
GHID	\$48.90	\$47.30
RIT	\$38.80	\$44.30
Mildura	\$42.20	\$60.00
Merbein	\$43.30	\$63.00
Red Cliffs	\$54.90	\$88.00
Cooamealla	\$24.63	\$48.50

**Mr ANDREW:** This rationalisation has taken place without major problems, even though there have been significant staff reductions. It has come about in parallel with cost reductions, and growers in the Riverland region under the Government highland irrigation schemes without doubt have become more competitive and the changes have been widely accepted by the local irrigation community.

The Government highland irrigation board has worked hard and has progressed this process, producing a business plan for the future management of the areas. This business plan provides for the future sustainable management of the infrastructure, including the completion of rehabilitation, and establishes a direct relationship between the operating expenditure and the price of water. Prior to 1992-93, this did not exist. It also includes a move to self management and, more importantly, the negotiation of that plan with the State Government to achieve what the growers and I believe is a very good deal for growers.

This very good deal will mean that the growers and irrigation farmers, in agreeing to move to self management, will enjoy a number of specific benefits. First, they will avoid the scheme's remaining in the Government's hands or control with no guarantee of any degree of grower influence. If that was the case and it remained in Government hands, they would be at the mercy of the Government regarding the price of delivery of irrigation water. They would not be able to control their own destiny and set their own price for water.

They will gain ownership of \$150 million worth of assets, handed over debt free, including the irrigation and drainage pumping stations, pipes, drains, evaporation basins, water resource licences, depots, machinery, offices and all other facilities that go to provide water services. They will get this ownership for the payment of nothing more than 20 per cent of their contribution to the rehabilitation process—a contribution which, spread over seven years, will mean that the majority of those who have already contributed (except for those in the Mypolonga and Cadell districts) will cease paying that irrigation contribution in the 1998-99 financial year. They will have control of the existing asset replacement fund currently worth about \$3.22 million.

By moving to self management, they will not be required to, first, repay any past debts or interest on a past debt or any other rehabilitation costs to the State Government. They will not be required to pay a real rate of return or dividend to the State Government. I mention that, because these three latter points were specifically agreed to by the Premier, as the Leader of the Opposition, during later 1993 when he visited the Riverland with the Hon. Peter Arnold and me, as the Liberal candidate at the time. In negotiation with the then Government highland irrigation board, there was a commitment that, in the event of our coming to government, as part of this self-management program, via the business plan agreement, we would deliver that commitment to the Government highland irrigators. We are almost concluding this process at the moment.

I acknowledge and thank the growers for their overwhelming understanding, acceptance and up-take of this negotiated offer. Board members in particular have worked hard to ensure that this process proceeds smoothly. At the end of August, growers were sent an application form effectively to apply for self management and included with the application form was a brochure explaining the background and the detailed terms and conditions of self management. I will not go into those, but certainly they included a range of aspects including date of operation, transfer of assets and liabilities, Government funding, employees, the trust's use of Government facilities, the trust's ability to grant licences, an arrangement for the joint use of assets and the provision of water by the trust.

I place on record that at the end of October the response had been overwhelming in terms of support for this process of self management. I also report, as part of this application by growers, that overall it involved more than 80 per cent of growers and more than 90 per cent of the irrigation allocation. It was certainly heartening and I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a table of purely statistical nature.

**Mr Venning:** That's the second time.

**Mr ANDREW:** Exactly—it is the second time. It is important and I am quite happy—

**Mr Venning:** We will be able to have high tea with all these tables.

**Mr ANDREW:** The member for Culance represents a significant Government highland irrigation board area at Cadell. I hope that he will make comment in terms of the value and progression that will be felt. If he is to interject, it is appropriate that I reinforce to him the benefits that I know his electors in Cadell will gain from this. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a table indicating the eight irrigation districts and the overwhelming support for self management.

**The SPEAKER:** If the honourable member can assure me that it is of a statistical nature, leave is granted.

**Mr ANDREW:** Absolutely.

Leave granted.

Government Highland Irrigation Districts  
Per Cent of Applications Forms Returned by District and Water Allocations

District	Signed		Water Allocations	
	Number		Ml	Per Cent
Berri	441	84%	34 023	87%
Moorook	47	100%	4 364	100%
Cobdogla	406	84%	30 687	86%
Chaffety	122	85%	11 063	90%
Waikerie	215	81%	17 637	86%
Mypolonga	70	96%	5 142	96%

Cadell	63	89%	4 373	88%
Kingston	27	90%	2 414	83%
Total	1 391	85%	109 703	92%
Target	1 635	100%	118 895.303	100%

Source: Rust PPK

Date: Wednesday 30 October 1996

**Mr ANDREW:** It is heartening to the Minister and me to see the positive and overwhelming response in this regard and for us to ensure that these amendments are passed in this place as quickly as possible so that we can get on with the process: 1 July 1997 will be a new era for irrigation management in South Australia.

These amendments will provide for the transitional circumstances to allow the trust to formally be established prior to July 1997 and to allow members to be appointed to the board by the Minister for the first time. I understand and expect they will be the existing elected members of the grower irrigation advisory boards.

In conclusion, I commend the Minister, the South Australian water officers and staff, the Government highland irrigation boards and the growers for their total cooperation. I thank the Opposition for its support of this progressive legislation, which not only will benefit irrigators in Government highland irrigation areas but will be of economic and environmental benefit to the whole of South Australia.

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** I fully support this Bill. Given what the member for Chaffey said, I point out that I have done a lot of work on this issue. This is an important area of the State and I pay tribute to the member for Chaffey and his predecessor, the Hon. Peter Arnold, who served this State well in this important area. I also mention Jack Seekamp who would be well known to the member for Chaffey. He was a member of the board when I was a member and put in many hours of work on this issue. Often a controversial figure, Jack always had the Murray River and the State at heart. I fully support the Bill and the member for Chaffey's comments.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Minister for Infrastructure):** I thank the Opposition for its support of this measure and the members for Chaffey, Custance and Ridley for their contributions. The member for Chaffey pointed out the importance of irrigation districts to his electorate, the substantial improvement in the operation of those irrigation districts and how with private sector management even further gains will be made to the betterment and advantage of irrigators.

The member for Ridley raised a question in relation to the name of the Act and put on the record his views, as he has to me on a number of occasions. We have given consideration to his view about changing the name of the Act; however, I put to the House that diversion of water from the Murray River, a plain water course, is controlled under the Water Resources Act and as such is managed by the Department for the Environment and Natural Resources. These were the changes we made to water resources upon assuming government.

It would be misleading to call the Irrigation Act a water diversions Act, since the Act does not in any way authorise diversions of water from the Murray River. If water is to be directly diverted from the Murray for activities such as fish farms and so on, it is a matter for the Water Resources Act. Therefore, notwithstanding consideration of this matter, we believe that, despite the honourable member's arguments, it

is more appropriate to retain the name of the Act. I thank all members for their support of this measure and commend the Bill to the House.

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

#### **ANIMAL AND PLANT CONTROL (AGRICULTURAL PROTECTION AND OTHER PURPOSES) (INTERIM CONTROL BOARDS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 October. Page 372.)

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** This Bill (all two clauses) has been exhaustively canvassed by the Opposition. I note that the member for Custance is in the Chamber and that he will give us the benefit of his knowledge with respect to this Bill very shortly. I commend the Minister on introducing this legislation. At one stage I thought that, because of the member for MacKillop's outstanding contribution as Minister for Primary Industries, his shoes would never be filled. I did not believe that the member for Frome would have the capacity to fill those shoes, but I am pleased that he has disproved my doubts. There is only one other man in this Chamber who should sit on the front bench at this time as the Minister for Primary Industries, and that is the member for Custance. He is the only other honourable member to whom I doff my lid, because he knows more about agriculture than I.

**Mr D.S. Baker:** What about the member for Lee?

**Mr CLARKE:** No, the member for Custance. As we read in today's paper, the member for Custance has shown leadership by joining a centre unity faction within his Party. He did this in an act of bipartisanship to ensure stability within the governing Party of this State. The honourable member showed considerable foresight and interest for his destabilised Party when he put aside personal prejudice and ambition for a position he has long sought—Minister for Primary Industries. For that, we can be grateful.

With respect to the Bill, the Animal and Plant Control Act provides for the control of animals and plants for the protection of agriculture and the environment for the safety of the public. Originally, I thought the Bill was being introduced to guard the public against the marauding hordes of the Parliamentary Liberal Party in this State: however, it relates to animal and plant control. The shadow Minister will ask searching questions about this Bill and seek detailed explanations when it finally reaches the other place. However, in the meantime, the Opposition is prepared to support fully the introduction of this legislation and to facilitate its speedy enactment into law.

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** I support this Bill. I would have said 'albeit briefly', but I might have to ask for an extension of the allocated 20 minutes because it is my favourite subject. I will be as brief as possible. As you know, Sir, I served 10 years in local government—seven of which

as a member of an animal and plant control board and six as chairman. As the Minister said, this is a very short Bill—a rats and mice Bill, if you like—to allow the continuance of funding and the effective operation of animal and plant control boards during local government amalgamations.

The Animal and Plant Control Act provides for the control of animals and plants in order to protect agriculture, the environment and the public amenity. The Minister, via the Animal and Plant Control Commission, has control over the many boards throughout the State. The current board structure arose as a result of the amalgamation of the old Weeds Board and the old Vertebrate and Pest Control Board in 1988. It was a common sense move, which has worked very well.

Why have the current animal and plant boards not been amalgamated with the soil boards? This is an argument in which I have been involved for over 15 years. I made a rather radical suggestion about joint animal and plant and soil boards at a meeting in 1982. I thought that some of the soil board bureaucrats (and a lot of them were farmers) would come down on me at a thousand miles an hour. I was absolutely surprised at the support I received from many people, especially those involved professionally.

One such person of note—and you, Sir, and others would know him—was Arthur Tideman, who was very high up in the commission at that time and eventually led the commission. In 1996 we are amalgamating every other board, but this anachronism continues. These two bodies do very similar work, and there is no reason why the officers and the boards could not assume a dual role. The officers can work with weeds in the winter, soils in the summer and pest animals during either season. When we expect a weed or rabbit problem, we end up discussing soil problems as well because, in the name of land care, they are integral. As it is, there is too much duplication of roles within the system.

Often, two officers in two vehicles with very similar roles work in the same area. I do not see why the two cannot be combined. The funding levels would be guaranteed by local government and State and Federal Governments. The funding would be locked in at the current ratios and the boards could be referred to as land management boards. The latest periodical that I read is called the *South Australian Landcare Committee Magazine*. It is amazing that every other instrumentality sees this as one issue of land care. Why will our boards not get with it as well? Sir, many of your friends and my friends are on these boards. They are as bad as any bureaucrat in government: they want the boards to remain so that they can keep their possies.

I am probably risking a fate greater than death by bringing this up again. I cannot justify it, nor can anyone else. This Minister is the fifth Minister for Primary Industries whom I have confronted with this anachronism. Surely one day common sense will prevail and we will see a leaner and meaner land management board. The current Minister has hinted that, if boards wish to amalgamate, they can. We all know that the bureaucracy involved will largely prohibit that.

The previous Minister, the member for Mackillop, said that, during the changeover period, they could go into a dual role if they wished. That will not happen: the Government will have to legislate for that or do it by regulation. With councils amalgamating and new boards being set up, this is an opportune time for the Minister to have the courage to put an end to this ridiculous situation with this duplication and introduce ways to implement a new structure that will replace the two. At last we would have land management boards.

I am concerned at the apparent backdown in recent years of the animal and plant control boards. When I was involved, we had very strict rules in relation to the proclaimed areas, particularly as they involved onion weed, and we were very diligent and strict in upholding the law. We often had to book many of our ratepayer friends for non-compliance. We were making great strides in controlling our weed problems. As you would know, Sir, on the Willochra Plain, the boxthorn problem could not be allowed to continue, but it was difficult to get growers to address that problem.

There was a similar problem with artichokes in the watercourses, particularly around Gladstone, and the Minister would be well aware of that. It went on and on. I see that we are backing off horehound areas. I am amazed that we have created the right atmosphere for our landowners and they know what their responsibility is. We have got over the hard sell as to our expectation of them to look after the roadsides and the weeds, but we seem to be backing off. I am amazed, particularly in relation to the proclaimed onion weed areas.

Given all the work that has been done, all the court cases and all the unpleasant confrontations, I wonder why we seem to be backing off. We have some very serious problems with weeds. The golden dodder is a weed coming into the Riverland, and I know that the member for Chaffey is aware of it. It is a very serious weed and it is a fierce competitor. We do not want that anywhere else. We need these priorities to be maintained, and I could go on.

Another important point is the inspection of machinery coming into this State. As you would be well aware, Sir, machinery comes into this State from Western Australia and also from the other States, and we have a very good inspection process. I hope that stays in place because we do not want weed seeds moving about. We have had some catastrophes, as happened during the last drought when a lot of fodder was moved around the State. Weeds were in donated hay which was unwittingly moved across the State, so we moved noxious weeds from one side of the State to the other.

Rather than backing off these priorities, we should be strengthening them, so I challenge the Minister and the department not to be any less vigilant because, once we have got those weeds, we are stuck with them. We can kill them with chemicals if we keep spraying them. However, some weeds are becoming not only environmentally but also chemically resistant. They will not die, and that is a great concern.

We all know how cash strapped our departments are. By amalgamating these two boards, we can prune without a lot of pain. We can save at least 20 per cent in salaries and up to 40 per cent in motor vehicle costs by amalgamating these two boards. The farming sector is absolutely crying out for more departmental people on the ground, particularly in the agronomy section. When I was an active farmer, we had access to two agronomists who would come onto my property and, in an afternoon, they could save growers thousands of dollars by giving them the right advice. They are no longer there. It is false economy to make cuts in this area because it is close to farmers. The agronomists have the information and can pass it on to the growers. Information transfer has been our biggest problem. We have excellent scientists, but the transfer of information has been the problem. We need our agronomists to expound that knowledge.

On his impending retirement, I pay tribute to Mr Trevor Dillon. Every farmer knows who Trevor Dillon is. He is an agronomist who lives at Kadina, and the member for Goyder would know him very well. He is an incredible gentleman.

Not only is he very colourful and a great character but he certainly knows his business. What he has done for this State could never be measured. He retires in a couple of weeks time. I know that the Minister will go along to farewell him in a right royal way.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I suggest that the member for Custance not invite interjections but address his comments to the Bill before the Chair.

**Mr VENNING:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I crave your indulgence and your protection. As the Minister would well know, at that time in my life, Trevor Dillon was an adviser. The Minister owned a chemical company, and we were blessed with extremely good advice, not only at a professional level from the chemical companies through their advisers but also from the department, which had agronomists in all the key points: in the Mid north, the Barossa, the Riverland, in the Mallee and in McLaren Vale. I guess that we had 50 to 60 agronomists on the ground. I do not want to flag how many we have now, but I would say it is between 10 and 15. It is grossly false economy.

We can save money by pruning the animal and plant control boards and the soil boards by amalgamating them. I am not suggesting that we reduce the service they provide, because they do a valuable job, but that we bring them together and have the officers perform a dual role with one motor car instead of two. In the winter, they can attend to the weeds and, in the summer, they can attend to the soils. They can attend to the animals in both seasons. It is common sense, but we have this difficulty.

The member for Mackillop was a very tough Minister but this issue seemed to floor him. I put it to him and he said that it would be easy, but then he backed off. I did not see him back off on any issue except this one. I cannot understand why it ever happened. The present Minister knows full well, more so than the last, about the bureaucracy and the nonsense that goes on, so I put the challenge to him: fix this anachronism once and for all to save us money and use that money to provide more agronomists who can help us grow crops and not worry about weeds and vermin. During the amalgamation process, this is a golden opportunity for the Minister to amalgamate the boards. As the Minister knows, all these boards, both soil and animal and plant, require new boundaries. What an opportunity for the Minister to go down in history and kill this anachronism once and for all.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has been speaking for a considerable time, but he has not addressed the Bill, which consists of two clauses. I suggest that he relate his comments to the Bill before the Chair. He has strayed a considerable distance and I should now like him to address the Bill.

**Mr VENNING:** I think my comments are extremely relevant, because we are talking about a substantive—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Custance knows he is not in a position to question the rulings of the Chair, and therefore if he continues I will have to withdraw leave.

**Mr VENNING:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your protection and wisdom, but I hope you are not protecting anyone else in this issue.

**Mr CLARKE:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker, regarding continual defiance of the rulings of the Chair. As I well know, you will not tolerate that, Sir, and nor should you.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has brought to the attention of the Chair that no member can question the rulings of the Chair. I have reminded the member for Custance that he should address his comments to the Bill or I will withdraw leave.

**Mr VENNING:** I remind the House of the relevance of the point I am making. We are discussing today the process of keeping the animal and plant control boards funded through local government amalgamations. I simply add that, while we are undergoing this process, we ought to save ourselves money at the same time. It is relevant to the Bill that we do it at the same time, because it will save double handling.

**Mr CLARKE:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. You have made your ruling as to relevance. The honourable member concerned is continuing to flout that ruling and therefore I believe that he has cast a serious reflection on you and the Chair and that this needs to be upheld.

**The SPEAKER:** I sincerely thank the Deputy Leader for his concern for the welfare of the Chair. I understand that the member for Custance has now concluded his comments, so I now call on the member for Mawson.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** It is appropriate to talk about weeds and, after listening to my colleague's comments, I wonder what sort of weeds he has been thinking about, because he seemed to be jumping all over the place. Whilst in a sense this Bill is only a technical amendment, anything to do with the protection of our agricultural areas is nevertheless very relevant. We know that we must make sure that with the amalgamation of our councils the boards still have the strength and capacity to go about their business. I commend the Minister on being so diligent as to pick up on the smaller technicalities as well as the bigger picture in agriculture by introducing this Bill into the House.

I have been grubbing weeds for most of my life, unfortunately, whether it be the scotch thistle—the family emblem that I have continued to curse ever since I was a boy, grubbing them out day after day—ice weed or innocent weed (which is atrocious) when I was crutching sheep as a young person, Bathurst burr that we are now getting on the Fleurieu Peninsula from the Riverland or that dreaded salvation Jane which I see spreading right over the hill and posing a huge threat to our dairy industry on Fleurieu Peninsula.

We have to be serious about this issue. I am sick to death of weeds. I would like to see the salvation Jane issue resolved with apiarists, because there we could have controlled a pest plant that is now clearly out of control. To that end, animal and plant control is of paramount importance to agriculture. Irrespective of what other members may say from time to time, the future of South Australia rests to a large degree with fully value added agriculture. If we are to have a sustainable future and see the greatest opportunities for fully value added agriculture, we must look after our soils (as the member for Custance has pointed out) and water, and deal with our weed and animal pests. Therefore, it is imperative that this Bill go through as a matter of urgency. I want to see weeds cleaned up in this State once and for all, and I will do anything I can do to help clean up pests in this State.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Minister for Primary Industries):** I thank those who have contributed. I think that some contributions did get a little off the point; just about the only relevant comment made was when the Deputy Leader showed his knowledge by saying that the Animal and Plant

Act is about animals and plants. Then we heard the member for Custance, who strayed to an argument which he lost about 15 years ago and which he has continued to lose since; it is an old chestnut with him. The defiance of the Chair was quite amazing. I assure the honourable member that the members of soil and weeds boards do a great job nowadays. I know that older people who served on boards many years ago always feel that the young whippersnappers nowadays cannot do the job, but I assure the honourable member that those doing the job now are doing it well. His suggestion to amalgamate these bodies without consultation is quite outrageous.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I am sure the honourable member's constituents would not be happy with that suggestion. I also thank him for announcing the retirement of Trevor Dillon, which he did so well. I am sure that Trevor would be happy to know that he is retiring. The honourable member certainly got one thing right: Trevor's contribution to the department has been enormous. His general contribution to the farming community and also the wider community through his many other affiliations has been much appreciated, and he is indeed very well thought of on northern Yorke Peninsula. After straying so wide, I mention that the Bill takes into account the current situation with local government amalgamations. The amendments will enable continuity in the funding and the operations of the animal and plant control boards during the local government amalgamation process. The transitional provisions cover the situations which were not provided for initially. The amendments provide that the area of a council that falls wholly or partly within the area of a control board is a constituent council of that control board.

Under the current legislation the council may be involved in more than one control board following amalgamation, and that presents a problem. In this case, the amendments allow the council to contribute *pro rata* to the different boards until the new boards are proclaimed. The total contribution to one or more boards will not exceed 1 per cent of urban rates plus 4 per cent of rural rates, as provided under the current Act. The amendments also provide for lawful continuation of membership of existing boards and the replacement of a member should a vacancy occur.

I thank members for their support and state again that the animal and plant control boards do a terrific job throughout South Australia, particularly in rural areas. It is perhaps not as sexy or glamorous work as that of the soil boards. It often is hard work and sometimes involves board members having to confront fellow ratepayers, but board members make a significant contribution to their communities on their local boards. On behalf of the State Government and the member for Custance I acknowledge that contribution and thank them, particularly the longer serving members, for their efforts. I thank members for their support for the Bill and look forward to its achieving what it aims to achieve.

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

#### **LOCAL GOVERNMENT (CITY OF ADELAIDE) BILL**

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed. Consideration in Committee.

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

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs Ashenden and Condous, Ms Hurley and Messrs Quirke and Scalzi.

*Later:*

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the Plaza Room at 8.30 a.m. on Thursday 21 November.

#### **RACIAL VILIFICATION BILL**

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the Plaza Room at 9 a.m. on Friday 15 November.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

At 5.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 26 November at 2 p.m.