

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 26 February 1997

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

### SLATER, HON. J.W., DEATH

The **Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier)**: I move:

That this House expresses its regret at the recent death of the Hon. J.W. Slater, former member for Gilles and Minister of the Crown, and places on record its appreciation of his meritorious service and that, as a mark of respect to his memory, the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Jack Slater died on Sunday last, and I wish to pay a tribute to him and his contribution to South Australia. Jack Slater served as a member of this House and as the member for Gilles for nearly 20 years from 1970 until his retirement in November 1989. During this time he also served as a Minister, being appointed in 1982 and holding the portfolios of water resources and recreation and sport until his retirement from the ministry in 1985.

Jack once said that he liked to think he was a mate of everyone. In truth, it can be said that Jack was a genial character who was respected and genuinely liked by members on both sides of the House. He earned a public reputation as a man of kindness, energy and some perseverance.

Jack Slater grew up in Prospect and left school at 14, at a time when the Depression was very much in evidence, and eventually became a bootmaker. This employment prompted an interest in the trade union movement and eventually he became Secretary of the Australian Boot Trade Employees Federation. His interest in politics was fired in the early 1950s when he became interested in the work of the Labor Party in the Glynde and Payneham areas. He was to become a staunch member of the State ALP Executive and Secretary of the Enfield ALP District Club. In 1970 he was elected to the seat of Gilles, which took in the subdivisions of Klemzig, Payneham and Windsor Gardens. His success in narrowly retaining the seat in 1975 was sufficient to allow the Dunstan Government of the time to retain government.

Jack Slater was appointed to the Ministry in November 1982, and it can be safely said that, with the recreation and sport Ministry, he had an ideal background for the portfolio, in that he was a member of the Veterans' Athletics Club and was so successful that he competed with the South Australian team at the 1980 world championships in New Zealand.

As a keen racegoer, he recognised the benefits of helping the TAB to grow and helping horse racing to prosper. In the field of water resources management, he oversaw an improvement of services in Adelaide's outer suburbs during a time when infrastructure had become run down in those areas. As proof of the enthusiasm for everything he did, Jack used the experience of his heart attack in 1984 to warn the public of the risks of heart disease by promoting a healthier lifestyle. His death on Sunday occurred due to a relapse of that heart condition.

In closing, I extend condolences to Jack's widow, Doris, their sons and daughters, Geoffrey, Graeme, Jennifer and Judith, and their extended families. It is appropriate that this Parliament remembers Jack Slater for his contribution to his electors within the seat of Gilles but, more importantly, for his energetic and enthusiastic contribution to South Australia.

The **Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition)**: In seconding the words of the Premier, on behalf of the Opposition I would like to pay a tribute to Jack, who was a staunch Labor person and staunch unionist throughout his life. I knew Jack Slater for many years, from when I first came to Australia to work for Don Dunstan, and Don Dunstan told me how Jack Slater's winning the seat of Gilles in 1975 helped save the Dunstan Government by 128 votes and helped keep one beacon light of Laborism in the Australian federation. It was that win that allowed the Dunstan Government to continue its program of reform.

Certainly, Jack's role in the union movement and in all forums of the Labor Party is something that all of us remember. He was a genial person, often slightly outrageous, often slightly irascible, sometimes irreverent—for instance, he refused to abide by dress regulations at Government House and at the opening of Parliament—but also someone who was deeply committed to working people. That is the thing we will remember Jack for: a deep commitment to working people. That is what his life was about, in both the union movement and in Parliament.

After a 25 year involvement in the union movement through the Bootmakers Union he became a member of Parliament for Gilles in 1970. During his time in the Ministry, and when I was working for the Government as a press secretary, I remember him coming around to tell me about some of the things that he was doing in terms of his own physical fitness. In 1980, when the Labor Party was in Opposition, Jack tapped on the door up on the second floor of Parliament House and told Bruce Muirden and me that he was about to undertake a performance in the World Athletics Competition in New Zealand. Quite frankly, we did not believe him; we thought he was having us on. But he said that he was representing Australia in javelin, shotput and elsewhere. As we did not believe him, we did not put out the press release. However, Jack went out and told the media and was featured on television and in newspapers showing that fitness was not just about the young but also about veterans, and he represented Australia with distinction. Of course, as Minister for Recreation and Sport he used to participate in the City-Bay run, along with John Bannon, Chris Sumner and Kim Mayes.

Many members of Parliament will remember Jack Slater's involvement both as an MP and also as a retired MP in the parliamentary bowling tournaments. In fact, I was talking only yesterday to members who participated with Jack interstate in January. Again, on a hot day, he was out there both winning games and contributing to the humour of the events. That is something that I think we will all remember Jack Slater for: good humoured, always prepared to take the rise, but never ever with malice. He was someone who was respected by people from both sides of this House.

I believe that he served his electorate with distinction. His period as Minister for Recreation and Sport was one which saw the doubling of expenditure in that portfolio during just three years. Jack Slater was part of the expansion of recreation and sport as a serious portfolio in South Australia. He had a deep commitment to that portfolio, a deep commitment to the racing part of that portfolio, in particular. In water resources Jack was always quick to claim credit for rain and full reservoirs, to a point where it became part of the culture of this Parliament.

We remember Jack fondly, with great affection, for his humour and his dedication to working people. I would like to convey the deep condolences and sympathy of the

Opposition—and, indeed, all members of this Parliament—to Doris, Geoff, Graeme, Jennifer, Judith and other members of the Slater family.

**Mr VENNING (Custance):** I rise to pay my respects to the late Hon. John William Slater (Jack) and to convey my condolences to his family. As a colleague and a friend and as President of the South Australian Parliamentary Bowls Club I, together with the House, was shocked to hear the news of his passing. Jack was nominated as the ALP candidate for Gilles in 1970 and was elected. He served as a Minister from 1982 under the Bannon Government and retired from this place on 25 November 1989. A press clipping from the *Sunday Mail* of 3 March 1985 is headed 'The Minister for not giving up'. This article gives a great profile of Jack. He claimed to have been a reluctant Minister, but having become one he was not reluctant about holding on to it even after he suffered a heart attack in November 1984 at the age of 57. He subsequently had four bypasses in a three hour operation.

As the Premier has said, Jack came from Prospect and grew up in the 1920s Depression leaving school at the age of 14. He worked at the Islington railway workshops for a year and was a message boy for a motor firm for a while. He became a bootmaker, following in his father's footsteps in the old and well known Unley firm of Rossiters. At that time, he became interested in the trade union movement and the Labor Party. In the mid 1960s he became Secretary of the Shoemakers Union, and in 1970 he was nominated by the ALP for the newly created seat of Gilles.

In 1982, Jack became the Minister of Water Resources and the Minister of Recreation and Sport in the Bannon Government. Until work commitments prevented him from taking part, as the Leader said a moment ago, he was a member of the Veterans Athletics Club, and he often made the State team, competing in the world championships in New Zealand in 1980. He believed that the change of lifestyle due to the pressure of holding one of the State's top jobs was a major cause of his heart attack in 1984. However, he was determined to fight back. After his operation he continued his role in the ministry and he set about getting fit: working out in the gym, giving up smoking, losing weight, and walking a great deal. He launched the Operation Four Minute campaign, a course run jointly by the St John Ambulance Association, the Australian Red Cross and the Royal Lifesaving Society. This course aimed to teach every person over the age of 10 how to maintain a collapsed person's breathing and circulation until help arrived.

Jack also took up bowls as a more general form of exercise, and I am very glad to have had the opportunity to get to know him as a result. As the Minister of Water Resources he had to deal with the never ending saga of dirty water complaints and problems. I know a lot about those problems, because they are problems with which I have had to deal as the representative for the Barossa Valley. It is a constant source of angst in my electorate today, and I often spoke to Jack about that. From reading through the old press clippings one sees that there are a lot of topics that just keep going around in circles. Some of these problems have always been with us.

With all the publicity about MPs' travel in recent months, I liked Jack's comments in the press of 14 April 1985. Jack spent two weeks in China from 20 March to 4 April 1985 as the leader of a delegation of rank and file members of the ALP. He said:

I've got nothing to hide; it's an MP's legitimate entitlement.

He went on to say:

I'd like to know how many trips journalists get. I wonder how many journalists are in China with Mr Bannon right now.

Jack could be said to be my complete opposite in every way, particularly in politics. I remember being introduced to him by my late father in 1982. Jack was a character with an opinion on everything, and he gave it whether or not you asked him for it. I really appreciated Jack's presence on the bowling green. My point of view of the value of bowls to serving MPs is well illustrated here. It is one occasion when politicians of all persuasions from all States get together to enjoy a social game of bowls. I have enjoyed those times immensely. Having a yarn to Jack between ends was an enjoyable and memorable experience. There was the common element of bowls, current events and old and new colleagues but, above all, his wit and humour were paramount and will be missed. Some of the jokes that he could come up with at the optimum moment would bring roars of laughter and interrupt the proceedings.

Jack was a very good bowler and a good sport and he liked to win. As a respected No.3, his ability and experience was one of the main reasons for South Australia's increased performance over the past two years. We were in Sydney only a few weeks ago where we were runners up. Next year was to be the one and Jack was keen to be there. He was not all that well at the carnival and he left early every day to get to the green so that he was relaxed before the game.

One joke he wryly drawled when it began to rain will always be my favourite, but I cannot relate it here. One night during the carnival, Labor members from all States have a dinner. I am told that Jack regularly had a joke session and was South Australia's part of the entertainment. His recall was absolutely amazing. I liked Jack Slater, he was a friend and I know that it was reciprocated. On behalf of the South Australian Bowling Club and parliamentary bowls Australia wide, my colleagues and my family, we wish to express our condolences to Jack's family, his wife Doris and his six children—Brian, Peter, Jennifer, Geoffrey, Judith and Graeme. We share your sense of loss.

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I am happy to rise to support the motion moved by the Premier and seconded by the Leader. I first got to know Jack Slater in 1968. I was much slimmer than I am now, much younger and had hair, and I was helping to campaign for Chris Hurford for the Federal seat of Adelaide in 1968. Jack was Chris Hurford's campaign manager and, for the best part of 18 months, Jack, Chris Hurford and me—we were the core group—and others, would go out religiously every Sunday and doorknock that electorate. It was a long, hard campaign and when we won that seat back in the 1969 Federal election it was very satisfying. In fact, I think Mick Young commented at the time that the swing was so great towards the Labor Party that if only Victoria was west of Western Australia we would have won Government in 1969. The swing to the Labor Party was greater the farther west you went.

In 1970, Jack was elected to State Parliament. I also knew him on a social basis through my involvement with the trade union movement, through Trades Hall in particular, and the then Trades Hall bar. Jack was also instrumental in the establishment of the Enfield ALP social club in Klemzig. With the assistance of the Enfield council, he was the driving force behind the establishment of that club which was

established in the days before the licensing laws were more liberalised. Membership prospered, as did the ALP Enfield club, as did the profits that went back into the ALP as a result of the establishment of that club. It was a great social centre for ALP activists in the Federal seat of Adelaide. It was in the heart of the then Federal seat of Adelaide, and Jack played an instrumental role in that club from its beginnings until its end 20 years later.

I well recall the 1975 State election where the Labor Party narrowly won the seat by 128 votes. Had Jack lost that seat the Dunstan Government would have lost office during one of the darkest times in the Labor Party's history, not only in this State but also nationally. I remember going into the Trades Hall bar just before the seat was declared. We were still waiting for postal votes to come through. I said to Jack, 'Do you think you will make it?' and he said, 'Not a worry; absolutely no worries.' I must say that I had a lot more doubt than Jack but he had done the work in collecting the postal votes and he had done the shoe leather work of doorknocking and looking after the electorate.

Part of my current electorate of Ross Smith was part of Jack's electorate at that time, namely, Northfield and Greenacres, and a number of constituents to whom I speak fondly recall Jack Slater as their serving member. I also knew Jack, as I said earlier, from my involvement with the trade union movement before I became a full-time official as secretary of the Boots Trades Union. It must be a bit novel and unique in Australian trade union history that his brother followed him as secretary of the same union.

Jack was a staunch union member and staunch unionist, and proud to be known as such, and even after his retirement he was a staunch Labor Party supporter and union supporter who never flinched from that. I always got words of encouragement from Jack about sticking it up the Liberals at every opportunity. I hope to continue that for as long as possible. That will be partly in memory of both Jack Slater and Gordon Bruce—two very traditional Labor supporters, two very good men who loved their families, their union and their political Party and we are the better for having had them amongst our ranks.

**Mr LEWIS (Ridley):** I endorse the remarks made about the former member Jack Slater, a man whom I count amongst my friends in life since I first met him when I was elected here in 1979 and got to know him better as part of the parliamentary bowls team. About 15 or 16 years ago, when he was beginning his bowling career, as I was also, he had had some greater experience than me—although only of a limited amount—and, as other members have pointed out, he had a great sense of humour. I recall one occasion when I had bowled ahead of him. As do all of us who bowl from time to time, I laid it down a bit narrow and it disappointed him immensely because we had not been doing so well. The expression that he used at the time—expletives deleted—was, 'Struth, it's as narrow as a hen's face.' I have never heard anything more colourful than that and it stuck in my mind at that time. It is the kind of thing for which Jack was famous. I know that bowlers from both teams on rinks either side of us lost track of the game for at least a minute on that occasion because of the remark he made, as he was inclined to do in circumstances where he thought proceedings were either boring or unduly tense.

He was no different in here. I found him a very capable person in the way in which he brought adversaries together, where he saw the necessity for resolution of a matter. Another

instance that I can relate to the House was recorded in *Hansard* during the shopping hours debate of 1981 wherein I was suggesting, as I have always suggested, that each and every shopkeeper should be free to choose when to provide a service to their customers and that it ought to be between them and their customers. Upon my making that comment, Greg Crafter, then member for Norwood pointed out to me across the Chamber by way of interjection, 'Well, you should go out and walk around your shops sometime before morning tea' to which Jack, sitting further along the bench from him, was quick in his rejoinder saying, 'Struth, it would be some walk, wouldn't it?' I think at that time Greg had not caught up with the fact that I was representing the electorate of Mallee, which included townships as far south as Millicent, as well as Strathalbyn, Wistow, Pinnaroo and Swan Reach. I can tell members that it is some walk.

In any case, I am also sorry that Jack has passed on and I offer my condolences to Doris and the family. I have always appreciated the camaraderie I enjoyed with him, which I found to be unique given that we had clearly philosophically divergent views of politics.

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** I wish to be associated with this condolence motion for the late Hon. Jack Slater. He was the member for Gilles for 19 years between 1970 and 1989, and for three years in the Bannon Government he was Minister for Water Resources and Recreation and Sport. Prior to his parliamentary career, as has been mentioned, he was Secretary of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Boot Trade Employees Union, and during the late 1970s and 1980s Jack was a competitor in veteran athletics, representing South Australia and Australia in javelin, discus and shotput events.

Jack also enjoyed playing lawn bowls and each year was a member of the South Australian parliamentary bowling team that competed at national carnivals throughout Australia. I have had the privilege of being a team member at seven such carnivals and I had a great respect for Jack, both as a friend and as a bowler. Only last month we competed together at the Sydney carnival and, as would be recognised by other members of the bowling team, it was through Jack's good and consistent bowling that our team finished runner-up to the Tasmanians at that carnival.

Jack was a real character, who always had a yarn or a joke to tell and who was highly respected by members of all political Parties. His keen sense of humour was always appreciated in this place and on the bowling green. Jack was very proud of his humble upbringing and he often spoke about his early life. He never forgot where he came from and was a true representative of the working class people here in South Australia. He will be sadly missed. As Party Whip, on behalf of my Caucus colleagues I extend sincere condolences to Doris and her family.

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** In respect to condolence motions, I think it is desirable to live long enough so that most members who are here at the time cannot remember you. Sadly, that has not happened to Jack, who is fondly remembered by many, if not most, members in the Chamber. I well remember the number of times when he came into the Parliament on the first or last Tuesday of the month and entertained us all in the bar. He had people around him from all political Parties and of all persuasions, and both old and new members.

I do not intend to go through Jack's biographical details, but I want to recount one story in particular which needs to

be told about Jack. I have been in many ministerial offices asking for things. I have been in the offices of Ministers of both persuasions and I must confess that there is only one Minister who said 'Yes' straightaway: that was Jack. Of course, I am quite happy for that record to be broken by anyone else, but I want to relate the events. In 1985, when I was prevailed upon by the Party to run in the then seat of Alexandra, which was not noted for returning Labor Party majorities, I was wandering around the countryside trying to work out what sorts of issues we could pick up.

The Port Elliot and Goolwa council called me in and told me it was to spend \$250 000 on a water supply system to be put into Mount Compass, and it wondered whether it could get some help from the Government. I asked how many people the scheme affected and the then Town Clerk said, 'We think it is 52, but why don't we go to the pub for lunch and we will send the dog catcher out to count all the houses.' He came back and they told me there were 94 houses, from memory. The council said it was proposing a water supply system that would be sub-standard to that provided by the then EWS.

I suggested that the council should approach the EWS, which at that time—and it probably still does now through SA Water—provided a water supply system to a community on a 15 per cent return on investment. With about 90 properties, the cost of building the system would be about \$400 000 and the return on that would be only about 8 or 9 per cent. I suggested that instead of putting in \$250 000 up-front for something that would not work as well as the EWS system, the council should pay the difference. In other words, the EWS puts the system in to its standards and the council pays the difference, which worked out at about \$27 000, so it was rather a large saving of money.

I rang Jack Slater, who told me that he was too busy to see every country candidate but that he would make an exception for me in his lunch time the next day. I rocked up with all the delegates and the first thing he said was, 'I understand that in Mount Compass they have a street named Slater Street.' I said, 'Yes, Minister, it is named in anticipation of your making the right decision today.' He looked at me and said, 'You're sharp, but you still won't get it.' He had a couple of blokes there from the EWS; we made out the case that I have just outlined and he asked these blokes, 'Can you fault that?' (I will not mention their names: one is no longer with the EWS but the other one is still there.) And they did not like it at all. They went on for a few minutes, and eventually Jack looked at me and said, 'You can't fault this: fix it and do it.' That is how Mount Compass got its water supply, and that is the current situation regarding the country water supply scheme. Like every other Minister I have met who has had anything to do with water resources, he had a keen interest in that area.

I do not know what it is about being a Minister for Water Resources, but it seems that many of the people in question pursue that interest years later—and I particularly bear in mind Peter Arnold, Don Hopgood and others. In 1986 Jack, as a backbencher, as an ordinary citizen, went down to see the Mount Compass water supply system turned on. He had a keen interest in this area, and I believe that that should be put on the record here today. Indeed, Jack provided not only 19 years of good parliamentary service but was a very good and decisive Minister.

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** I rise to say a few words on behalf of the people of Torrens, who were once Jack's

constituents. He is very fondly spoken of throughout the Klemzig and Windsor Gardens area, and is a greatly respected man. Residents talk to me about how he was so supportive of children's sport and how much he loved being Minister for Sport. As has been said, he started the Labor Club, and I know that the community were very proud of that facility. Sadly, I have to say that that facility is no longer available to the community and it was a great loss when it closed.

Often I am stopped in the street by my constituents who ask how Jack is going, and they often relate stories to me about some of his activities in the community. He will be greatly missed by many members here and by people out in the community.

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I would like to record my condolences to Jack's wife, Doris, and their children. I was brought up in the area two streets away from where Jack lived, and I know that he is remembered very fondly. In fact, I often used to go to the house next door to his place to see friends. I knew Jack as a person who served his constituency well. When he came into this place on a monthly basis as a former member I used to ask, 'How is my constituent?' and he acknowledged that I was his member. So, things had changed.

I remember his time at Marden High School when I invited him to give a talk on Government and society (as I did with Ian Wilson), and how ready he was to serve the community. In fact, late one evening he signed papers for my and my then wife's State Bank loan application—his door was always open. I would like to express my condolences to his wife, Doris, his six children and, indeed, the whole family.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles):** I endorse most of the remarks that have been made by previous speakers. My only doubt is in relation to Jack's jokes. Jack had some terrible jokes; he really had some awful jokes, but he used to get away with it because he was a lot better than his material.

I first met Jack Slater at a preselection in 1970. We were both preselected for the first time early in that year, on the same day, along with a number of others with a trade union background, and we all went to Jack's beloved Labor Club to celebrate. It is considerably different today: you cannot find the Enfield Labor Club, and I do not think that after a preselection you would see anywhere near as many people in the Labor Party with the trade union background that Jack Slater and a number of others had.

I think I am the only member left in this Parliament who was in Cabinet with Jack Slater. He was a tremendous person to have in Cabinet because, as members who have been involved with Cabinet will know—and as those who have not will fear—Cabinet can at times be dealing with some fairly airy-fairy proposals. It was pretty esoteric at times, but we could always rely on Jack to relate it directly to people and, I have to admit, to votes. He was very good at joining with those who had a more down to earth view on things. He did not always win, but at least the arguments were always put, and I think it is a pity that he did not win a lot more often, as well as those who shared his point of view.

I met Doris many years ago, and I doubt very much whether she would remember me, but Jack Slater was above all a family man. He was an enormous supporter of his family and his children. He was a member of the 'twins club' in the Parliament. Numerous members of the Parliament were fathers of twins at the time. I have half joined that club, being

a grandfather of twins, but it is certainly a lot easier than in the case of Jack Slater, who brought up his sets—plural—of twins in his young married life.

I would say to Doris and his children that I wish to join with everybody in the Parliament in expressing our great sorrow at his death. Jack Slater essentially was a great comrade who served the working class well.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

*[Sitting suspended from 2.39 to 2.50 p.m.]*

### ORPHANAGE

A petition signed by 154 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to retain the site of The Orphanage for community use was presented by Mr Brindal.

Petition received.

### TRAFFIC LIGHTS, PASADENA

A petition signed by 383 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to install traffic lights at the intersection of Fiveash and Grandview Drives, Pasadena, was presented by Mr Evans.

Petition received.

### UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** Yesterday in this House the member for Taylor, in typical Opposition fashion, waved around a document she suggested would result—

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

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

**Mr CLARKE:** My point of order relates to—

**Mr Bass:** Number?

**Mr CLARKE:** Do you want it?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will make his point of order.

**Mr CLARKE:** My point of order relates to the use of ministerial statements, which is for the declaration of Government policy and not for debate or argument.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Unfortunately, there has been a tendency for Ministers to use ministerial statements to be critical of other members. I do not think that is in the spirit of the Standing Orders but, as I have indicated earlier, Ministers receive considerable latitude in making statements. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** I was indicating that the member for Taylor came into this House yesterday and waved around a document suggesting it would result in the closure of University of South Australia campuses. Again, in typical Labor fashion, the member for Taylor proffered doom and gloom for South Australia, spreading despondency and fear without checking the facts of her claims. The Vice Chancellor of the University of South Australia has advised me as follows:

We are disappointed that no member of Parliament, other than the Minister and the member for Peake, has contacted the university's senior management to gain clarification of the status of the document.

The document to which the Vice-Chancellor referred is entitled 'Changing our budget profile' and is an internal discussion paper which is yet to be presented to the University Council. This document is not a formal position paper. But more damning for the Opposition is the fact that the Vice Chancellor advises me that there is no need to close the campuses, and that includes Whyalla and Underdale. I repeat: there is no need—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** —to close these campuses to meet any current budget requirement. The Vice Chancellor has also advised that all the Labor Party has managed to do with its scurrilous misinformation is cause speculation and unsubstantiated rumour about the future of these campuses which may have an adverse effect on the 1998 applications for courses. All this, simply by not checking the facts before seeking to sensationalise in the media. What will it take to convince the Opposition that it ought to be working for South Australians, not yapping at their heels in a continued attempt to fuel their fear campaigns?

### MINNIPA RESEARCH CENTRE

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Minister for Primary Industries):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I am pleased to inform the House that one of South Australia's most important agricultural facilities, the Minnipa Research Centre, will receive a \$1.8 million boost to increase and strengthen its research capability. The need to upgrade Minnipa was one of the key recommendations of the Eyre Peninsula Strategic Task Force, which was headed by the Hon. Caroline Schaefer. It is appropriate that I pay tribute to Caroline Schaefer for the way in which she has worked tirelessly to ensure that the recommendations of the task force have been implemented.

As a result of those recommendations, we commissioned a report into the future of the Minnipa Research Centre and initiated discussions with the Grains Research and Development Corporation. The major upgrade of Minnipa, which is a vital Eyre Peninsula facility, will be a joint project between the State Government and the GRDC. The State Government will commit \$500 000 and the GRDC \$300 000 during this financial year towards capital works to upgrade the facilities. The GRDC will also commit \$200 000 a year for the next five years on research projects. The Government has guaranteed funding for ongoing PISA and SARDI programs and has also embarked on a program to improve housing accommodation.

Our aim is to develop Minnipa as a centre of excellence for sustainable low rainfall farming systems in South Australia. The centre is already an integral part of several national breeding and agronomic programs, and it is well regarded for its work on transfer technology and demonstration farming. By improving the facilities of the centre we should be able to attract more funding for research and development into low rainfall farming practices. There is strong community support for this improvement. By upgrading the research capabilities at Minnipa we can hopefully improve crop yields and subsequently profitability for

farmers on Eyre Peninsula. We must use the centre so that our farms become a sustainable resource in this low rainfall area.

Minnipa is part of the southern region strategic initiative proposal of the Grains Research and Development Corporation, and I want to commend the GRDC for recognising the value of the Eyre Peninsula grain haul. Farmers in the region pay levies to the GRDC, and this upgrade is a just recognition of that input. Eyre Peninsula contributes significantly to South Australia's economy. The Minnipa Research Centre is an integral part of Eyre Peninsula's field crop industry, which produces about 45 per cent of South Australia's wheat crop and 20 per cent of the State's barley crop. A small increase in yield would represent a significant increase in income for grain growers on Eyre Peninsula.

Apart from the direct benefits to Eyre Peninsula, it is likely that there will be increased returns to the wider community associated with an increased research capacity at Minnipa. These include long-term sustainability, increased grower profitability with flow-on benefits to the regional economy, and broader application of technological advances across the drier grain growing regions of Australia. I commend the Eyre Peninsula community for their enthusiasm and support so far, and I am sure that the farmers in the region will be the long-term winners from the ongoing and new research at Minnipa.

#### LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

**Mr CUMMINS (Norwood):** I bring up the twelfth report, fourth session, of the committee and move:

That the report be received and read.

Motion carried.

**Mr CUMMINS:** I bring up the thirteenth report, fourth session, of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** I bring up the forty-eighth report of the committee on the Port Lincoln Health and Hospital Service Incorporated redevelopment stage 3 and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That the report be printed.

Motion carried.

### QUESTION TIME

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** Does the Minister for Health agree with the conclusion drawn by a woman detailing her 10 day stay as a patient at the Royal Adelaide Hospital that funding cuts have resulted in cuts to specialist services and facilities to such an extent that the public health system is now in 'wild crisis'? A letter written to the Minister for Health and me this week details instances of nurses being overworked; of male patients wandering into female wards and observing women in a semi-nude state; of patients defecating in their beds because nurses were unable to supply

a commode on time; and of a patient in a neighbouring ward who was handcuffed to his bed and who screamed and swore for up to 20 hours a day. In her letter she says:

I wondered whether I was in the zoo or an asylum.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms STEVENS:** Of the RAH staff, she says:

How those people kept going and why they kept coming back on duty I shall never understand.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** Obviously, the Government and the Royal Adelaide Hospital regret when any patient finds that their stay in hospital is less than they may have expected from the point of view of satisfaction. I would point out that the Hon. Sandra Kanck also received a letter about this and made a media release 12 hours ago, which indicates how far in front of the Labor Party is the Democrats. However, when we received the letter we acknowledged that, 'Yes, there is this letter from a person who has made some allegations.'

Before answering the specific part of the allegations I point out that 300 000 inpatients are seen each year in our hospital system, and there are 1.5 million outpatients. I regularly receive letters from people who express their satisfaction with the service. Interestingly, the letter makes not a single complaint about the standard of medical service. In fact, the complainant—so called by the member for Elizabeth—compliments the system on the care which she and other patients were given. And, indeed, in a radio interview this morning with this woman she was at pains to emphasise that the standard of care was spectacular. So, the nub of this complaint then goes to where she was accommodated and where other patients in the ward were accommodated at the same time.

This woman was in a particular ward at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and there has not been a single change to the accommodation in that ward since the Labor Party was in government. So, the standard of accommodation is exactly the same today as it was before. However, we acknowledge that there is an opportunity to improve the patient mix by spending somewhere between \$250 million and \$300 million on the Royal Adelaide Hospital. There are two ways in which we can get this money.

*Ms Stevens interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** The member for Elizabeth asks 'When?' That is a crucial question, because there are two options. One is that we can put another \$250 million impost on the State taxpayers, which is obviously the way the Labor Party would solve this problem—although I note that it did nothing for hospital infrastructure during the 13 years in which it was in government, other than let it run down.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** Indeed, as the member for Light says, it managed to close a few hospitals; but it did nothing to improve the infrastructure. So, that is one solution. The other solution in terms of providing a better mix in respect of patient facilities is potentially to go to the private sector. I have indicated in a number of answers over the past couple of parliamentary days that the Labor Party will not contemplate that. So, the member for Elizabeth has two options: either she accepts the present state of accommodation, or she acknowledges that the private sector is a way of providing the necessary funds.

That is a general answer. I would like to answer the allegations specifically. The ward in question is a general

medical ward which accepts all patients with all medical conditions. This includes patients with cerebral vascular accidents, cardiac failure, general infections, and vascular disease. The patient in question was admitted in August 1996. Incidentally, the hospital is a little distressed that she chose not to complain until now. There are other forums for doing that. Obviously, in August 1996 it was winter, and at that time the ward in question was very busy and operating at full capacity. The member for Elizabeth delighted in saying that the nursing staff were overburdened and could not cope.

*Ms Stevens interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** The member for Elizabeth chirps away, but the fact of the matter is that she delighted in reading into the record these allegations, trying to stir up the impression that there are not enough nurses. I know that the facts often get in the way of the member for Elizabeth's stories, but the facts are as follows.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not want any further interjections.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** The ward had a full allocation of nursing staff. In fact, extra nursing staff were allocated to the ward on an 'as needs' basis. Regarding the specific patients, there was a woman with a heroin addiction who was fully dependent and required total nursing care for all activities. She was awaiting a nursing home placement. Another patient had received a psychiatric review from the perfectly legitimate and normal Royal Adelaide Hospital Psychiatric Liaison Service. Due to her mental condition, for which she was receiving a review, she was confused. Nursing staff made all appropriate attempts to preserve her dignity and privacy during her admission.

Another patient mentioned in the letter was a man who allegedly roared. The point was made and emphasised by the member for Elizabeth that this was inappropriate. This man was a confused gentleman. Such patients often present in a confused state and certainly provide specific challenges for nursing care. At that time, this patient was being nursed in a single room in order to minimise disruption to the ward. Short of putting a person like that into *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* style accommodation, which I know is what the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Elizabeth want, putting a patient—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:**—in a private room is the appropriate way to minimise disruption. Nursing staff are particularly vigilant in assessing patient needs and assigning care accordingly. Admission to a particular ward is based on patients requiring acute medical care. Specific room allocation is based on their clinical need. For example, patients who are a danger to themselves or who have a high level of acuity requiring close observation are placed in wards where they are more easily seen and where nursing staff who may be doing something for another patient are able to observe them: in other words, perfectly valid care.

Patients who require psychiatric care are attended to by the hospital's Psychiatric Liaison Service. The hospital has a psychiatric liaison nurse and a psychiatric registrar who are on call for the supervision of the care of such patients. The other allegation was that mental health beds are in a crisis, that this is terrible and that these patients should not be in these wards. I disagree with that allegation. As opposed to the stigmatisation of mental illness which often comes from the benches opposite, I believe quite strongly that if a patient

with a mental illness coincidentally has a physical illness they deserve the most appropriate care.

Despite all the rhetoric which comes from members opposite, there has been no reduction in specialist mental health or dementia care services in this State. In fact, in recent years there has been an increase in the range of such services. For example, the number of acute psychiatric beds has been increased overall in this State over the past three years. I thought the member for Elizabeth would know that, because the Lyell McEwin Health Service is one of the places where there has been an increase in the number of beds. I would have thought that the member for Elizabeth would acknowledge the services that have been put into the community through the assessment and crisis intervention service teams. So, we have an individual situation amongst 300 000 in-patients where a number of patients with difficult conditions were nursed in single rooms, as is appropriate, or in places where nurses could see them so that, in particular, they would not be a danger to themselves.

### MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY

**Ms GREIG (Reynell):** Will the Premier provide advice to the House on the presentation to the Productivity Commission yesterday in Melbourne on the future of the automotive industry in Australia and today's supportive comments from the Federal Leader of the Opposition?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I thank the honourable member for her question on a policy issue that is absolutely critical and important to South Australia in the long term. Yesterday, at the Productivity Commission hearings in Melbourne, Ford and Toyota clearly presented a case that a further collapse in tariffs post the year 2000 without offsetting microeconomic reforms and the cost of production would place at risk their investment in Australia in the future. We should not take this as simply a bluff from the major car makers. This is real in terms of long-term investment decisions for Australia.

What also needs to be recognised is that the automotive industry is not a lazy lot. It is not as though it has not done anything for 10 years. This industry has upgraded its productivity and efficiency gains, and the work force is delivering a product in terms of price, quality and reliability of supply that is now accessing the international marketplace. We ought to be backing this industry. The fact is that a country such as Australia cannot afford to have a manufacturing industry which is not vibrant and which does not appropriately underpin the country's economy.

The manufacturing and automotive components suppliers are the key to the manufacturing base of Australia. They are the key tools upon which we base our manufacturing industry in this country. I note that the Chair of the Productivity Commission has published a letter in today's *Financial Review* which takes issue with me. To begin with, I point out that it is somewhat unusual for the Chair of the Productivity Commission to enter into public debate on a draft report.

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Especially in the middle of it when the final report has not been completed.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Well, he deserves every bit of the belting that he is getting. The Chair's letter to the editor today misses a fundamental point. He says that in my comments I have criticised the commission for not including taxation reform. What I have said is that, whilst the body of the report talks about taxation, Mr Scales and the Productivity

Commission have absolutely wimped out, because the recommendations do not include any reference to taxation reform in Australia. He says publicly that taxation reform is more important than tariff reform, but his recommendations are silent on that question. This therefore demonstrates how fundamentally flawed is the Productivity Commission's draft report. It ought to be blown out of the water for the loose case which it is presenting to support the commission's claim for the further reduction of tariffs from 15 per cent after the year 2000 when Malaysia currently has a 200 per cent tariff. I do not envisage that country moving in the short term to reduce its tariffs: it will do so only if it is in its interests and not if it is in Australia's interests.

I certainly support the movement in tariffs to date. It has sharpened up the industry—it has become internationally focused, and it is doing well—but it is so easy to destroy an industry and so difficult to create one. Even the Scales report indicates that post the year 2000 a further reduction in tariffs will make a beneficial contribution to the economy of .6 per cent in GSP. Are we serious that we should place at risk in South Australia 17 000 direct jobs and 40 000 indirect jobs for the possibility of a .6 per cent increase in GSP post the year 2000? Why would we put those jobs at risk? That is the basis of the argument of the South Australian Government. Too much is at risk for such a small identified gain according to a model in a report that, as a basis, is fundamentally flawed.

Every member of this House would well recall that approximately eight or 10 years ago we were encouraging people through the vine pull scheme to start pulling out vines because we did not have the market for the vines. Look at what we are now doing: we are putting in place policies to try to increase plantings of vineyards throughout South Australia to meet the export market demand. Let us not repeat that fundamentally flawed policy decision on the automotive and manufacturing industries in Australia, and particularly South Australia. It is not only South Australia and Victoria that are at risk. New South Wales also has some major manufacturing automotive component supply firms employing several thousand workers. Let them not forget that New South Wales has something at stake as well as South Australia and Victoria.

I certainly welcome any support in the case to debunk the productivity commission's recommendation and its draft report and to that extent I welcome any support from any quarter. I was delighted last week to meet with Paul Noack to talk to the unions about their support—a consistent support regarding what this Government has been pursuing for some time. I certainly welcome the Federal Opposition's support for a pause from the year 2000, to have another review in 2003, and then post 2005 to make a further determination.

I put to the House that one thing the industry needs is some predictability and certainty for the long term. If General Motors intended to invest \$1.25 billion on the second production line of the Vectra, it would want some certainty in policy over an extended period. That is why we in South Australia did not support another mid-term review where you can bring in risk part-way through. Therefore, I would argue for the submission of the South Australian Government where we are asking for predictability and certainty through to the year 2010 so that investment decisions made overseas have some predictability and certainty over a period of time in which they can amortise their investment in Australia. Anything short of that will see a vacuum, a dry-up, of investment in this country.

I simply say to Mr Scales: be a little more objective in what you are doing and not be driven by ideology, as he clearly is in this case. The basis upon which his draft report is put forward is fundamentally flawed and it has been demonstrated to be fundamentally flawed. On that basis, we will certainly be arguing before the commission next week and in a submission that we will be making on behalf of the Government of South Australia and the industry in this State post the hearings next week, prior to 14 March, when the final submission must go in.

I point out to the Leader that the Howard Government does not have a proposal before it at the moment: the draft report is simply out for public debate and assessment, and we anticipate that the final report will go to the Howard Government in the last week of April or the first week of May. At that point we will be taking up the case with the Federal Government. I welcome the Prime Minister's commitment that he will discuss the final report with South Australia prior to Federal Cabinet's giving consideration to any recommendations contained within it.

Let no-one be under any mistake that between now and then no stone will be left unturned in pursuing South Australia's case, South Australia's interests and the right policy outcome for thousands of workers in this State.

#### BLAIKIE, DR D.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Premier confirm that the Government has now reached agreement with Mr David Blaikie's lawyers regarding defamation action Mr Blaikie took against the Minister for Industrial Affairs when he was Premier; and, if so, will the Premier confirm the amount of the settlement is in the order of \$40 000 plus legal costs?

In May 1996, a press article stated that the former Health Commission Chief Executive Officer, Mr David Blaikie, lodged a claim for unspecified damages in the Supreme Court alleging that the former Premier 'defamed him professionally and personally, bringing him into public scandal, odium and contempt'. In 1995, the Government was forced to pay \$700 000 plus an annual pension when Justice Olsson found that the action enforcing Mr Blaikie to quit his job was 'unconscionable' and that there were 'significant divergences in factual detail between the evidence of the former Premier and David Blaikie' and that he unhesitatingly preferred the version given in court by Mr Blaikie.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader is now commenting.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I understand that the answer to the question is 'Yes', but I understand also that the court costs could well be in excess of the settlement.

#### SMALL BUSINESS

**Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurua):** Will the Premier report to the House on encouraging signs of small business confidence in South Australia as indicated in both the housing and the retail sectors?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Here they go again—classic interjection. As soon as there are positive signs, they interject and try to create a shroud of doom and gloom. In a ministerial statement, the Minister put paid to the doom story of yesterday, but we constantly have this. You can continue your doom and gloom; that is fine. Carping, negatives, opposing, criticising for the sake of it—that is fine; you stick on that,



and we will see you at the ballot box, because it will not get you far in those circumstances. There is no doubt that South Australia has suffered—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:**—a bout of despondency over the past decade following the collapse of the State Bank, in which the Leader and the member for Hart played a key role. Let us not forget their involvement in State Bank issues.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Whenever members of the Opposition are reminded about their stewardship of the finances of South Australia, they interject, because they are so embarrassed—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:**—about the fact that they sat on their hands as the State Bank went down. They did nothing despite the warnings, questions in this House, auditors putting points to them, and financial advisers knocking on their doors and telling them that they had a problem—‘Please do something about it.’ They did not. The taxpayers of South Australia are paying for it dearly now and will continue to do so at least for another five to 10 years.

That is the set of circumstances that we inherited, but we are now seeing signs that the economy is starting to pick up and is looking healthier each day. Yesterday there was some encouraging news about small business confidence. Today I can report to the House some encouraging signs in the housing sector and the construction area. The Housing Industry Association reports that the State Government’s incentives coupled with interest rate drops have rekindled the flame with only general confidence standing in the way of potential home ownership. Some early signs are being reported by the top 20 builders in this State and that is encouraging for 1997. Despite December and January being traditionally poor months for home buying, display home attendances are up markedly. Sales figures and inquiry levels are high, and remnant blocks of land have been ‘mopped up’. Many contracts are being signed subject to Deposit 5000 eligibility.

I referred to the HIA figures yesterday but I will repeat them for the Opposition: approvals for January are up 57 per cent; and December’s figures show a net sales rise of 17 per cent, 20 per cent above the previous quarter. They are encouraging signs—the signposts are going in the right direction. This can mean only good news for South Australian businesses, not only in real estate but also builders, plumbers, whitegoods manufacturers, electricians and any business related to the establishment of a new home. The Deposit 5000 scheme has provided a much needed boost, but overall confidence is needed to ensure that we really take off the brakes on economic recovery in South Australia.

A recent report in the retail sector, provided to me by the President of the Retail Traders Association, also supported the notion that there were signs during January and February that consumer confidence was returning in South Australia. Anecdotal evidence suggests that trade in January had been better. This admittedly followed a national trend for October and November for poor retail sales. The two bright areas for the retail sector for November were food (up by 4.4 per cent compared with 4.2 per cent nationally) and recreational goods (up 4.9 per cent compared with a national increase of only .5

per cent). As in the housing sector, there is an expectation that confidence is returning.

Only one thing stands in the way of a full recovery—the attitude of the Opposition. Every time there is announcement about a new investment or new confidence returning to South Australia, they want to pull it down and drag it back. They do not want recovery in South Australia, because they know that economic recovery and the return of confidence equals new investment, equals jobs being created and equals a satisfied electorate, and that is what they want to avoid at all costs. They can speak up and yap constantly, as they will; there are some things they will not be able to take away—the signs, the statistics and the performance—as small business starts to see the real benefit of expenditure and the creation of jobs for young South Australians of the future.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hart will not be doing anything in the Chamber if he continues to interject.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the member for Hart.

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** And the member for Mawson, who has been particularly bad this afternoon. The Leader of the Opposition.

#### MINISTERS, DEFAMATION

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Premier advise why taxpayers are paying the bills in relation to defamation actions taken against the Minister for Industrial Affairs and the now Deputy Premier, where some \$30 000 was paid out last year, and does the Premier still stand by his statement when he was Leader of the Opposition—and I quote for the benefit of the unruly mob opposite:

It is only in exceptional circumstances that taxpayers should provide an indemnity for Ministers of the Crown in respect of personal actions taken against them or by them.

Perhaps the Premier can tell us what exceptional circumstances took place with the former Premier and why he supports taxpayers paying the bill.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The Leader of the Opposition, who sat in the Bannon Labor Cabinet and participated in decisions relating to ministerial support in matters of this nature, knows the tradition and the appropriate procedures put in place.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Exactly. There is no different set of circumstances here than in all those cases pursued by the former Bannon Government, in which the Leader of the Opposition was a Minister.

#### THE RING

**Mr CUMMINS (Norwood):** Will the Premier advise the House of South Australia’s key role in attracting to Australia one of the world’s most important cultural symbols?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Last night we had the opportunity to participate in Sydney’s Powerhouse Museum with the launch interstate and internationally of the box office opening for next year’s *Ring* cycle. It was certainly a proud moment

for Australia and for South Australia. *The Ring* is effectively the olympics of opera—an event like no other. The fact that it is being held in Australia for the first time in its entirety has attracted attention around the world. I understand that the Internet inquires of the past 24 hours have been staggering.

That underscores the artistic reputation of Australia and South Australia—a project not without risk but attracting strong interest from interstate and internationally. As much as it showcases Australia and Australian talent, it will also showcase South Australia on a global scale, showcase our commitment and devotion to arts in this State, and showcase the people and the talent we have to tackle a project of such mammoth proportion. They will be here for six months prior, practising and assembling the stage, the production and the orchestra. We will prove that the knockers are wrong and that this State has no place for negative people—for pessimists and for those who say it cannot be done. As was reported by a number of people at the function, this is a project which Jeff would have loved to have, which he has not got and which he will not get: it will stay in South Australia.

It is a project with great artistic and cultural value. The South Australian Centre of Economic Studies indicates a net benefit of some \$14 million to the economy of South Australia. It is a quantum leap for Australia and for South Australia. I congratulate all those involved—the State Opera, the ASO, the sponsors and a number of great South Australian companies that are prepared to back this project. The Minister for the Arts has vigorously pursued this project, to which the State Government has committed \$1.5 million in underwriting and guarantee funds. Next year it will create a focus for South Australia internationally in the arts and, upon its being successful, we are looking at the possibility of ensuring that it returns to Australia and to Adelaide every third or fourth year, as happens in Seattle in the United States, which is now known as the city in the US where *The Ring* is regularly performed. It will position South Australia, much as did the first Festival of Arts with the decision made in 1958 and 1960. This is a quantum step for repositioning South Australia as the head of arts in Australia.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I suggest that the Deputy Leader do not say anything else. He has continued to interject and try to talk over everyone this afternoon. I suggest that for his own good, if he wants to see out the rest of the week, he go and have a cup of tea.

### SCHOOL COMPUTERS

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Premier. Why has the Government contracted with only three companies to supply up to 10 700 computers to schools without calling tenders at a price that is \$366 more for each computer than the price being offered by other South Australian suppliers? Schools have been told that they can access subsidies for computers, including an Apple for \$1982 and a Pentium for \$1961, only if they purchase from DECS preferred suppliers. The Minister for Education and Children's Services announced that this would save schools up to 30 per cent on the cost of computers. The Opposition has now received a quotation from a local computer supplier to provide the same Pentium computer, with a superior CD-ROM drive and with warranties, for \$1595 per unit. That, for the benefit of the Premier, is \$366 less than the Government's contract.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The Leader of the Opposition obviously does not understand what is included in the price that DECS has achieved: it is not only the purchase of a computer but an on-going service contract for the computer. The Leader of the Opposition came out with the question, 'Why did this not go to tender?' The fact is that it did go to tender.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** In 1995 the Department of Industrial Affairs—or the Office of Information Technology as it was then—called tenders for the supply to Government and for a panel of suppliers to be established. That was announced in late 1985. The Government went back to the panel of suppliers requiring, in addition to that, a contract and service agreement over a number of years for the servicing of these computers. Under the original tender for the panel contract they had to go back to that contract. In fact, they did that and the point that the Leader of the Opposition should praise is the fact that this work has been carried out largely in South Australia: the three suppliers are South Australian companies. This is an excellent buy, to get a Pentium computer with a service contract attached to it for all the schools around the State—and to get it for about \$1 900. No-one else would be able to go in and buy that sort of thing. It will create literally many jobs here in South Australia in supplying that contract.

I highlight one other point, namely, that this is part of one of the most exciting initiatives in education that this State has seen for a long time. This Government has made a \$15 million commitment this year as part of an ongoing \$75 million commitment to put the latest computer technology into our schools. It is not just about supplying computers: it is about teaching the teachers how to use computers; it is about developing the curriculum for those computers; it is about providing networks within schools for those computers; and it is about linking those schools into the Internet and into an overall network for the whole State.

What we have put down is probably one of the best policies of any Government in Australia in terms of the use of computers within schools to enable our students not just to have a computer but, most importantly of all, to be able to use that computer as part of their learning process. I would have hoped that the Opposition would be out there supporting what we are doing, particularly in supplying these computers from South Australian manufacturers.

### WATER, FILTERED

**Mr EVANS (Davenport):** Will the Minister for Infrastructure inform the House on the progress of the provision of filtered water supplies to the Adelaide Hills?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I thank the member for Davenport for his question, because this is the first of many good news stories coming out from the water quality contract that we have with Riverland Pty Ltd. I point out to the member for Hart that this company, with the 10 filtration plants it is putting in, is the same company that won the \$3.2 billion contract in Manilla, thereby creating jobs for the next 15 years in South Australia and Manilla. It is an excellent contract, not only showing the export opportunities arising from the water quality contracts that have been developed but also highlighting the local contract operating here for the 10 filtration plants. The plants will service the Adelaide Hills, the Barossa Valley, as the member for

Custance will know—and he will soon start to get some clean water—the Mid North and the larger towns along the Murray River.

This contract for water treatment plants will require the Riverland Water Company to finance, design and build the facilities and maintain them over 25 years. So, we have a long-term investment by this international company here in South Australia, providing filtered water for the first time for those small country regions. Many people are aware of the quality of Murray River water and, for the first time, the people concerned will receive water equivalent to that being supplied in the metropolitan area: it will be filtered for the first time. The first plant is the summit storage at Balhannah which will come on stream towards the end of the year to serve the Adelaide Hills, and it will be achieved well within the deadline put down by the Government. The commissioning of the remaining plants will be spread over 1997-98, with the total project involving the 10 plants being completed no later than the end of 1999.

In addition, nearly 17 kilometres of underground work has already been done in the Adelaide Hills to connect Hahndorf and Nairne and eventually into the Adelaide Hills work at Balhannah. This is the first of the major construction works being undertaken under the water quality program set up over the past three years. It involves international companies and it is certainly in the interests of all South Australians, because it means more jobs and more opportunities with these companies exporting to Asia.

### SCHOOL COMPUTERS

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** Will the Minister for Information and Contract Services direct that, if schools can purchase the same or comparable computers at a price cheaper than that offered by the DECS preferred suppliers, they can still receive the Government subsidy?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** As I pointed out to the House, this is not just a supply contract but—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:**—a much more comprehensive contract. Certainly, I will look at the terms of the contract, but my understanding is that there is a panel of three suppliers from South Australia who have come together and won this tender, and we want to make sure that there is reasonable uniformity of computers within schools. The one thing we wanted to avoid is the current situation in which a classroom may have five or six different computers, none relating to the other, and so you get a breakdown and schools are not sure whom they have to call out to solve problems because each computer involves a different service contract. As a Government, we gave them a choice between IBM compatible and Apple, and the Leader has acknowledged that they have that choice. Through a tender process we selected a panel of suppliers, and out of that panel of suppliers the Education Department has taken specific orders for its schools throughout the State.

This process went right back to the original panel tender through the Supply and Tender Board, and we complied in terms of making sure it was appropriately ticked off and had its approval. I stress that this Government sets down rigid tendering procedures, particularly for an order like this of up to 10 000 computers. It is a significant order and we want to make sure that it is undertaken to the letter of the law, with

a due diligence process that will stand up to the closest public scrutiny.

I can assure the honourable member that that is the case in this instance, where the Education Department went to the panel and resolved the service contract as a basis of the panel tender that was previously called. I understand, therefore, that that precludes being able to go out and buy other computers, because these other companies will not be able to provide the uniformity that we want to achieve with either Apple or IBM compatible; and, secondly, they will not be supplying the service contract which is so important for these computers.

### SMALL BUSINESS

**Mr BUCKBY (Light):** Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education advise the House on what the Government is doing to assist small businesses in the northern suburbs?

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** I know from past experience that the honourable member has a great interest in this area, mainly because of his many representations to me concerning job creation. I am extremely pleased to be able to tell to the House and the honourable member that I had the pleasure this morning to officially open a \$500 000 business training centre funded by the State Government. The centre is at the Salisbury Campus of the Para Institute of TAFE in the heart of the northern suburbs. In fact, it is located in the member for Taylor's electorate.

The provision of such a centre contrasts with the actions of the former Labor Government, which used whiteboards to distribute funds into its own electorates and actively discouraged and disadvantaged a large number of South Australians who were not in Labor electorates. This new \$500 000 training centre is a perfect example of how the State Government is responding to the needs of the community, particularly small business, and doing so in a responsible and equitable manner right across the State. In addition to the new centre, the Government has committed an extra \$30 000 for an innovative training course, which will provide free business management training to small business operators in the northern suburbs.

Under this program, 20 potential and existing business operators will take part in a six-week training course covering all aspects of business management. Each businessman or businesswoman will walk away with an accredited certificate in small business management as well as a comprehensive business plan specific to his or her business. The \$500 000 business training centre is the first purpose-built training facility in the northern region and has been built to commercial standards.

Several TAFE business courses will operate from the centre and it will be available to individual businesses and private training providers working closely with businesses in the northern region. It is envisaged that this relevant training will lead to the establishment of new businesses in the northern region and will assist existing businesses in becoming more successful, thereby creating job opportunities, which is the priority of this Government.

### SCHOOL COMPUTERS

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** My question is directed to the Minister for Information and Contract Services. Will the Government increase school operating grants to meet the running costs associated with the Government's new targets

for school computers? The Government has announced its target to double—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hart.

**Mr FOLEY:** The Government has announced its target to double the number of computers in schools by the year 2001. One country high school (I quote from a document from that school) states:

The running—

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** I can tell you, if you want to know.

**Mr Brindal:** Tell the House, not me.

**Mr FOLEY:** The Mannum High School, in the electorate of Ridley. The school states:

The running cost to meet the DECS goals is around \$39 000 per year and could be higher. This would consume two-thirds of our total school budget. We are a poor community; we cannot raise this amount of money in one year.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I would like to consider why the school believes that its running cost will increase that much, because the contract has a service agreement attached to it. Surely the electricity cost for the computers will not be \$39 000 a year. I would have thought that the schools—the Education Department, the teachers, the parents and the students—which previously had to pay for computers out of their own budgets and which suddenly have a Government that is putting a substantial subsidy towards the purchase of those computers would be out there celebrating what has been announced by this Government—\$15 million this year for the DECS Tech proposal for the purchase of computers, to train teachers, to develop the curriculum, to put networks into the schools and to link the schools together with a telephone network over the whole State—and that is only the first year of a \$75 million package.

I stress the fact that the purchase price includes a service agreement. I suspect that the school is talking about the additional cost of service agreements, because they can be reasonably high. It may not understand that the purchase price for these computers includes the service agreement. I hope that the Opposition will celebrate with the Government what has been a major commitment in South Australia—a program which will enable our students to get the best education possible using computer technology as a means of teaching.

### GAMING PROMOTIONS

**Mr ROSSI (Lee):** Is the Treasurer aware of a gaming promotion by a group of hotels which encourages people to exchange \$10 for coins in return for a chance to have their latest ETSA, gas or Telstra bill paid? A promotional flier displaying the logos of ETSA, Telstra and the Gas Company claims that the promotion by the hotels is in association with these organisations.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER:** Since gaming machines were introduced in July 1994 a continual stream of rather interesting and innovative schemes has been adopted by a small segment of the hospitality community—and I say a ‘small segment’ because most are very responsible and play the game. However, there are others who feel that they have to go beyond the bounds which I thought I had made quite clear at the time gaming machines were introduced in this State: there are some out there who continue to try my patience. The member for Lee is correct: there is a promotional pamphlet afoot which states:

Here is your chance to have your next Telstra, electricity or gas bill paid for. Simply exchange \$10 for coins and receive an entry coupon for the lucky draw.

This is the latest initiative to tempt people into gambling, to create some belief that if they get into this poker machine racket they will suddenly have some of their basic essentials supplied from this activity. The Liquor Licensing Commissioner brought this advertisement to my attention. It was bad not only from the point of view of the message it was selling but also as to the problem that it featured the logos of ETSA, the Gas Company and Telstra, thereby creating the impression that ETSA, Telstra and the Gas Company were part and parcel of the scheme.

Being very concerned about this revelation, we contacted the Electricity Trust of South Australia. It said that it did not know anything about it; that it had never had anyone apply for this scheme; that it could only presume that if people presented a bill they would be given the cash money for that bill; that it had heard nothing about it; that it did not condone nor endorse it; and that its name was being used inappropriately. The use of the logo and the claim were totally inappropriate, unauthorised and illegal.

I can advise that the Liquor Licensing Commissioner, after discussing the matter with my officers, met with the organisers of the promotion to outline his concerns. I understand that the promoters have seen fit to withdraw the advertisement. We have also contacted the Australian Hotels Association, which supports the Commissioner’s view on this matter.

I suggest to this very vibrant industry that it should do the good sense test. We do not need to change the laws: the laws are sufficient. However, I raise serious questions about any group of hotels or individual hotel which would use such a technique to get people through their doors. We believe that responsible behaviour is appropriate, and we know that the Australian Hotels Association believes that also, as do the licensed clubs. I have to give these occasional warnings, but I hope that we can get through a month without another such scheme coming to my attention.

### PATAWALONGA

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Premier give an unequivocal commitment that his Government will announce its decision on the option of diverting stormwater from the Patawalonga through West Beach prior to calling the next State election?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr CLARKE:** The Government has paid \$5.23 million to dredge the Patawalonga, and now the Mayor of Glenelg says that it is returning to its notorious worst, with banks covered with litter and the water polluted by a recent chemical spill, debris and contaminants. The Mayor said:

When it comes to the tough decisions that are controversial that is when they [the Government] seem to stagnate.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** We have again seen the Opposition run out of questions when it gets down to asking questions that have been asked time and again. What do you resort to when you have to fill in your 60 minutes—you go back to an old question that has been asked time and again. For the benefit of the Deputy Leader, I will answer the question as I have done on radio, television and in the newsprint on numerous occasions. On a very good tour of inspection of the progress that had been made in cleaning up the Patawalonga in the upper reaches and the wetlands that

have been put in place, after 13 years of inaction by the previous Administration—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** It was this Administration that did something about the environment. It took some positive steps to clean it up. The Deputy Leader knows that the EIS has not been concluded in its final form. We would expect to receive the recommendations towards the end of March. That is the answer I gave in January, it is the answer he is getting in February, and it is the answer he will get next week if he asks me the same question. When the Government gets the recommendations from the EIS, we will give consideration to it and make an announcement. However, the Deputy Leader will be the last to know. We will tell the public of South Australia first, and then I look forward to joining with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on the banks of the Patawalonga in his togs to go for a swim.

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

**Mr BUCKBY (Light):** My question is directed to the Minister for Primary Industries. What success has the South Australian Research and Development Institute had in attracting research funds from commercial sources, and could he identify any spinoffs for the State from these successes?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** South Australia certainly has a world-class research facility at the Waite Institute, not only in respect of SARDI but with all the other research providers situated there. We see much cooperation producing what are now world-class results. Yesterday was an open day at the Waite Institute. It was well attended by 400 farmers who came from various parts of the State, as well as 300 students from both metropolitan and country schools.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I thank the member for Custance for making his presence felt also. I take the opportunity once again to remind the House that the primary industry sector is worth \$3 billion at farm gate value each year, and a further \$1 billion is generated through value adding. The rural sector is indeed doing a lot for the economy of this State. Certainly much of the increased production in recent years has been underpinned by what we see as well focussed and planned research at the Waite, along with great cooperation. Horticultural production has virtually doubled to \$825 million in the space of only a couple of years, which reflects the commitment not only of Government but also industry to work in partnership for the benefit of primary producers in South Australia.

Yesterday's open day was organised by the Agricultural Bureau Movement, and I congratulate President David Jericho and the bureau on that initiative. Following yesterday's success, I certainly encourage them to make it an annual event. It included the various research departments of SARDI as well as the University of Adelaide's field crop improvement centre, the CSIRO's centre for horticultural crop improvement, and the several cooperative research centres (CRCs) located at the Waite.

SARDI has certainly established itself as one of the leading agricultural science agencies in the country. The role of both SARDI and PISA with agricultural research will be greatly enhanced by the announcement of the upgrade of the Minnipa Research Centre. Importantly for South Australia, last year the institute attracted record levels of external and competitive research funding from rural industry research

corporations. External funding for the past 12 months totalled \$10.84 million compared with \$6.62 million in SARDI's first year of operation (1992-93). That certainly reflects the increased confidence which industry has in SARDI's capacity to conduct world-class primary industries research and to contribute to the economic progress in South Australia. Certainly this is one of the real success stories at the Waite campus. Speaking as one who has visited there for many years, what we used to see were the various bodies out there working independently of each other, not sharing their findings, but now we see great cooperation.

**BLAIKIE, DR D.**

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Industrial Affairs):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I advise the House that legal proceedings issued in the South Australian Supreme Court against me in my former capacity as Premier by a former Chief Executive Officer of the South Australian Health Commission, David Blaikie, have now been settled between the parties. When issuing proceedings, Mr Blaikie alleged that he had been defamed during the course of a radio interview conducted in September 1995. Settlement was reached before the proceedings went to trial, and no findings or judgment has been made by the court.

The total settlement costs, which include legal costs, are \$45 000, and have been negotiated to avoid further legal costs, including the costs of senior legal counsel, which would have been incurred had this matter proceeded to trial, particularly given the costs already incurred in the earlier Supreme Court proceedings. The settlement also takes into account the length and vagaries of litigation of this kind, particularly in the evolving nature of defamation law. The settlement has been endorsed by the Crown Solicitor and has been made with a full denial of liability. The denial of liability follows the receipt of legal advice that the defences of qualified privilege and freedom of speech would arise in these proceedings.

As former Premier and defendant in the action, the costs of these proceedings are indemnified through the South Australian Captive Insurance Corporation. That indemnity has been approved by the Attorney-General on the recommendation of the Crown Solicitor, and it was issued in accordance with the guidelines and principles adopted by the previous Labor Government and endorsed by this Government.

**Mr Atkinson:** Cornwall resigned!

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will be named if he keeps that up.

---

#### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** I wish to deal today with a proposal for a landfill at a quarry on Medlow Road near One Tree Hill in my electorate. In fact, it is in the hills face zone

area. I first heard of this proposal when the planning decision was made back in 1992, and I was involved in an initial protest from residents who lived along Medlow Road and in the nearby Blakeview area.

The proposal at that time was put forward by the Northern Adelaide Development Board (NADB), and after protests and representation from the then local member, the Hon. Terry Hemmings, an environmental impact statement took place. As a result of that protest, a committee was set up and the NADB promised full consultation and participation by the residents in the planning and management of the proposed landfill. Later in the proposal, the Northern Adelaide Waste Management Authority took over as the proponent and the proposal for the landfill went to the Environmental Protection Authority. Last year that proposal was rejected, I understand, because it did not meet best practice guidelines for landfills.

Following that, there has been a revival of the protest, and the residents of Medlow Road and the nearby residential area of Blakeview were not informed that a new proposal would be put up, and another protest committee has been formed. It is nearly five years since the last proposal, and waste management has been an issue of increasing concern in South Australia and Australia generally. My initial concerns about this landfill were that a dump should not be placed in the middle of prime residential land. Also, there are a number of environmental concerns surrounding the landfill, including noise, dust and nuisance to surrounding residents and, perhaps more importantly, issues to do with water, with leachate and rubbish getting into surrounding watercourses. I remind the House that I am talking about a hills area where there are watercourses in the vicinity.

Added to those concerns—and particularly in relation to the new proposal—I have grave reservations about the viability and efficiency of such a small landfill being put in, and whether this proposal fits in with long-term plans for integrated waste management within South Australia. I am particularly concerned that small dumps will not be able to implement best practice guidelines for landfills. I am concerned that small landfills will not have the resources to be able to do the best thing in terms of management of waste for the area.

The EPA will make a decision on the new proposal based on current best practice guidelines, but this is an area that is moving very fast and there will no doubt be future modifications to those best practice decisions. If this landfill gets its licence it will be on existing best practice, and that may not be good enough in two years. However, the likelihood is that it will not have to modify its practices because the licence was granted on existing conditions.

I believe it is far better that Adelaide looks to very large dumps which will be able to implement best practice and manage the cost such that waste management is undertaken properly. I believe that will include sorting of the input that comes to those dumps and separation for recycling and other methods of dealing with that. In fact, the Integrated Waste Strategy for Metropolitan Adelaide 1996 to 2015, which has been produced by the Environmental Protection Authority, talks about the siting of waste facilities, and it states:

The provision of transfer and treatment facilities will increase operating costs. However, economies of scale with fewer landfills serving larger catchment areas should partially off-set these increases.

It also states:

Landfill sites are currently being proposed and developed in an ad hoc manner.

**Mr LEGGETT (Hanson):** I have mentioned in this House on a number of occasions the developments which are at present well underway at Mile End, which is in my electorate of Hanson. I refer to the old Mile End rail yards, which are being rehabilitated and redeveloped as a major initiative to establish an international sports gateway to the city. The main features of the development are new facilities for athletics and netball. A new residential development and a two lane road will also be included in the total rehabilitation program.

Work on the netball stadium commenced in December last year and completion is expected in September 1997. The total estimated cost of this project, including site preparation and development, is \$9.7 million. It is estimated that employment for 275 people will be provided during the construction of this exciting project. The athletics stadium will include international standard facilities for track and field events and a warm-up track. The capacity of the stadium will be 8 000, including 1 000 seated in a grandstand. The netball stadium will include four indoor courts and 26 outdoor courts. The indoor stadium will also include seating for 3 000 people. This will provide a home for State and national league games for our extremely successful netball players—who, of course, won the national championships last year. Both facilities will be important to our strategy of promoting Adelaide as a warm-up venue for the Sydney Olympics and the Paralympics in the year 2000.

This promotion highlights this city's clean air, Mediterranean style climate, health and sporting services as the ideal venue for fast acclimatisation and peak performance. The athletics facility will provide headquarters for Athletics South Australia and will cater for elite members of the sport, children, through the Little Athletics, veterans and the disabled. The new facility is being constructed on the portion of the Mile End rail yards north of the Hilton Bridge. Construction of the facility in this location enables costs associated with remediation of the site to be contained, and the facility is being designed to compliment the preferred residential development of the site.

Car parking, which has been a very important part of the development, is being provided near Railway Terrace, and this, together with the Thebarton Residents Association proposal to realign the western bypass, was a major issue of contention for the residents of that area. The Thebarton Residents Association formally raised the latter issue with the Public Works Committee. The issues of parking, traffic and public transport for the Mile End development have been addressed in a coordinated approach between the Urban Projects Authority, the Department of Transport, the Department of Recreation and Sport and Services SA. In addition to the ongoing maintenance, user groups will make a contribution of between \$50 000 and 70 000 per annum to a sinking fund to be utilised for future development and upgrading of the facility.

With regard to the netball project, in August 1996 State Cabinet approved the project at an estimated cost of \$9.9 million. A supplementary memorandum of understanding has been signed between the Government and the Netball Association, indicating that a levy of \$2 be placed on all players at Edward Park. That was dated from 1 April 1996. The sum of \$90 000 has already been collected from the levy, and it will be placed in a trust fund to be administered jointly by the association and the Government. The money will be used to meet the South Australian Netball Association's share of the cost and to have additional courts put in place. Full

marks to the Minister and the Olsen Government for this outstanding development, this outstanding initiative, which will benefit not only the people of the western suburbs but all South Australians.

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** Last Thursday night I attended a public meeting held at the Migrant Health Service. The meeting was called to discuss the future of the Migrant Women's Emergency Support Service. From my count, there were about 70 or 80 people present, and the meeting heard comments, stories and issues from quite a large range of people. The future of the service has been called into question following the review of services for women and children escaping domestic violence. The review suggested that the Migrant Women's Emergency Support Service be amalgamated with the Domestic Violence Outreach Service. A great deal of concern was expressed about that. In fact, a great deal of concern was expressed prior to the meeting, and it has been expressed on a number of occasions to many people.

Some of the points that have been made are as follows. The Domestic Violence Outreach Service is very much a generalist mainstream outreach domestic violence service, whereas MWESS is a specialist service with ethno-specific emphasis, and its core business focuses on the specific needs of migrant women and children. And they are different. The target group of Domestic Violence Outreach Services is predominantly Anglo-Saxon, whereas MWESS services exclusively non-English speaking background women and children from diverse cultural backgrounds. The extensive needs of MWESS's clients require an intensive level of support with medium to long-term service provision, which is very different from the nature of service delivery that the Domestic Violence Outreach Service provides, that is, high volume minimal support, phone assessment and referral.

Finally, I wish to quote from a letter that I received from MWESS, which states:

The recommended amalgamation of two entirely different domestic violence services will create further barriers for women from non-English speaking background and their children.

I believe that those points are very important and very accurate. The report of that review lists the advantages of this amalgamation under 'strategic options' as follows: first, it streamlines management with the formation of one management committee, one administrator, one financial system, and one data collection system; secondly, it streamlines coordinated access points; and, thirdly, it provides a more comprehensive consolidated service. It is interesting to note that the most important advantages involve the streamlining of management, and into that can be read the saving of money. In this case, two entirely different organisations will be amalgamated, probably to the detriment of both. In particular, women from a non-English speaking background and their children, who are already disadvantaged, will find that things will be much tougher as a result.

One of the points that I made at the meeting was that this report should be looked at widely. It was put together with the very laudable aim of increasing the range of support services available to women who are escaping from domestic violence, but the problem was that whatever solution was found would have to be cost neutral. In other words, in order to provide more of one service they would have to reduce another. That is what has given rise to this amalgamation. We certainly need to provide a wider range of choices and options for women who are affected by domestic violence, but in order to achieve that we must not be short-sighted like this

and destroy two services in order to come up with a nice neat equation in terms of dollars. The problem of domestic violence against migrant women and their children is far more important than that.

**Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna):** I put on record my congratulations for the Port Noarlunga CFS Brigade. On Sunday last, the Minister for Emergency Services and Deputy Premier (Hon. Graham Ingerson) and the Mayor of the Noarlunga City Council (Ray Gilbert) shared the honour of officially opening the new Port Noarlunga CFS station at Seaford. In attendance was the new CEO of the CFS, Stuart Ellis, who spoke at length about the importance of volunteers in our community. He particularly praised this brigade for its dedication to the needs of others over the past 45 years. The Port Noarlunga CFS is 45 years old this year. As a birthday present, I presented it with a rather large photograph that was taken by the volunteer magazine of the South Australian CFS brigades to display in the station.

The Noarlunga City Council funded more than 50 per cent of the new station and a new vehicle, which was also commissioned on the day. So, it was a triple celebration: the opening of the brand new CFS station; the commissioning of a brand new CFS vehicle; and the celebration of 45 years of service to the community. John Savage, the Brigade Captain, gave a short history of the Port Noarlunga CFS from its very early beginnings in a small tin shed, and he showed some insight into the way fires were fought in those days—basically with a knapsack and vehicles fitted only with a tank of water.

This move from the old site at Port Noarlunga to the new site at Seaford was needed because of safety issues at the Port Noarlunga site—the fact that vehicles were trying to egress onto a very busy and dangerous road. The site at Seaford is much more appropriate in terms of response time for the CFS, with 80 per cent of vehicle call-outs actually occurring south of the Onkaparinga River. So, this relocation puts the CFS in a position of having a shorter response time. The other achievement of the Port Noarlunga CFS that should be noted is that it took part in the fighting of the New South Wales fires. Both the community in general and all South Australians thank them for that effort.

Until volunteers are no longer in the community doing the work they do voluntarily, many people will not appreciate their work on behalf of others. CFS members who put their own life at risk to save the property and life of others should be held in very high regard by all South Australians. On behalf of all the constituents of Kaurna, I want to place on record my sincere thanks for the work done by the Port Noarlunga CFS. Many people who are not closely involved with CFS brigades may not appreciate the level of sophistication to which these members are now trained. Levels of responsibility are also very high, and all members are put through rigorous training programs for the benefit of the general public.

The event that marked the opening of the new station coincided with a break in a record hot spell of weather. Everyone present was happy to see rain fall during the opening of the building, because that put aside the fear of another major Ash Wednesday toward which the State was heading. My congratulations also go to John Savage and his brigade; Mr John Kidd, the MC of the event; and to all the behind-the-scenes people, such as Elizabeth Groeke, who took on the mammoth task of organising the day, having the tents erected and having the public address system put in

place. All members of the brigade appeared in their traditional blue and red Port Noarlunga CFS uniform. I think all were proud of the new building and I was proud to be amongst those who attended to congratulate them on the day. I wish them another 45 years of serving the community in the future.

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I want to speak briefly this afternoon about the Premier's non-answer to a question from me about tackling the issue of stormwater that currently goes to the Patawalonga instead of to West Beach and into Gulf St Vincent. The Premier constantly dodges and evades what is basically a simple matter: the people of the western suburbs have the right to know when they go to the next State election whether or not the Olsen Government, if re-elected, will pursue a policy of diverting the Sturt Creek through the sand dunes straight into the gulf.

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** The member for Peake interjects. I tell him quite frankly that, in the event of a Rann Labor Government being elected to office, there will be no stormwater channel and no diversion of the Sturt Creek into Gulf St Vincent. We need this Premier to stop ducking and weaving and coming up with these well worn cliches of refocussing, re-engineering, ramping up and every other cliché that he can imagine, and simply to answer a straightforward question. We want to know that, whenever he decides that an election is to be held, he will tell the voters of Colton and the other coastal seats whether or not a future Liberal Government will divert the Sturt Creek straight into Gulf St Vincent. It is very simple. It does not require massive EISs or anything of that nature. If an election is called at the end of March when the EIS, it is expected, will be received by the Government, will the Premier go to the voters of Colton and say, 'We have not yet considered the EIS, so you will have to wait until after the election before we can tell you whether or not we will go ahead with the stormwater diversion straight into Gulf St Vincent'?

If the election is held at the end of the year, will the Premier dance, duck, weave and dodge giving an answer on this issue until several months after the EIS has been received by the Government—and it is to be received, it is expected, by the end of March this year? The member for Morphett when he was the Minister responsible for the project was absolutely dead keen (and still is) on that stormwater diversion.

We know that the Mayor of the City of Holdfast Bay is dead keen on diverting the stormwater out into Gulf St Vincent. We know that the project manager, Mr Hook, is absolutely dead keen and is on the public record on numerous occasions as saying the only solution to the clean-up of the Patawalonga is to divert the Sturt Creek stormwater straight out into Gulf St Vincent. We know that the developers who are planning to spend so many dollars around the Patawalonga are insisting on a year round primary contact ability with respect to the Patawalonga. However, there are great environmental reasons why that policy should not be pursued and they have been repeated *ad nauseam*.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** If the member for Unley cared to talk to the member for Colton, he would find out, because the member for Colton's political future rests on this Government's answer with respect to the stormwater diversion.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**Mr CLARKE:** If the Premier was smart and was careful and considerate of the member for Colton—and he should be, because he switched his vote from the Minister for Industrial Affairs to the current Premier—to save the member for Colton he should come out swiftly and rule out option three. However, we know that the Premier is also beholden to the member for Morphett, who wants the stormwater diversion to go ahead. All we ask is a very simple question and one to which the voters of Colton are entitled to know the answer prior to the State election being called: will the Government make a decision and tell the voters so that they can make an informed decision at the election, because if a decision is not taken we can only assume the worst?

**Mrs HALL (Coles):** Soccer in South Australia is one of our State's rapidly developing sports and, with more than 30 000 participants, impressive junior development programs, two successful national league clubs, a premier and State league competition, an amateur league and women's soccer growing stronger, it is undoubtedly an important part of our sporting and business community.

Recently, the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing, under the leadership of CEO Michael Scott, commissioned a report entitled 'The Business of Sport and Recreation—not just a game'. This report clearly shows the changing face of sport and outlines that in this State sport related expenditure in 1994-95 was \$650 million, which is equivalent to 2.2 per cent of South Australia's gross State product, and that is slightly higher in size than the gross product of the State's mining industry.

One of the many sports to benefit from this booming sporting business is soccer which, in partnership with recreation and sport, is successfully attracting soccer teams to Adelaide to prepare for a variety of world sporting events, including the Olympic Games. In January this year, the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing and the South Australian Soccer Federation received a grant from Austrade to pursue opportunities to attract Japanese J-league teams to Adelaide for pre-season training camps. Together they produced a proposal under the banner 'Prepared to Win' to put to the various J-league teams. After tendering the travel and accommodation component of this venture, South Australian travel agent Marion Bunnik Travel was appointed to coordinate the proposal. Sponsorship was obtained by the Soccer Federation for air flights to Japan to detail the proposal directly to the 10 interested J-league clubs.

It is pleasing to report an outstanding success from this initiative, with J-league champions, Nagoya Grampus Eight, accepting the package, and they have now completed their first training camp in Adelaide. In addition, the Japanese Football Association youth team, which recently qualified for the world youth championship in Malaysia later this year, also conducted its training camp in Adelaide and was managed by the Soccer Federation. Additionally, we were privileged to have the Australian youth team, again qualifiers for the world youth championship, train in Adelaide and play against the Japanese youth team at Hindmarsh Stadium. Along with this soccer feast, games were organised against our State team at Camden sports field and national league club, West Adelaide, at Hindmarsh Stadium.

I understand that our international guests were impressed with the high standards of the organisation and facilities, and we hope that they return. This is truly a South Australian sporting success story and shows what can be achieved by team effort. The teams were accommodated at the Stamford



Grand Hotel, the Stamford Plaza Hotel and the Adelaide Hilton Hotel; Coachlines of Australia provided a superb on-call service; Tip Top Dry Cleaners ensured all teams looked good in clean uniforms for each match and training session; Excel Rent-A-Car provided courtesy vehicles for the teams; and Austrade, through its Tokyo office, acted as coordinator between the Federation and the groups.

A team of more than 30 people was involved in making this initiative succeed. I particularly acknowledge the efforts of the general manager of the Soccer Federation, Tony Farrugia, and his staff, with special thanks to Carlos Buzetti and Rodger King; the CEO of the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing, Michael Scott, and his staff; Dennis Bunnik of Marion Bunnik Travel; the liaison officers, John Evans, Sam Miskelly and Peter Thomas; Ansett Australia for interstate travel for all teams and the international travel for Nagoya Grampus Eight; and Jack Smith, John Mitchell and Bruce O'Daniel of the West Torrens Birkalla Soccer Club who prepared their ground at Camden sports field so well.

Whilst this has been a direct benefit for the promotion of soccer in this State, it has also had a substantial general economic benefit. I was privileged to host a special dinner at Parliament House with the Premier and Minister Ashenden for the President of the champion J-league team, Nagoya Grampus (Mr Iwasaki, Chief Adviser of Toyota International), and the President of Toyota Australia (Mr Komori), demonstrating quite clearly the strategic link between sport and business: the captains of sport are in many cases also the captains of industry.

Feedback since the teams departed has been excellent, with no fewer than seven teams plus the national team showing interest in embarking on a training camp in Adelaide next year. As ambassador for soccer in South Australia, I congratulate the Soccer Federation and the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing for having the foresight to develop this initiative and apply it so successfully for the benefit of South Australia, and I wish them good luck in their next venture.

### RSL MEMORIAL HALL TRUST BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

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

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Returned & Services League of Australia (S.A. Branch) Incorporated (the 'RSL') has requested this legislation to enable it to sell its Memorial Hall premises in Angas Street and to use the proceeds of the sale to buy or lease premises suitable for its present needs.

Legislation is needed to allow the RSL to sell the Memorial Hall because it does not have absolute ownership of the ownership of the Memorial Hall. The *Services Memorial Hall Act 1939* provides that the premises are to be available for use by the League so long as it has 250 financial members. If the number of members falls below 250 the trustees are required to transfer the Memorial Hall to the Minister of Works or such other Minister as the Governor may direct and the Hall will be dealt with or disposed of in accordance with directions to be given by the Governor.

The history of the Memorial Hall goes back to the time immediately after the First World War. In 1918, 1919 and 1920 the Returned Sailors and Soldiers' League raised money by public subscription for the purpose of building a club house, and erecting a hall to be dedicated to the memory of those who fell in the war.

Some doubt arose as to the exact way in which the money raised by the League was to be apportioned between the objects for which it was subscribed. An action to determine this was settled and the terms of the settlement were embodied in a trust deed in 1922. The terms of the settlement provided that £4 000 of the money raised was to be transferred to the Attorney-General for the erection of a memorial hall, and the balance was to be paid to the league to enable it to equip and maintain the Returned Sailors and Soldiers' Club.

Nothing was done about building the memorial hall until 1939 by which stage the £4 000 held in the Treasury had accumulated to approximately £7 000. The League then asked the Government to make this sum available for the erection of a memorial hall on a block of land adjoining the League's premises. Under the terms of the trust deed the Government was required to buy the land and build the hall itself. However, the Government agreed to use part of the money to buy the site of the proposed hall and to hand over the land and the balance of the trust moneys to the League who would use the land and money for building a memorial hall. The League was willing to invest some of its own funds in addition to the trust money. This agreement was embodied in the *Sailors and Soldiers' Memorial Hall Act, 1939*. (The name of the Act was changed to the *Services Memorial Hall Act* in 1975).

The Memorial Hall was to be a focal point for the commemoration of those who died on active service and a place to which the public would have access for that purpose and to view trophies and memorials relating to the Great War and other hostilities. This purpose has not been fulfilled to any significant extent. Traditions have evolved under which observances of occasions such as Anzac Day and Remembrance Day have taken place at other venues.

Until 1976 the League held two adjoining properties in Angas Street, one housing the Club and offices and the other housing the Memorial Hall. In that year the League, with the consent of the Attorney-General, executed an Amending Trust Deed to allow it to sell the clubhouse and office premises and with the proceeds of the sale, to adapt the Memorial Hall premises to accommodate office and other facilities as well as the Hall. The clubhouse premises were sold to the Housing Trust which owned adjacent premises. Office facilities, meeting rooms and other facilities for members were provided in the Memorial Hall premises.

The Memorial Hall premises are large in relation to any requirements the RSL has now or in the foreseeable future for the purposes of its administration, for meetings or for the accommodation of memorabilia.

The RSL wishes to be in a position to sell the premises and to buy or lease premises appropriate to its needs from time to time while at the same time keeping faith with the public who subscribed funds towards the erection of the Memorial Hall. This is achieved by providing that the proceeds of sale of the Memorial Hall are to be held on trust by the RSL for the purposes of providing, maintaining and furnishing a hall in memory of those who have fallen while on active service in war or similar hostility.

The 1939 legislation required the Memorial Hall to be located within the City of Adelaide south of the River Torrens. Clause 4(2) of the bill requires the premises to be in the City of Adelaide unless the Attorney-General approves the purchase or lease of premises outside the City of Adelaide.

The Memorial Hall premises may, under clause 4(3) of the bill, continue to incorporate administrative or club facilities.

Clause 4(4) of the bill allows trust property not immediately required for the purposes of providing and maintaining a memorial hall to be used for any other purpose within the objects of the RSL if it consists of income from investment of trust property or with the approval of the Attorney-General. This provision will allow surplus trust property, should there be any, to be put to use without the need for further legislation.

#### Explanation of Clauses

*Clause 1: Short title*

*Clause 2: Repeal*

This clause repeals the *Services Memorial Hall Act 1939*.

*Clause 3: Interpretation*

This clause defines the terms Memorial Hall, RSL, and trust property for the purposes of clause 4.

*Clause 4: Trust*

This clause in effect substitutes the trust under which the RSL holds Memorial Hall under the repealed Act and authorises the RSL to sell Memorial Hall. The proceeds of the sale will be subject to the trust.

The purposes of the new trust are similar to the purposes for which Memorial Hall is currently held, namely, for providing,

maintaining and furnishing a hall in memory of those who have fallen while on active service in war or similar hostility.

As is currently the case with Memorial Hall, premises provided for the purposes of the trust may incorporate administrative or club facilities for the RSL.

It is a term of the trust that the approval of the Attorney-General is required before the RSL purchases or leases land or premises outside the City of Adelaide for the purposes of the trust.

The RSL is authorised by the clause to apply trust property not immediately required for the purposes of the trust for any other purpose within the objects of the RSL. If the RSL proposes to use capital rather than income from trust property in this way, the approval of the Attorney-General is required.

Mr CLARKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

### STATUTES AMENDMENT (SUPERANNUATION) BILL

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Judges' Pensions Act 1971, the Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1974, the Police Superannuation Act 1990, the Southern State Superannuation Act 1994 and the Superannuation (Benefit Scheme) Act 1992. Read a first time.

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

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

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

This Bill seeks to make a number of minor technical amendments to five Acts establishing superannuation schemes or arrangements.

The following Acts are proposed to be amended under this Bill:

- Judges' Pensions Act 1971
- Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1974
- Police Superannuation Act 1990
- Southern State Superannuation Act 1994
- Superannuation (Benefit Scheme) Act 1992.

Specifically the Bill proposes amendments to all the before mentioned Acts to provide more flexible accounting procedures as a consequence of the Government funding for the employer liabilities. In order to reflect this change, the Acts are being amended to enable the Treasurer, if he wishes, to pay both employee and employer contributions into special deposit accounts held in the name of the Treasurer. This proposed amendment is merely a procedural matter and has no impact on the operation of the schemes, the funds, or members' benefits.

The second group of technical amendments being proposed in the Bill deal with the ability of the Superannuation Board to meet the actual costs of administering the Southern State Superannuation Scheme (Triple S Scheme) and the State Superannuation Benefit Scheme (SSBS) on an ongoing basis throughout the year. At the present time there is no provision for the administrative expenses to be met during the year, but only at the 30 June. Collection of the administrative expenses before 30 June is only possible under the existing legislative provisions where a benefit is being paid to a member. At present the Department of Treasury and Finance is meeting the administrative expenses from its own departmental operating account and recovering these expenses at the end of the year. The amendments will make provision for these expenses to be recovered in a more timely fashion from the fund or account in which the employer contributions are held. The charging of the prescribed administration fee to members' accounts will still remain as part of the normal 30 June updating of members' accounts. As part of the amendments to the arrangements for charging the administration fee, the formulae which are used to update members' accounts have been modified to reflect the fact that an administration fee is charged in respect of each year. Modifying the formulae will give a more comprehensive picture of the updating process and the components that are part of that process.

The third group of amendments are consequential on amendments made in December 1996, to the *Police Act 1952*. Those recent amendments made the appointment of the most senior commissioned police officers subject to a contract. In line with the requirement that each employment contract must contain the terms and conditions of employment, it is proposed to modify the existing requirement in the

*Southern State Superannuation Act* that all newly appointed police officers must be members of the Triple S Scheme. The effect of the amendment in the Bill will enable superannuation to be dealt with like other terms and conditions, within the contract document. This will not alter the fact that contract officers may if they wish, elect to be members of the Triple S Scheme under the Southern State Superannuation Scheme.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### PART 1

##### PRELIMINARY

##### *Clauses 1, 2 and 3*

These clauses are formal. Clause 2 provides for the retrospective operation of clauses 16 and 17 of the Bill. These clauses are included as a consequence of amendments to the *Police Act 1952* in 1996.

##### PART 2

##### AMENDMENT OF JUDGES' PENSIONS ACT 1971

##### *Clause 4: Amendment of s. 14—Payment of pensions*

This clause brings the method of paying pensions up to date in the *Judges Pensions Act 1971*

##### *Clause 5: Amendment of s. 15—Refund of certain contributions*

This clause is consequential.

##### PART 3

##### AMENDMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT 1974

##### *Clause 6: Substitution of s. 39*

This clause makes a change to the *Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1974* to enable the Treasurer to use a special deposit account for the purpose of paying pensions.

##### PART 4

##### AMENDMENT OF POLICE SUPERANNUATION ACT 1990

##### *Clause 7: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation*

This clause defines the term 'special deposit account'.

##### *Clauses 8, 9, 10 and 11:*

These clauses amend the *Police Superannuation Act 1990* to facilitate the use of special deposit accounts.

##### PART 5

##### AMENDMENT OF SOUTHERN STATE SUPERANNUATION ACT 1994

##### *Clause 12: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation*

This clause defines the term 'special deposit account'.

##### *Clause 13: Amendment of s. 4—The Fund*

This clause amends section 4 of the *Southern State Superannuation Act 1994* to facilitate the use of special deposit accounts.

##### *Clause 14: Amendment of s. 9—The Southern State Superannuation (Employers) Fund*

This clause makes an amendment that will streamline the reimbursement of the Consolidated Account and the Treasurer for the employer component of benefits and administrative costs paid by the Treasurer. New subsection (3)(b) is consequential on the repeal of section 29.

##### *Clause 15: Amendment of s. 12—Payment of benefits*

This clause amends section 12 to facilitate the use of special deposit accounts.

*Clause 16: Amendment of s. 19—Members of the Police Force*  
Clause 16 amends section 19 of the *Southern State Superannuation Act 1994*. Section 19 provides that all members of the Police Force are members of the SSS scheme. The effect of the amendment is that a police officer on a fixed term contract is not automatically a member of the SSS scheme. Such a police officer may of course apply for membership if he or she wishes to.

##### *Clause 17: Amendment of s. 25—Contributions*

Clause 17 amends section 25 of the *Southern State Superannuation Act 1994* to make it clear that a police officer who is on a fixed term contract who is a member of the scheme is not required to contribute at 4.5 per cent of salary.

##### *Clause 18: Employer contribution accounts*

This clause replaces section 27(2) and (4) of the principal Act. New formulas are inserted which provide for an administrative charge 'C' to be deducted from the amount credited to members accounts. A number of changes consequential on the inclusion of the administrative charge are included in new subsections (2) and (4).

##### *Clause 19: Repeal of s. 29*

This clause repeals section 29 of the principal Act.

##### PART 6

##### AMENDMENT OF SUPERANNUATION (BENEFIT SCHEME) ACT 1992

##### *Clause 20: Amendment of s. 7—Members' accounts*

This clause makes changes to the *Superannuation (Benefit Scheme) Act 1992* that are similar to the changes made by clause 16 to the *Southern State Superannuation Act 1994*.

*Clause 21: Repeal of s. 11*

This clause repeals section 11 of the principal Act.

*Clause 22: Substitution of title*

This clause replaces the heading to Part 4 of the *Superannuation (Benefit Scheme) Act 1992*. The existing heading is the same as the heading to Part 3 of that Act.

#### PART 4

#### ENTITLEMENT TO BENEFITS

*Clause 23: Amendment of s. 17—Payment of benefits*

This clause amends section 17 to facilitate the use of special deposit accounts.

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

### SUPERANNUATION (EMPLOYEE MOBILITY) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 February. Page 998.)

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** The Opposition has considered this Bill and the Bill that will follow it and understands the reasons the Government is pursuing this measure before the Parliament. We support the legislation and understand that it will put in place far greater flexibility in certain specific State superannuation arrangements. In particular, the Police Superannuation (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill, which is to follow, will allow far greater flexibility for those members of the Police Force who do not wish to take their superannuation benefits at age 55 years.

There is considerable community argument about what is the appropriate age and what should be the appropriate target for superannuation benefits to be paid. This debate may well be the other way around in a matter of months for other Australians in the sense that there is an argument that superannuation benefits should be paid much later. Even for politicians there is an argument, at least at the Federal level, involving some people who I suspect are hoping that the majority of politicians will save them from their own fate. I am talking about those people who live at the bottom of the garden—known as the Democrats—who have argued that superannuation benefits and all the rest of it should not be available until age 92 and then only on 4 July between the hours of 3.55 and 4 o'clock.

We have listened for many years to the Democrats on superannuation, on remuneration for members of Parliament and about how good they are at not collecting their wages. At the end of the day I suspect that they are sinners just like the rest of us. I may be wrong and I may be a cynic, but I know that they would be greatly relieved if we save them from that.

That is not the measure here today but rather to build into the system a far greater degree of flexibility. I understand that this measure has the support of all Parties. I made my own inquiries about the matter and was told quite categorically that this measure was one that the work force believes is in its interests. As a consequence, we support the legislation and it will not be necessary for it to go into Committee as far as this side of the House is concerned.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer):** I thank the member for Playford for his usual lucid explanation. We will miss him in this place in future debates on these measures and perhaps we will not get the quality of debate that we have had while he has been in this House. This measure is designed to preserve the position of those persons transferring, and

without these provisions they will lose those benefits. It is in the interests of the employees concerned.

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

### POLICE SUPERANNUATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 February. Page 998.)

**Mr QUIRKE (Playford):** As with the previous Bill, this is the core of the legislation. It allows police officers to arrange their affairs, between the ages of 55 and 60 years, much in their own interests. The Bill has the support of the police officers and their association, and it has the support of the Opposition. We are of the view that these sorts of arrangements where agreed are beneficial to all workers. This side of politics believes strongly in superannuation and believes that all workers in Australia now have at least a sniff of superannuation, whereas until 10 years ago it was the preserve of Government employees and the rich.

It is now the case that we have superannuation arrangements of varying types under varying schemes around the country, and it will be an interesting social experiment to see how it unfolds in the next 20 years as the schemes come to maturity. We strongly believe in flexibility for those people who pay into a scheme to be able to take the benefits at a time when it suits them, provided it is at no cost to the taxpayer. This measure achieves that goal.

**The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer):** I thank the member for Playford for his support for the Bill.

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

### ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 February. Page 948.)

**Ms HURLEY (Napier):** This Bill deals with a couple of minor problems involving the Environment Protection Act, and the Opposition has no objection to these amendments. There are a number of issues about the Environment Protection Act and the way in which it operates that deserve greater attention, and I am surprised that there are not more far-reaching amendments to the Act as a number of significant problems have arisen, perhaps more particularly with the regulation and enforcement of the provisions of that Act. We would like to see more action taken on those fronts than in the minor areas addressed in this Bill.

Those areas addressed include membership of the authority and the way in which the Deputy Chair is appointed. A second and more significant point is that involving false reports. The Bill enables the authority to prosecute a person for making a false report when that person knows the substance of the report to be false and allows the authority to recover reasonable costs and expenses incurred when checking out that report. It is patently obvious that false reports may be used by people to cause a nuisance to competitors or to get a commercial advantage, and it is clear that the Environment Protection Authority should be able to take some action against people making such reports. The other amendment deals with time limits with transitional

rights, and the amendment simply provides a closing date for those transitional rights within schedule 2.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! It is inconsiderate for members to pass in front of the Chair and to interrupt debate.

**Ms HURLEY:** These are minor amendments: we have no objection to them and look forward to seeing Government action on major difficulties that have been highlighted by some deficiencies in the Environment Protection Act.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources):** I thank the Opposition for its support for this legislation. As has been indicated by the previous speaker, the amendments are reasonably small in importance in the overall legislation. However, it was felt necessary to proceed with these matters. As I indicated in the second reading explanation, it is my intention to have an appropriate review of the legislation. With legislation as complex and as important as the Environment Protection Act there needs to be a review.

It is not that long since the legislation was introduced and I do not think it is time yet for that review to be carried out, but we should be giving serious consideration to how best we can communicate with the public, with industry, the conservation movement, local government and all of those who are stakeholders in this area of importance. The three or four matters that are referred to and supported by the previous speaker are those it was felt needed to be addressed at this stage. I provide a commitment to the House that at the appropriate time a full review of the legislation will be carried out. It will certainly be my intention to consult with the Opposition to determine how best we in turn can consult with the community about such legislation because a lot of stakeholders are involved, and it is appropriate that that should happen. I thank the Opposition for its support.

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

**Mr BASS:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

#### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That Standing and Sessional Orders be so far suspended as to enable private members' business set down for tomorrow to be taken into consideration forthwith.

Motion carried.

#### CONSTITUTION (CASUAL VACANCIES IN HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 February. Page 971.)

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** My colleague the member for Davenport introduced this Bill in the House and I commend it to members for serious attention. The member for Davenport gave a very reasoned and reasonable second reading explanation and is to be commended for the effort he put into this Bill. All members in this House occasionally have a foray into private members' Bills, and some do it more successfully than others. All members should study this effort of the member for Davenport because of the care, attention and detail that he has put into researching this matter, but I

suspect it is not how much care and attention he has put into it with which the House should be concerned but, rather, the substance of the Bill and the efficacy of the matter he proposes for the House to enact as statute law in South Australia.

I believe the member for Davenport adequately makes the point that Parliament is a dynamic and constantly changing institution. He did it in a number of ways and, in effect, I would like to supplement what he was saying by indicating that often it is in the Houses of Parliament throughout the world—from Westminster through to Adelaide—that the latest innovations and technology have been added.

Things like electricity, microphones or any adjunct that can be added to a House of Parliament which actually helps the operation of efficient government has always been deemed to be within the province of the Parliament. The member for Davenport pointed out, additionally, the forms of the Parliament that are constantly modified, changed and updated to meet the needs of changing society. It is certainly worthy of comment that our democratic system of government has survived and has survived well through hundreds of years. Arguably, the system of government that we currently have on this continent is the most stable form of government that the world has ever seen, as it has been in the British Isles as well, at least in the period since the Civil War of Oliver Cromwell, which was some several hundred years ago, as the member for Spence knows.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** Oliver Cromwell was involved in it, unless the member for Spence can tell me otherwise.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** I had forgotten. The member for Spence is an avowed royalist. He is a peculiar chap: he is an avowed royalist and he believes that Bonney Prince Charlie and his heirs and successors should currently be on the throne of England. One always wonders at the member for Spence's contribution.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** This is the member for Spence, yes; he is really quite a peculiar chap.

*The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** As the member for Giles interjects, 'That's putting it politely,' and he is one of his friends. Returning to the substance of the Bill, the member for Davenport points out that the Bill is a considered measure, and I believe it is, because it is predicated on the fact that in modern politics, very often after an election defeat, major persons in either Party may see it in their best interests and in their Party's best interests to relinquish senior positions within the Party. Often, if the Prime Minister leads his Party to a poll and is then—

**Mr Atkinson:** Or a Treasurer.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I said 'senior positions in the Party'. The member for Spence would do well to listen to the substance of the debate: it is a serious debate which might contribute to the better governance of South Australia. If he were more interested in listening than petty point scoring off Ministers sitting on the front bench he would do well.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Spence said that he was speaking in the abstract, and the Treasurer piped in and said, 'As usual.' I would have to agree with the Treasurer: I have never heard the member for Spence speak in anything but the abstract. Often a leader, having led his Party, is told by the electorate—whether it is the electorate of South Australia or

Australia—that he or she is not considered to be the best alternative for that Party; and often in those situations that person resigns.

This Government may one day be faced with the problem, when defeated at a general election, that senior Ministers—people who go through a career as a Minister—decide, in the interests of the better development of their Party, this Parliament and themselves, to leave the Parliament, having been told at a general election that they are no longer required as a Minister, thereby causing a by-election.

*Mr Evans interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** As the member for Davenport points out, because of the inevitable backlash of by-elections, those people often hang around not knowing what to do for about 12 months or however long it is reasonable to hang around.

**The Hon. Frank Blewins:** Why is everyone looking at me?

**Mr BRINDAL:** The member for Giles is worried that we are looking at him. Let the record show that the member for Giles has served the longest apprenticeship into retirement of anyone I know. He went to the last election telling his electors that this was his last term, and every day since he has told anyone who will listen that this is his last term and how many days he has left to serve. He has had a very long preparation for his retirement, and we all wish him well in it.

The member for Davenport has done a lot of research in respect of this Bill, and it clearly shows that where a person is elected as a member of a Party and achieves a majority of greater than 60 per cent, no matter what circumstance has occurred in comparatively recent times—and he goes back decades—when a by-election has been held it has never been lost by the Government in power. It is true that there might be swings against the Government in power, but basically the seat has always been retained by the Party which won it. The member for Davenport's proposition in this legislation is quite simple: if, within six weeks of a general election, a member of the Government or a member of the Opposition seek to resign and their majority is more than 10 per cent, the Party which had nominated them to stand for that Party in the general election should have the right to nominate a successor who would serve out the remainder of that term.

The member for Davenport points out that the electorate at large does not like going to a general election and then being told within weeks or months that they have to face a by-election for a reason they believe is beyond their control. This measure acknowledges that. It seeks to save the voters from the impost of repeating an exercise which they have just completed.

**Mr Atkinson:** Here we go!

**Mr BRINDAL:** The members for Spence says, 'Here we go', on the grounds that he is one of the few people in here vain enough to believe that were he not in the Labor Party he would still be re-elected as the member for Spence. He is one person who thinks that his personal popularity is such that the Labor Party would rise and fall in Spence on his particular candidacy. I have got news—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** He says, 'Modesty forbids.' He will just let everyone else say it for him. I have news for him: if he cares to be a little more honest with himself he will probably find that, like the rest of us, he is more dependent on his Party for his existence in here than on his personal popularity. I put it to the member for Spence that, if he were to be run over by a bus tomorrow and he disappeared from the political scene, another Labor candidate would possibly be elected in Spence

despite the best efforts of this Government and despite the ill-advised tendencies of voters in that electorate to vote for a Party which they should not.

The only quibble I therefore have with this excellent proposition is that the member for Davenport believes that, as death is not a voluntary action entered into by a member, a by-election should be held if a member dies within six weeks of an election. I will talk to the member for Davenport about a possible amendment, because I contend that if somebody dies within six weeks of an election it is an even more compelling argument to say that the Party which nominated the person who died should nominate another person and not put the electorate through a by-election. This is a cost saving measure and an efficiency measure, and it is in line with all the principles of modern Government. It also is in line with what clearly has been voter intention for the past few decades.

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** The convenience of the major Parties is the object of this Bill. The member for Unley outlined all pretended advantages of the Bill, that all this Bill is for is to make things easier for the Liberal Party and perhaps the Labor Party. It is a Bill directed at undermining independence and undermining the sovereignty of the people. It is as simple as that. It is a Bill which just happens to suit the Liberal Party at this time in history. After the next State election, which the Premier says will be held this year, those departing from the ministry will include the Treasurer, the former Premier and the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. There may be others.

**The Hon. Frank Blewins:** At least.

**Mr ATKINSON:** At least. What the Bill in its original form would do is make it convenient for those three Liberal MPs and others to be replaced by Liberal Party appointees within six weeks of the 1997 general election without the consent of the electors in those three State districts.

*Mr Evans interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr ATKINSON:** As the member for Davenport points out, it takes effect in 1999. I am pleased that he introduced the Bill to the House in that form because that was not its original form. The member for Davenport points out that there is formal recognition of political Parties in another place, and that in another place when a member of a political Party steps down as a member he or she can be replaced by a member of the same political Party after a joint sitting of the two Houses. This is a necessary evil because the alternative would be a statewide election: the whole of South Australia going to the polls to replace that particular member, and that is not viable, although the member for Davenport seems to think it is.

Because the other place is elected on the basis of proportional representation, it would be unfair to have a by-election statewide for a single vacancy because the person who is retiring or who has died may have been elected with, say, 8 per cent or 9 per cent of the vote to represent a minor Party and a by-election for the whole State would result in one of the two major Parties getting the replacement.

I will describe one of the evils in this system. The Hon. Dr Bernice Pfitzner has never faced the people of South Australia. The Hon. Dr Bernice Pfitzner was elected to a casual vacancy in 1990 to replace Martin Cameron when he stepped down. The Hon. Dr Bernice Pfitzner has been voting in Parliament, chairing parliamentary committees, and doing it for seven years—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**Mr ATKINSON:** —and the only people who chose her were a conclave of the blue rinse set down on Greenhill Road.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** For seven years the Hon. Dr Bernice Pfitzner, without a mandate, has been pontificating about a range of issues. Just last weekend, the Hon. Dr Bernice Pfitzner was preselected to face the people for the first time ever, at position number five and, because she was not happy with that position, she gave her Party a real spray about being racist and sexist. Imagine what she would have said if she had been chosen at number six or not chosen at all. I dread to think. I am very pleased that the Hon. Dr Bernice Pfitzner has been preselected to face the people of South Australia next time, because she will get back. She will be a member of Parliament again, and she is a great asset for the Australian Labor Party!

It is bad enough that we have had the Hon. Dr Bernice Pfitzner in the other place for seven years without facing the people. Now, the member for Davenport thinks it is such a good idea that we ought to do it for the House of Assembly as well. So, it is quite possible that, following this year's State election, we could have three Liberal MPs elected for Heysen, Finniss and Waite and, for the next four years, those three members would be members of the House of Assembly without having faced the people. So, three or more of the 47 members of the House might be people who have never obtained a popular mandate.

The truth of the matter is that this is designed to disadvantage the minor Parties because, in a situation where former Ministers resign *en masse* from the Parliament within days or weeks of being re-elected by their constituencies, there will be some anger in their constituencies when those by-elections are held. The possibility is that it will be the minor Parties and Independents who will win those seats and not the Opposition. What the member for Davenport is trying to do is inveigle the parliamentary Labor Party into a dirty deal to make sure that Independents and minor Parties have no chance of being elected to this House in by-elections. That is what the Bill is about, and that is one of the reasons why we are opposing it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The members for Davenport and Unley have both had a chance to speak.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I think it is quite dangerous to include in our Constitution the concept of a two Party or two candidate preferred vote. Why the magical figure of 60 per cent?

**Mr Brindal:** Why not? It works.

**Mr ATKINSON:** The member for Unley says it works. What we are doing is making House of Assembly districts the personal property of political Parties. So, South Terrace and Greenhill Road become the beneficial owners of State districts, and they can trade those State districts among themselves without any intervention by the electors of those constituencies.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** I am strongly opposed to that.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** The Deputy Leader interjects about a recent arrangement by the Labor Party regarding the Senate and the State district of Playford. The virtue of that deal is that the Labor Party's candidate for Playford will face the people at a general election or a by-election, and the people

of Playford will have the opportunity to endorse the Labor Party's preselected candidate or reject him or her. Under the member for Davenport's proposal, the people of Waite, Heysen and Finniss do not get a choice. All they get is whoever Greenhill Road chooses for them, and those State districts become the beneficial property of the Liberal Party of South Australia Incorporated for the next four years. That is wrong on constitutional principle, and the parliamentary Labor Party will oppose it.

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I commend the member for Davenport for the research he has done, for his attempt to save the taxpayers' money on unnecessary by-elections, and to make it easier for the transition, but I oppose the Bill. I do so because it is against the democratic principles of the way we elect Lower House members, since we are based on districts. There is no doubt that there will be economic savings. There is no doubt that it will make easier the transition of members after a general election, and to safeguard our 60 per cent makes some sense. However, it is flawed basically because it is against the democratic principles of how members are elected to this House.

I do not agree with the member for Spence who has used the debate as an opportunity for a bit of point-scoring and a little bit of fiction writing as to who will be replaced at the next election, and so on. The basic principles we should be looking at are whether it is democratic, whether or not it will empower the people and whether it will give an electorate the opportunity to elect the person they want to represent them. The House of Assembly is not elected on proportional representation. It is a single electorate House, and this is the Chamber that produces the Government from the Party with the majority of the 47 seats. It would be wrong to interfere with that basic principle.

The member for Davenport's Bill assumes that we will always have a Party system. Of course, over the past 70 or 80 years, we have had a Party system and, more recently, a two Party system. But to assume that that is the way we should select members after a general election I think is wrong and flawed. It will disempower the electorate. It will not give them the opportunity to select the member they wish to represent them. Decisions like this should not be based on economic grounds.

**Mr Evans:** What about the Upper House?

**Mr SCALZI:** The Upper House is based on proportional representation. Simply, if one member resigns, or if there is a vacancy in the other place, the member for Davenport knows that there is a ticket with a number of people listed one to five, six or seven, and therefore it is only natural that the person next on the list comes up. Members would know that, if you have a preselection for the Lower House, you need five weeks to work out the preselection process, so how will the six weeks provision operate?

Will the preselection of candidates be ready before the general election so that six weeks later they are ready to go? That puts the democratic principles of this House in jeopardy. Even though there is, basically, a two-Party system in this State, the election of members to this place should not be based on the convention over the past 50 years. Things could change. There could be more independents. What will happen then? How will casual vacancies be filled?

**Mr Evans:** Why would an independent resign six weeks after the election?

**Mr SCALZI:** We do not know. Everything is possible in politics. I am not a clairvoyant: I cannot predict what is going

to happen. All I am saying is that we should stick to the principles. In this House there are 47 seats, and to assume that members are just waiting around to retire is not what it is all about. From time to time, of course, people will wait for the right opportunity to retire, but let the Parties decide based on the principles—

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr SCALZI:** There is a fraction too much friction in the comments of the member for Unley. We cannot base the election of members in this place on expediency. We cannot base it on whether we will save \$50 000 for a by-election. The reality is that, if there is a by-election and if the people want to let the Government know that they are not happy with the situation after six weeks, 10 weeks, or whatever, then the people of that electorate should have the opportunity to do so. Whether it be a Government member or an Opposition member, the electorate should decide. We should not have a mechanism to make it easier for members of Parliament to enter and leave Parliament. Democracy should not be based on the benefits to the members or the benefits to the political Parties. The principles should be the benefits to the electorate. And if the electorate wants to send a message to a Government or an Opposition in a by-election, it should have the opportunity to do so.

This Bill would prevent us from having that opportunity. It would prevent the electorate from having the opportunity to voice approval or disapproval of the way that the Government or the Opposition is heading. We should not base decisions such as this on economics or expediency: we should base them on democratic principles. This is a single electorate House and, if someone vacates a seat, the Party, whether in Government or Opposition, should go to the people to let them have their say. For those reasons, I oppose the Bill.

**Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I oppose the Bill for the reasons put forward by the member for Spence so eloquently. Basically, the member for Davenport is somewhat of a Stalinist in his approach to parliamentary democracy: he devalues every individual member of this House by assuming that simply because—

*Mr Quirke interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** Don't invite me to answer that. He devalues every individual member of this House by assuming that the people who vote for us in our electorates do so simply because we wear our Party tag, and that, simply because a two-Party preferred vote of 60 per cent or more is deemed to be a safe seat, the electorate does not get a chance to select its preferred member if, within the first six weeks or so after the election, a member should retire. We all know, just looking at the Government front bench opposite us, that every one of those Ministers has been elected by their constituents on the force of their own personality, their intellect, their ingenuity and the benefit that they bring to the local electorate. It had nothing to do whatsoever with their Party label.

For example, the Treasurer got there by the force of his own personality, not simply because of his Party label. The electors of Waite were discerning. They have been discerning over the years. The electorate of Waite has a two-Party preferred vote, anyway, in excess of 60 per cent, and most of that is due to the personality of the current incumbent. One cannot simply assume that the member for Waite, when he is no longer the Treasurer, straight after the next State election—whenever that might be—through a sense of grave injustice that has been done to him—already done to him, but

twice over when he loses the Treasury after the next election—will show his displeasure by resigning within that six weeks period. That would deny—

**Mr BRINDAL:** I rise on a point of order, Sir. Members are supposed to address the substance of the debate. This Bill canvasses issues which occur after—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, there is no point of order. The member is allowed to express his opinions freely. I simply remind the member for Unley that by way of interjection he has extended his own debate by some three minutes while a previous member was speaking. So let's be fair about this.

**Mr CLARKE:** I have almost forgotten where I was. Anyway, I will come back to the—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** I know it refers to 1999. However, as the member for Giles rightly pointed out by way of interjection, the Upper House could in fact drop off '1999' by amendment. Therefore, we could be dealing with the next State election, so—

*Mr Evans interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Davenport is acting in a somewhat despotic manner, too.

**Mr CLARKE:** What I am trying to point out to the House is that, quite literally, because of the work that the member for Waite has put into his constituency, he probably has a very substantial personal following because of his own personal magnetism, charm and charisma, which could not be easily transferred to another political Party simply because he happens to wear the Liberal Party tag. We all know that the seats the independents are most likely to win are safe Liberal or safe Labor seats where, because of chance of circumstances, or where a sitting member decides to retire because they do not have the position that they thought they were dutifully entitled to after an election, or where their Party has been defeated, a member, a former Minister or whoever resigns.

In that sort of context, the electorate, particularly in safe Liberal or Labor seats, feels that it has been taken for granted and, when an opportunity arises for a by-election, it expresses that displeasure through the ballot box by electing an independent. Alternatively, as happened in the case of the seat of Mitcham—when the Tonkin Government displayed an act of crass political opportunism by appointing to the Supreme Court a thorn in its side, the former member for Mitcham—at the by-election the Tonkin Government expected Mitcham to return a Liberal member once it had got rid of Robin Millhouse, but it found that a Democrat, in the form of Heather Southcott, was elected because the electors of Mitcham recognised—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr CLARKE:** No, wait a moment. They recognised that it was crass political opportunism on the part of the Tonkin Government at that time. We in the Labor Party have felt the same with respect to the Federal seat of Adelaide: not long after the election in 1987, Chris Hurford resigned, and in February 1988 what was a formerly safe Federal Labor seat under the old boundaries was lost in a by-election, due in no small measure to the anger of the electorate in response to its believing that it had been taken for granted when a candidate had stood for election and said, 'I will serve the next three years' (or, in our case, four years) and then, because personal ambitions were not realised, left and the voters had to go back to the polling booth.

Members of the House of Assembly are not like members of the Legislative Council because when we present ourselves to the electorate we have to make ourselves known, and our constituents vote for a mixture of Party politics and what they see as a personal following. In the other place, to put it bluntly, when one sheep falls off the twig another sheep gets out of the dip and replaces him in the same political Party. That is basically the way it works in the Upper House. It does not matter much because they are elected on a statewide basis, and it is not humanly possible for individual legislative councillors to be known to a huge number of their constituents. Some have an aversion to meeting constituents. Obviously, the major Party leaders in the other place are noted but, by and large, it is impossible for ordinary legislative councillors to be well known simply because of the huge area of the State and the sheer number of electors involved.

Whilst I appreciate that the member for Davenport in a pragmatic sense might have come up with a right solution, it is right only if it is predicated on the basis that members of Parliament are purely pawns of political machines and are here only as the result of political chicanery, whereas all 47 of us know that we got here purely on our own ability and intellect and because the electorate recognised our outstanding contribution to our local community. To vote for the member for Davenport's resolution would fly in the face of our own true knowledge of our own self-worth.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr ROSSI (Lee):** I wish to continue my grievance debate today with the results of surveys undertaken in my electorate. On tariffs, I asked: 'Do you believe that tariffs on imported goods should be reduced or increased?' In response, 26 per cent believed they should be reduced; 48 per cent believed they should be increased; and 26 per cent did not know. On election issues, I asked a number of questions, as follows: 'Should referenda be held at the time of elections to give the community more participation in political processes, especially on moral issues, after being debated in Parliament and before becoming law?' The replies were: 'Yes', 84 per cent; 'No', 5 per cent; and 11 per cent did not know. I asked, 'Do you think three tiers of government (Federal, State and local government) are too many?' The replies were: 'Yes', 42 per cent; 'No', 47 per cent; and 11 per cent did not know.

When asked, 'How long do you feel the fixed term for the Federal Government should be', 47 per cent said 'Three years'; 47 per cent said 'Four years'; and 6 per cent said 'Five years'. In response to the question, 'Do you feel that Australia should become a Republic?', 37 per cent said 'Yes'; 53 per cent said 'No'; and 10 per cent did not know. The next question on the survey was: 'Should voting be compulsory at all State and Federal elections?' The replies were: 'Yes', 74 per cent; 'No', 21 per cent; and 5 per cent did not know. The next question was: 'Do you believe that the Federal Government should sign international treaties that override the laws of Australian States?' The replies were: 'Yes', 32 per cent; 'No', 58 per cent; and 10 per cent did not know. My final question was: 'If "No", should the particular issues go to a referendum before they can become enforced?' The

replies were: 'Yes', 80 per cent; and 20 per cent did not know.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr ROSSI:** When I voted on this issue, I had not yet done a survey. That is one of the reasons why I conduct these surveys, and that is far more than Labor Party candidates do.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr ROSSI:** I have not seen any results of surveys by Labor candidates—neither by the Labor candidate for Lee nor the Leader (Mike Rann), who should conduct surveys. I refer to a letter from a constituent, which states:

Dear Mr Rossi

I feel compelled to write. Many years ago, sex education was introduced into schools because there were too many ex-nuptial pregnancies, the reason being parents were unable/unwilling to teach their children the fundamentals. More than 20 years later we have similar or worse statistics. This leads me to think that sex education has not been a spectacular success and that you were 100 per cent correct in your recent statements or that, alternatively, the sex education program has been a monumental failure and a huge waste of our precious and hard worked for resources and needs urgent investigation and assessment. Somebody got it very wrong and personally I don't believe it was you. I hope that this important issue doesn't 'go away'.

This letter refers to the public education system of sex education which the previous Labor Government thought was such a wonderful idea in order to make sex safe for teenagers. As far as I am concerned, during my short time in Parliament there has been no reduction in this type of activity. In fact, sometimes the way in which teachers talk about sex practices and safe sex encourages sexual activity in young children. I refer to a letter dated 4 February 1997 from my opponent in the electorate of Lee, as follows:

During the next couple of weeks I will be visiting homes in your area and I hope to have the opportunity of meeting you. Should you not be at home when I visit I will leave a business card. If you would like to meet with me please contact me and I will be happy to return at a more convenient time. I believe the concerns of people—

and I draw this to the attention of the member for Spence, who is always interjecting—

need to be listened to and I intend to keep in close contact with people in this area.

The Labor candidate for Lee has already been a candidate for two other seats in this State. So, he is not interested in a particular seat or a particular group of electors: he is a full-time candidate for the Labor Party, and he has already failed twice in respect of other seats. It is most important to note that the Labor Party's Constitution states that Labor candidates cannot represent the electors, that first and foremost they are there to represent the views of the Party. Labor candidates must sign a pledge which apparently is binding. So, I think the statement in the final paragraph of that letter is false. Unless the Labor Party changes the pledge of its members, such a paragraph should not have been written. Most Labor members, including, I have been told, my predecessor (Mr Kevin Hamilton), do not listen to anything other than the concerns of Labor supporters. If Mr Hamilton found out that someone was a Liberal supporter or not a supporter of the Labor Party, he turfed them out the door.

He did not listen to their concerns and did not represent them in the electorate or in the Parliament. I would like the Leader of the Labor Party in this House to refute my allegations, because I think it is unbelievable that a member of Parliament represents only a sector of his community, when, in actual fact we are here to serve the taxpayers, and that means all members of the electorate.



**Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna):** In a previous grievance recently I raised the issue of levels of crime in the community and the recent report put out by the Attorney-General which showed that in many cases crime was on the downturn. Today I would like to consider a few issues, commencing with some of the things happening within the electorate of Kaurna as a result of some of the budget processes that this Government has put in place over the past three years. One of the most important things is that we have managed to reduce prisoner costs from \$54 000 per prisoner in 1992-93 to \$36 000 this year. When we came to Government we had the most expensive prison system in Australia; in fact, in South Australia it cost 25 per cent more than anywhere else in Australia to keep a prisoner in prison.

One of the most successful innovations has been the transfer of prisoner transport to private operators. Police officers at Christies Beach police station have complained constantly to me about the times that their whole shift has been tied up in transferring prisoners into Adelaide. By letting out this activity to a private operator, police have been freed up to do the job that they want to do and, in fact, are paid to do. I believe that rehabilitation is essential in the correction system, and I applaud the Minister for his adoption of an internationally recognised method of rehabilitation in our prisons.

Regardless of some things that have been stated in the newspapers and on radio in the past couple of days, South Australia continues to spend more on education per student than any other State in Australia. Early intervention in education remains a key area of importance for this Government and is certainly a focus in most of the schools and kindergartens with which I have close contact. All 6 000 pre-school and junior primary school teachers have had an intensive training program through Cornerstones to allow them to identify problems in children at a much earlier age. The sum of \$2 million was given to schools in 1996 as a cash grant for extra assistance for those students with particular learning difficulties. This money allowed the purchase of SSO hours, and it was left to each school to decide how to allocate that funding. I think it is appropriate that each school was given the opportunity to make that decision because, after all, the principal and teachers at each school know best how to spend that money.

In 1997 this cash grant has been increased to \$3 million, and in 1998 will be increased to \$4 million to be used for children identified through the basic skills testing procedure. Speech pathology positions have been increased by six, and in 1997 a further 12 salaries will be provided, totalling a 72 per cent increase in speech pathology services. Guidance officers numbers have increased by six to improve the timing of assessment of children with hearing difficulties.

I have spent quite some time with the member for Unley as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Education visiting most of the schools in Kaurna and participating in an education forum indicating that the key issues were the early years strategy and the need for much greater early intervention throughout all schools in Kaurna. This year the Liberal Government has established a hearing difficulty support team to provide specialist advice to teachers on how to deal with children found to have a learning difficulty.

We have also allocated an extra \$4.2 million in 1997 and \$9.25 million in 1998 for special education to provide added help for students with disabilities and severe learning difficulties. In fact, I am very pleased that the new Seaford six to 12 school within the electorate will have a special unit

for students with particular disabilities. We will also provide schools with \$18 million in flexible staffing money for those schools to use how they wish to help students with special needs.

The back-to-school grants in Kaurna this year are budgeted at \$94 730 to address maintenance backlogs left by the previous Administration. Programmed minor works for the electorate of Kaurna in this budget totalled \$115 000 to address high priority school improvements, such as storm-water drainage at Seaford Primary School and connection of sewer for the Port Noarlunga Primary School. Although they are deemed minor works, they are minor works that schools should have had as part of the original building program. To imagine that a primary school is waiting to be connected to a sewer in 1997 is not really acceptable within the school maintenance program.

In terms of education, I also want to raise the hypocrisy of the Labor Opposition which became evident a couple of weeks ago when it started to talk about school closures. We have listened to a lot of talk about how we should be handling school closures. I remind the House that the Liberal Party during the last election campaign pledged as part of its platform for education that we would restrict school closures to 40; the current number is 37 compared with 70 closures in the last few years of the Labor Government. Five schools in Kaurna have received extra staffing for school card allocations. Money is being fed into the education system in Kaurna despite the scare campaign that went around during the last election. If you listened carefully to everything that was said during the last election campaign, one school would be left open in the entire electorate of Kaurna.

Another important initiative receiving continuing support in the budget program this year is the community development fund which arises from a share of revenue raised from the new poker machine tax. The sum of \$300 000 has been allocated to run an interagency abuse assessment panel based at Noarlunga FACS. All sexual abuse matters relating to children aged 17 years and under are referred to this panel to investigate whether criminal proceedings should continue and to reduce the number of interviews that children need to face. Community legal centres are receiving \$269 000 this year from the State Government, an increase of \$50 000 over last year. This has been an extremely important contribution following the Federal Government's decision to dramatically cut its share of funds.

I have mentioned in my grievance today that the Minister for Emergency Services and the Deputy Premier, along with the Mayor of Noarlunga, Ray Gilbert, attended the opening of the Noarlunga CFS station. The commissioning of the new station and the new CFS vehicle recognise the extra funding being provided for the electorate of Kaurna.

The recent Southern Business Expo was held at the Southern Sports Complex within the electorate of Kaurna. The Business Expo, which is always very successful and which was opened jointly by the Premier and the Mayor of Noarlunga, displays all local businesses that are offering services to local residents. I also welcome three new businesses which have opened in the electorate of Kaurna over the past couple of months—Bridgestone, Andy's Tyres and Dustin's Hair Design. It is important to put on record that although a lot of doom and gloom is being spread by the Opposition about businesses being in trouble, in the electorate of Kaurna—which depends heavily on small business—in the past three weeks we have seen the opening of three new businesses which I welcome and wish well.

Yesterday, the Treasurer and the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources met a deputation from the Willunga District Council to discuss the possibility of establishing a washpool within the Sellicks Beach area. Members would know that the washpool area was the proposed site for the Sellicks marina, which has now been well and truly forgotten. The community is now looking

forward to positive support and to being part of the decision made about the procedure involving the washpool and the reinstatement of the wetlands within that area, and to seeing something positive happen for that part of the community of Sellicks Beach.

Motion carried.

At 5.45 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 27 February at 10.30 a.m.