

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 19 March 1998

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)** took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

## PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: HIGHLAND IRRIGATION DISTRICT

**Mr LEWIS (Hammond):** I move:

That the sixty-fifth report of the committee on the rehabilitation of Highland Irrigation District be noted.

Cadell is one of the eight former Government highland irrigation districts along the River Murray in South Australia and the final one to be rehabilitated. That is true in the context of the package that was put together but not true entirely in that there is still the highland irrigation area in Loxton, which the member for Chaffey reminds me is yet to be rehabilitated. I believe that the net benefit to South Australia, if in no other way than the amount of water that will be made available for an extension of the area of crops under irrigation, then in that way alone it will be warranted.

However, to continue with the phases of the project which have been before the committee: a total of 8 500 hectares of irrigated land is in these districts, with most of the schemes having been established before 1930 and comprising of pumping stations and open channel distribution systems to reticulate the irrigation water to farms.

The Cadell area comprises about 380 hectares and is planted with high value horticultural crops, predominantly stone fruit, citrus and vines. SA Water proposed to provide irrigation rehabilitation and restructuring in the highland district of Cadell to replace the ageing and outdated open channel irrigation system. The estimated cost of those works is \$6.35 million and the anticipated completion date will be about the middle of next year. It is proposed that the capital cost for the project will be shared between the Commonwealth, the State Government and growers on a 40:40:20 basis. In addition, SA Water advises the committee that the net present value of the proposed works is \$10 million, with a cost benefit ratio of 2.37 based on an internal rate of return of 7 per cent over the 25 year period.

By way of explanation, the committee now obtains the net present value and the internal rate of return with the cost benefit ratios for projects that come before it. That is in compliance with the Act. It is a more effective way of assessing how well the public interest will be served by the investments which we make in such projects. In essence, the net present value is equal to the difference between the present value of the future net cash flows (not of costs) generated by a project and the initial capital outlay. So, if you assume a cash outlay at the beginning of the project's life and a series of cash flow in the foregoing periods, the net present value is calculated by using the following formula, which I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard*. Whilst it is not statistics, it is a piece of data that cannot be described by words.

Leave granted.

$$NPV = \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{C_t}{(1+k)^t} - C_0$$

where  $C_0$  = the initial cash outlay on the project

$C_t$  = net cash flow generated by the project at time  $t$

$n$  = the life of the project

$k$  = required rate of return

**Mr LEWIS:** The internal rate of return is the rate of return that equates the net present value of cash flows generated, that is net cash flows, net of cost, by a project with its initial cash outlay. So, the internal rate of return can be calculated using an equally simple formula. I further seek your leave, Mr Speaker, to have that also incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

$$C_0 = \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{C_t}{(1+r)^t}$$

where  $C_0$  = the initial cash outlay on the project

$C_t$  = net cash flow generated by the project at time  $t$

$n$  = the life of the project

$r$  = internal rate of return

**Mr LEWIS:** In other words, the net present value of a project is found by discounting the future net cash flows at the required rate of return and deducting from the resulting present value the initial cash outlay on the project. Generally, agencies should select projects with a positive net present value. However, it is legitimate for the Government to decide as a matter of policy that that is to be overridden. Selecting such projects means that the project's benefits are greater than its costs to the public purse, with the result that its implementation will increase revenue and decrease costs. It will also increase the Gross State Product. Therefore, we can see how much benefit the project will generate in dollars in those terms and as well what this will be as a yield or dividend per \$100 invested by discovering the internal rate of return. It will enable us to rank projects on these criteria and thereby get much more from the scarce capital works dollars we have to spend, which will come one way or another from taxpayers.

The works to be conducted for this project include the replacement of existing open supply channels with new pipelines, metering of the supply to each property, installation of new mechanical and electrical equipment in the pumping station, and the construction of a new 1 megalitre surge tank to pressurise the system, control the pumps and remove from it the risk of water hammers.

A delegation of the Public Works Committee conducted an inspection at the Cadell Highland Irrigation District on 5 February last. Members were able to see the existing irrigation system in operation and see first-hand the need for its upgrade. We saw the vulnerability of the existing open channel system which requires constant repair to contain the cracks and to prevent large volumes of water leaking off from the system. Members were also able to see the age of the current pumping system and the shed in which it is housed. In particular, we were told about and could see the need for higher maintenance costs if the pump is to be kept operational. Furthermore, the pumping station generally does not meet current occupational health and safety standards. Ventilation alone is extremely poor, and workers in that station could easily end up being gassed.

The committee then travelled to the Moorook irrigation district—an area which was rehabilitated in 1993. We were able to compare the two districts and observe the benefits of rehabilitation, particularly the increased efficiency and effectiveness of the new irrigation system and its contribution

to the redevelopment and reclaiming of some areas in the Moorook district. The Public Works Committee agrees that the life of the existing irrigation system at Cadell is over, well and truly. Worse, as growers have to take water based on availability rather than need, they are often required to irrigate—actually, it is hardly irrigation; they just spread water through their crops—at a time that is not necessarily optimal. We consider that this proposal will eliminate these limitations, as growers will be able to order up their water as they need it, that is, use it at times when it will provide maximum benefit, and maximum benefit will provide maximum profit from their crops.

In addition, we could see and strongly agree with the option put to us in evidence that the main benefits of this proposal arise from increased horticultural output resulting from the improved productivity that is possible with a rehabilitated distribution system and an increased level of confidence in the ability of the distribution system to provide for timely irrigation, and it will be a stimulus for individual growers to review and improve their cultural husbandry operations on their crops. Other benefits include savings in repairs, as well as savings in maintenance and administration costs.

By metering growers' water use, we accept the view that it will reduce water consumption. This will, in turn, decrease drainage returns to the environment, as well as free up existing water allocations for further development and expand production income and employment per megalitre of water available for irrigation in South Australia as a result of doing this work. Finally, growers will become responsible for the management of the system, not the public purse, as is the case at present.

Given all this, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act, the Public Works Committee reports to the Parliament that it recommends the proposed public works. I thank all members who have contributed in any way to a better understanding of these projects of highland irrigation rehabilitation, and in this one in particular the Member for Eyre who provided the committee with his understanding of and strong support for not only the proposed works but also the haste in their consideration.

**An honourable member:** He's the member for Stuart.

**Mr LEWIS:** I apologise to the electors of Stuart and the member for Stuart for that oversight.

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** I rise to support the report of the committee relating to the rehabilitation of the Cadell highland irrigation system. This work is important both economically and environmentally. When the committee looked at it, we found that it met all the tests that we are required to apply in relation to public value, public interest and the value of the investment of public moneys. The Chair has already mentioned the important occupational health and safety aspects of the rehabilitation process, and the water management aspects. I simply want to emphasise the value of the training involved for the growers who are participating in the new irrigation system.

Often issues come up in respect of people on the land who are not readily able to upgrade their skills in relation to the technologies that they are now required to use and in relation to some of the planning and business skills required for the effective operation of any small business. The part of the scheme that is involved in the new rehabilitation processes that have already been embarked upon in places such as Moorook and now Cadell involves extensive training and

planning by the irrigators and the owners of the blocks who have to really analyse the nature of the soil and their crop requirements, and match the two together so that they are neither planting in land which will prove to be non-viable nor misusing the precious water that is available to them. The nature of the scheme means that the water will not be running in open channels and therefore subject to all forms of waste but will be contained in pipes and dripper systems throughout. This involves a challenge for growers, and most of them are willingly participating in the training, although some of them have yet to be convinced of the value of the new operations.

Our visit to Moorook gave us the opportunity to meet some of the growers who are benefiting from the scheme and from the training that is involved. They were very ready to praise a former Minister responsible for water resources, Susan Lenehan, for being brave enough to take the risk and establish the project at Moorook to see how it would work and to involve in that process training in business management and land irrigation. Ms Lenehan's contribution should be noted here, as it was by the growers to whom we talked. I was very happy to sign this report, and I look forward to the effective work being proceeded with very quickly.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** I support the rehabilitation of the—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** At the moment I am more interested in the rehabilitation of the Highland Irrigation District, because it means that the region can get its act together with respect to the opportunities that have been created by our Government in the past 4½ years in freeing up water resources for all of South Australia. The Murray River is the lifeblood of South Australia and, now that we have been able to free up water resources, it will play an even more important economic role.

Although I was not able to attend the inspection of the Highland Irrigation District because of electorate commitments, I was involved in the report that has been presented to Parliament, and I appreciate that the people in that district have waited a good deal of time to get this project approved. I know that they are looking at it with a great deal of excitement because it creates opportunities for further expansion and economic growth in that region.

We often hear Opposition members in this House, particularly of late, state that regional economic growth is important, and we realise that because that is a fundamental philosophy of the Liberal Party. We realise that the rural sector has a major part to play in economic development opportunities for the State and we will not let our regions down. By working in partnership with the producers, the Government and Parliament, this will be an exciting opportunity for that area.

On leaving Urrbrae I had the privilege to spend time in the Riverland to get a better feel of horticulture, and at that time, 23 years ago, the salinity problems and the antiquated irrigation systems were of major concern to people in the established areas. The newly developing areas were putting in better technology but, at that time, some of the system was screaming out for replacement. Sadly, it has taken nearly 25 years before this opportunity has arisen.

It is realised that, if we are to capitalise on projects such as the Food for the Future initiative of Premier Olsen, which will result in the growth of agricultural product in this State from \$5 billion to about \$15 billion by the year 2010, we

have to ensure that water facilities are upgraded. In addition, I call on my Federal colleagues to consider allowing increased taxation rebates for growers who put in high-tech and low water volume irrigation systems.

One of the things that is impeding the growth of all agriculture, but particularly horticulture development in these regions, is that prices for horticultural product fluctuate immensely. One only has to look at what is happening with oranges, with many people ripping out orange trees, not unlike the vine pull scheme of 10 or so years ago.

When growers achieve a better rate of return, one of their problems then is tax. Years ago home on the farm, at times we were able to claim 120 per cent or more write-off in irrigation costs in the one year. That was fantastic because, when we did have a successful financial year, we were able to improve the farm and therefore allow for more productivity in successive years. This is the sort of thing these horticulturalists currently need, and I trust that the Federal Government would look at the long term rather than the short term, as has been the case with taxation imposts over the past 10 years or so. I support this important project and look forward to its completion as soon as possible.

**Mrs MAYWALD (Chaffey):** I support the recommendations of the committee in relation to the rehabilitation of Cadell highland irrigation, but I also bring to the attention of the Parliament the importance of the other area on the River Murray which has not been rehabilitated at this stage, and I refer to the Loxton irrigation area. Over some time there has been work on a proposal for the rehabilitation of the soldier settlement Commonwealth-owned district which is State managed at this stage and which is in grave need of rehabilitation.

The proposal envisages that there will be a project of about \$40 million to rehabilitate the area, and it is vitally important not only for the future of the river and the environment but for future development within the Riverland region. The environmental benefits to the River Murray from rehabilitation of the Loxton irrigation area will be substantial. Linked to this rehabilitation is a \$30 million development by Century Almonds, an almond and vineyard development, which will also employ many Riverlanders. What we need to do in this State, because we receive the dregs of irrigation mismanagement from the entire Murray-Darling Basin, is to promote best practice in irrigation methods, and open channel is definitely yesterday's practice: in fact, it belongs to about 100 years ago. It is most important that this project be progressed to the stage where the funding arrangements for the scheme are negotiated and we can progress to getting works on the ground.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop):** As a member of the Public Works Committee, I add my weight to the motion, and contribute to what has already been said about the efficient use of water. We often hear it said that this State is the driest State in the driest continent on earth, and water certainly is the gold of the next century. It is rather amazing that it has taken so long to rehabilitate this scheme. As my colleague the member for Chaffey has just said, the scheme in Loxton is still languishing with open channel irrigation delivery of water.

One of the major advantages of this scheme is that the water will now be delivered to irrigators pressurised through a network of pipelines rather than through open channels, which not only were subject to evaporation and considerable

leakage but also encouraged irrigators merely to pour water over the ground rather than using modern technology and best practices.

In this House yesterday we debated at great length the wine and wine grape industry in South Australia—its importance and the fact that we are proud of it. I bring to the attention of the House that certain standards are set in the international wine trade regarding the level of sodium in wine. Basically, sodium is taken into the wine during the manufacturing process through the salt in the grapes, which comes from the water. The big problem, particularly along the Murray irrigation area within this State, is the build-up of salts because of the overuse of water. The water continually percolates through the soil profiles, the waste water eventually finding its way back into the river system: further downstream the process is repeated over and over until finally the water is pumped to the City of Adelaide for human consumption.

I recommend to the House that this scheme go ahead: it is long overdue, and the quicker it can be completed, the better. I also suggest, as my colleague has just mentioned, that the irrigation scheme in Loxton be looked at shortly.

Motion carried.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL**

**Mr LEWIS (Hammond):** I move:

That the sixty-sixth report of the committee on the Repatriation General Hospital redevelopment, Stage 1, be noted.

The Repatriation General Hospital at Daw Park was built during the Second World War for the Australian military forces. It was commissioned in 1943 (when I was just a little tacker) as an Australian military hospital under the control of the Commonwealth Department of Veterans Affairs, and it was transferred to the Repatriation Commission as the Repatriation General Hospital in 1946—I was a little bit bigger then. In March 1995, the hospital transferred its control and ownership to the South Australian Government.

The South Australian Health Commission proposes to undertake the first stage of a two stage redevelopment of the Repatriation General Hospital. The two stage approach has been adopted to enable the earliest overall completion date of the project, with minimal disruption to the hospital's services. The estimated total cost of the whole project is \$19.9 million, of which \$14.7 million is the estimated cost for Stage 1 works. The committee is advised that the Commonwealth Government has already contributed \$13 million towards Stage 1 as part of the hospital's transfer agreements. The anticipated completion date for Stage 1 is February 2000.

In summarising, I draw the attention of the House to the fact that the redevelopment will include preliminary works comprising all works essential to make the site available for the allied health facilities and rehabilitation wards, which also includes the relocation of the existing functions on that campus—that is, they will be shifted around within the area available. Then there is to be the construction of a new allied health unit, including physiotherapy, a gymnasium and a hydrotherapy pool; then the demolition of the vacant buildings and the construction of a new staff car park.

On Wednesday 28 January a delegation of the PWC conducted an inspection, and we examined all the areas to be involved in the new development. That inspection highlighted the inefficiency and the inappropriateness of some of the existing aged buildings and the facilities. It was particularly

evident with the inpatient physiotherapy unit, which illustrated for us the limitations and inefficiencies of the hydrotherapy pool. No self-respecting vet would use that room for the treatment of small animals and birds. It is so small; it is clearly a risk to the staff who have to use it; and it is grossly inadequate for the purpose to which it has been dedicated. It was never intended to be used for that purpose, but it is the best possible from the available resources of space.

Members learnt that on the site current medical practices, particularly in relation to patient management and the duration of hospital visits, have resulted in large portions of these buildings becoming redundant. That causes costly inefficiencies and in other instances overcrowding and a reduction in privacy. I am sure that you, Mr Speaker, would not like to have to discuss your medical conditions, if you had multiple treatable conditions, and the history of those conditions within earshot of 10 or a dozen other people, some of whom were undergoing the same undignified examination and assessment of their needs. Committee members were impressed with the dedication of the hospital staff and we recognise the importance and sentimental value of the hospital, particularly to war veterans.

The Public Works Committee notes that currently the hospital's patient accommodation consists of a number of single-storey wards, which were built in the late 1940s and early 1950s and most of which were in poor condition, being significantly under-utilised or vacant because they are nearing the end of their useful life, if indeed they have not already done so.

Additionally, the buildings are widely dispersed across the campus, expensive to maintain and do not meet current standards in any sense other than that they perhaps protect the people working in them from sunshine although, in certain instances, not even from rain. In addition, the committee acknowledges that the Health Commission is committed to the comprehensive redevelopment of the Repatriation General Hospital campus as a matter of high priority and in a manner that is designed to secure the long-term future of the hospital within the Adelaide metropolitan public hospital system.

Furthermore, members of the committee acknowledge that the Repatriation General Hospital has established its future role as a major provider of aged care and rehabilitation services to the southern region. We know that is of particular interest at least to the member for Mawson, a member of the committee.

The committee notes that that service will have a continuing significant role in the provision of acute and general hospital services to the veterans community in South Australia and increasingly to the wider community of that region. Moreover, the committee considers that the proposed works are necessary to ensure that the Repatriation General Hospital can continue its world-class research into aged care, whilst still providing the milieu which engenders high staff morale, thereby enhancing illness and trauma recovery rates in its patients as well as maintaining high levels of public confidence in its reputation for a high standard of service.

More importantly than that, the proposed project will benefit families living in southern Adelaide metropolitan area by significantly enhancing the coordination of patient care delivery, increasing the range and level of rehabilitation services, particularly hydrotherapy and the improving operational efficiencies elsewhere. As such the Public Works Committee endorses the proposal for Stage 1 of the RGH redevelopment and recommends the proposed public work.

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** I will speak briefly this morning on this report: I do not want to take up too much of private members' time. My colleague on the committee, the member for Reynell, and I give our full support to this project. There are a number of members on this side of the House whose constituents in the southern area will benefit directly: the member for Reynell, as I mentioned, the member for Kaurana, the member for Mitchell and the member for Elder. All those members on this side of the House are very pleased that this work will go ahead.

As the presiding officer mentioned, the Public Works Committee undertook a very comprehensive site visit. The need for this work is undeniable. I absolutely concur with the comments of the presiding officer in that regard. We give our full support to this redevelopment and we look forward to Daws Road Hospital being able to realise its particular role in aged care and rehabilitation—a role which is appropriate not just to the southern region, although it directly relates to that area, but one which will benefit all South Australians. We wholeheartedly support this report.

**Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson):** I am delighted also to support my colleagues in a bipartisan way in noting this Stage 1 redevelopment of the Repatriation General Hospital. I have spent a great deal of time at the Repatriation General Hospital, particularly when I was younger. In fact, I feel that I know that hospital like the back of my hand. What concerned me when we undertook the site inspection was that, having wandered around that hospital as a little kid for years when my father seemed to be in there forever and then returning in 1998, I saw the condition of the buildings—and this is not to be taken in the wrong context because they have tried to maintain the standards. Effectively, the general conditions, the layout and facilities of the hospital in many parts were no different from what they were 25 or 35 years ago. It is high time that further upgrades occurred to this magnificent hospital.

I commend the Chief Executive Officer as the leader of a very dedicated team, both medically and administratively, in the great work that they do for my electorate of Mawson, and indeed for the whole southern area and throughout the whole State. Every member would have constituents who served in the Second World War and Korea and, more recently, in Vietnam, who would access that hospital.

I am pleased to see that some forward planning has occurred because the needs and the demands of the patients of the hospital, both repatriation and general, are increasing. In fact, as far as repatriation patients are concerned, over the next 10 or 15 years the hospital will take on a bigger and busier role than it has in all its history, even including the time after the Second World War when it was obviously performing a lot of medical work as well as assisting the older First World War veterans.

I say to RSL members in my own electorate and to RSL members and other members who are associated with the war that they have nothing to fear by the current moves that are occurring; that is, the flexing arrangements between the usage of the repatriation hospital and also other hospitals such as the Flinders Medical Centre or, when it comes to post-acute care, returning to the Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital. The opportunities that are being made available as a result of the flexing arrangements that are now in place between the Repatriation General Hospital and other hospitals will provide better medical services for the people who certainly deserve them.

True, the hydrotherapy pools and the physiotherapy areas in particular are overcrowded. The staff do a great job and the results they achieve are fantastic, but it is time that those facilities were brought up to the standards to which we are accustomed in most other hospitals now in terms of that type of rehabilitation. This redevelopment will certainly allow that to happen. It will also allow the staff to become a lot more efficient because, as was pointed out by the Presiding Member of the Public Works Committee, it is a single-storey complex which is situated on about 30 acres, and staff are kept fairly busy getting from one corner of the hospital to another.

This revamp will allow for consolidation of some of those areas. It will also allow for another stage, which will be referred to later, in which the private sector may become involved. That is also exciting for the future. I look forward to this work proceeding quickly, because it is well overdue. There are many returned service persons who have been wanting to see this happen, and I know that it will bring a big smile to their faces and those of the staff and the medical fraternity who use the Repatriation Hospital.

Motion carried.

### EDUCATION POLICY

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms White:

That a select committee be established to consider and report on the following matters of importance to primary and secondary education in South Australia:

- (a) the financial and operational impacts on school and learning of the introduction of information technology to South Australian Government schools including the EDSAS and DECStech 2001 technology programs;
- (b) issues relating to the provision of education to country students and the disadvantages they face;
- (c) the effects of school closures on the provision of education to school communities;
- (d) the fall in retention rates to Year 12 and the related issues of the recognition of vocational education within the South Australian Certificate of Education and the transition of students from school to employment; and
- (e) any other related matter; and

that the minutes of proceedings and evidence to the 1996 Legislative Council Select Committee on Pre-school, Primary and Secondary Education in South Australia be requested for referral to the committee.

(Continued from 26 February. Page 544.)

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training):** I indicate my opposition to the formation of a select committee on education. I think the education community, and parents in particular, feel that this has been one long select committee, because over the past six years two committees have met on a total of 52 occasions. Thousands of pages of submissions were received during that period of time from more than 500 groups. Those previous select committees listened to hundreds of witnesses and took thousands of pages of evidence. It is interesting to note that neither committee completed its task.

I believe that the public would perceive this to be somewhat of an expensive and excessive waste of effort. The credibility of this process must be wearing very thin. The first of these select committees was established in the Lower House in 1992 and it continued until November 1993. The committee met 35 times and, again, reams of evidence and written submissions were received. The Chairs of that

committee were: the Hon. G.J. Crafter, the Hon. S.M. Lenehan, Mr Atkinson and, finally, Mr Quirke. That committee never reported.

The other select committee was established in the Upper House in 1996. This committee lasted until the election was called last year in 1997. That committee met 17 times, there were 55 witnesses and 339 submissions and, again, although the committee met over a period of two years it did not bring down a report. So, in the past six years, after 52 committee meetings, hundreds of witnesses and thousands of pages of evidence the public has not seen a result.

Let us look at some of the reasons outlined by the member for Taylor in support of her motion to set up a select committee, the first of which relates to 'the financial and operational impacts on school and learning of the introduction of information technology to South Australian Government schools, including the EDSAS and DECStech 2001 technology programs'. In its last year of government (1992-93), the Labor Government spent \$360 000 on information technology. When this Government committed itself to the DECStech 2001 project it allocated \$75 million over a period of five years. I repeat: \$75 million. So, \$360 000 pales into insignificance in relation to \$75 million for this project.

In addition, as I mentioned in the House only last week, I have further allocated \$10.6 million to a scheme called Computer Plus. That amount is broken down into two sections: \$5 million for indirect cash grants to schools as a one-off grant. Schools can spend that money however they wish. They might wish to buy laptops or computer software, or they might wish to put that money towards training teachers in computer literacy. They can use that cash in any way they wish. The structure of that cash grant was such, though, that it was intended to benefit those schools that had very high School Card numbers, so that the money was going to those schools that required it the most.

The funds were structured in such a way that there was a base grant of \$2 200 to every school, which would cover the cost of an administration or laptop computer to those schools. The next criteria was that \$15 be allocated for every full-time equivalent student. Finally, in terms of School Card, a grant of \$13 was made for every child who is on School Card. In other words, we are directing that funding towards those schools with the greatest need, so that those schools that have high School Card numbers would receive more money from this Computer Plus cash grant scheme than those schools with low School Card numbers.

As I move around the schools, as I do, the feedback from that particular scheme has been excellent. I met only last week with the southern region group of principals who commended the Government on that initiative and the flexibility that it gives them in terms of their being able to decide, at a local level, where they will spend that money. In addition to that \$5 million, an amount of \$5.6 million has been set aside as a grant for which schools can apply. This amount is intended to address the needs of upgrading administration computers, the installation of computer-specific furniture within schools, as well as teacher training and software.

I believe that that is a very extensive package; it is one that has been heartily welcomed by schools all over South Australia in terms of recognising the fact that, when DECStech 2001 was commenced, schools complained that there was not enough money available for teacher training, as well as a few add-ons, such as wiring, cabling and those

sorts of things. This allocation addresses that need in no uncertain terms. As you would know, Mr Speaker, our aim is to have one computer to every five children in public schools by the year 2001.

Yesterday, together with the member for Price, I attended the Ridley Grove Primary School and we opened a new administration block. A computer room has been established with 21 new computers, which the school purchased through this scheme. The school is extremely happy with this new addition. It is a magnificent facility and I commend all the staff of the Ridley Grove Primary School in terms of their planning and their foresight to integrate a number of technology sectors within that building. The building is wired so that, when they are able, they can form communication links between other buildings and the administration building. That school is looking ahead. It was an excellently presented school and the staff are to be commended for the way in which education is delivered in that school, particularly given the school's very high School Card numbers (approximately 70 per cent).

I believe that the Government is addressing the issue of information technology extremely well. The feedback I receive from the school community is very positive, and the issues raised by the Auditor-General in his report were addressed by my department to his satisfaction.

One area of criticism that has come from the community is the fact that local providers of computer equipment were not able to supply computers to schools under the DECStech 2001 project. Three main suppliers were chosen. All suppliers had a chance to put in a tender for this process. The three chosen were selected for reasons such as their ability to supply the large number of computers that were required and also their ability to supply a 24-hour service to any school in South Australia. When members consider the isolation of some of our schools and the fact that in some towns there are no small private providers of computer technology and software, they may well understand why the three firms chosen were allocated the tender.

As I have said, the allocation of this \$10.6 million, particularly the \$5 million cash that has now gone out to schools, can be spent by schools wherever they wish. If they want to go to one of the three suppliers they can; if they want to go to a local supplier of computers and computer software and technology, they can do so.

The second issue raised in the member for Taylor's motion relates to the provision of education to country students and the disadvantages that they face. As a country public school student in primary years, while I would not say that I was isolated, there were certainly areas where our city and large town counterparts had advantages over us in terms of the breadth of curriculum and the sorts of resources available to them.

We have done a great deal in terms of attempting to give country students the broadest possible curriculum that we can deliver to them. In addition, last year I announced an incentive for teachers to be attracted to the country in terms of removal costs, particularly with a view to attracting part-time and replacement teachers into the country, and also in terms of removal costs for those teachers who had been in the country since 1991. There were incentives involving leave to be granted to those teachers over a period to give them some incentive to stay in the country and also to acknowledge the excellent job they are doing.

The next issue is the effects of school closures. There is no doubt that any school closure affects any particular

community, be it in the city or in the country. However, the fact is that demographics change. We have to accept that, and we have to look at the infrastructure costs of running our schools. In many cases—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:**—schools which have amalgamated are able to offer a far broader curriculum and the outcome for students—and we are focusing on the education outcome—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** The member for Spence interjects and says that we focus on polling booth figures and on electorates. The member for Spence should go back over the past four years to see how many schools were closed in both Labor and Liberal electorates and tie that up—rather than being totally political—with the change in demographics in those areas. Be fair; look at the demographics in the areas to see if they have changed and also take into account the number of factors we have to consider in terms of closing schools and the isolation of schools in country areas.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** The final issue raised involved retention rates. It is of concern to us. Currently, a study is being undertaken nationwide in terms of retention rates for school leavers. It is interesting to note that South Australia has a very high level of part-time students in year 12; some 28 per cent of year 12 students are part-timers compared with Victoria at 2.7 per cent, New South Wales 3.7 per cent, Queensland 10 per cent and Western Australia 9 per cent. We do not yet have evidence to show this, but I believe that a number of young people when offered a job at, say, year 11 are taking that job because of the tightness of the market and at the same time continuing their studies on a part-time basis. As well, a large number of adult re-entry people are coming back into the year 12 system to upgrade their skills and to upgrade their ability to gain jobs in the workplace.

I believe that the Government is addressing all these issues raised by the member for Taylor and is addressing them on a very positive basis. I do not believe that anything will be further gained from appointing another select committee which will basically just drag over the same sort of information.

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** Here is a Minister who has gone 'native' in his portfolio already. He has no values of his own to bring to education in this State but merely speaks in the House with notes given to him by his bureaucrats. He has no values of his own to bring to the portfolio. He is just a blank sheet on which the department writes.

Education is the biggest item in the State budget. You would have thought that, being the biggest item in the State budget, it is a portfolio which should have priority for a select committee inquiry in this State—and we have had two goes at having a select committee inquiry, one in the Lower House and one in the Upper House. The only reason that those select committees did not report is that elections loomed up and ended the operation of those select committees.

As the Minister says, there is a wealth of representations from the public which can be used immediately by a new committee to get on with the job and do what the people who made those submissions expect, that is, report. Yet, although we are so far along the process of receiving a report from an education select committee, the Minister will not allow such a committee to be formed to complete its task. It is simply because this Minister could not be bothered hearing from the

public and the Parliament about education issues. All he wants to do is rule in accordance with the wishes of his bureaucrats. I must say that at least the previous Minister, the Hon. R.I. Lucas, brought some values to education policy in this State. Now we just have an economist in charge of the education system, and his only concern is reducing the cost to the budget of State education. State education is in serious decline in this State. Just look at my electorate—three schools closed—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** Can I have some protection from the Minister?

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member is receiving protection and will proceed with his speech.

**Mr ATKINSON:** Three State schools have closed in my electorate in the past 18 months: Findon, Croydon and Croydon Park Primary Schools. The member for Bright says, 'Hear, hear!' with approval, because he has been in the ministry that has been targeting Labor electorates for the purpose of closing schools. Let us look at my electorate. Three primary schools have closed, but the school which my children attend for religious reasons—St Josephs at Hindmarsh—has a building program. It has recently completed a major building program and enrolments are going up.

**An honourable member:** What's wrong with that?

**Mr ATKINSON:** What's wrong with that? A lot is wrong with that, because the Catholic school system is there for Catholics; it was never designed to take over the State education system. Who in previous generations over the past hundred years would have thought that a Government would come along which had a policy of transferring responsibility for the education of thousands of South Australian children from the State Government to the Catholic Church? Catholics of a previous generation who fought for 60 years for the very just cause of State aid to Catholic schools must be—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** Opposed by people such as the member for Ross Smith—

**Mr CLARKE:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker. The member for Spence has accused me of an absolute gross—

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order there. The honourable member has an opportunity through grievance debate or personal explanation if he has a problem. The honourable member for Spence.

**Mr ATKINSON:** The only reason there was State aid to Catholic schools is because of the Democratic Labor Party. Without them neither the Liberal Party nor the Labor Party would have granted State aid to Catholic schools, but because the Democratic Labor Party was in a brokering situation in the Senate it was able to chisel out State aid to Catholic schools.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** The member for Ross Smith refers to the gaining of State aid to Catholic schools as a form of political harlotry, but I think it was merely a matter of educational justice. But in my view the process of State aid to independent schools has now gone on to a ridiculous extent, to the point where the churches are taking over the education of the general public, taking over the education of non-Catholics, and the balance is right out now.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** What is wrong with it is that the Catholic parents who fought for 60 years in this century for State aid for Catholic schools could never have envisaged the colossal growth of the Catholic education system to the point

where it was taking over the education of non-Catholics. That is precisely what is happening at my children's school, St Joseph's at Hindmarsh. Local parents are sending their children there not because they want a Catholic education but because they think they will get a better education at St Joseph's at Hindmarsh than at local State schools. That is a tragedy.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** It is not really competition at all. Why are they transferring? One of the reasons they are transferring is the poor revenue base of the State compared to the revenue base of the Commonwealth. The Catholic school system has the inestimable good fortune to be funded by the Commonwealth, whose revenues are buoyant, whereas if you send your children to State schools they rely on State revenue, which is contracting and in trouble. That is one of the reasons why the State system is declining, and it is not the Labor Party's fault or the Liberals Party's fault or the Democrat's fault. It is just a fact of life.

The other reason why increasingly parents are sending their children to private schools is because they have no opportunity to make an objective comparison between the State system and the independent system. If they had some objective measure they would rely on something other than gossip; but parents gossiping over a Sunday lunch is what is leading to so many children being transferred out of the State system, on no logical basis.

The other thing is that parents are making a flight from the progressive and counter-cultural educational methods which are rampant in the State system, and that is something that a select committee ought to look at. It is what the previous select committee of the House of Assembly was looking at. In fact, when the Hon. Martyn Evans established that committee he said to me, 'Mick, I am establishing this committee to save a generation.' It is only a pity that that committee was not able to report, and now, alas, the Minister of Education, for pretty poor reasons, is not allowing that committee to resume its deliberations. The other reason why parents are transferring their children from the State system to the Catholic and independent system is because they are looking for an education system that educates children in accordance with a value system.

Many parents do not particularly care what that value system is, as long as there is a value system. We are seeing increasing numbers of non-Catholic families sending their children to Catholic schools, with adverse consequences not just for the State system but for the Catholic system itself, which is losing its Catholic distinguishing marks because it has to be inclusive of non-Catholic children. That is not a result that our ancestors intended, so we should stop and look at the education system and ask ourselves whether this is the result we intended. I suggest to the House that it is not the result that anyone intended. We are drifting; we need a select committee.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** I oppose the motion. It is disappointing that we are wasting time in the Parliament with these sorts of motions instead of looking at the positive aspects of what is happening with education in this State both public and private. I am surprised by the member for Spence's working against people who may have a chance eventually to grow into the Catholic church, by opposing people who are non-Catholic coming into Catholic education. Speaking as an Anglican and as a member of the board of trustees of the Woodcroft Anglican College in my electorate,

we are delighted to see non-Anglicans coming into the Woodcroft College to have an education with some Christian ethos. I want to say how proud I am of the public education system. We saw this sort of rubbish going on before the last election, where the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House (Hon. Carolyn Pickles) played these sorts of tricks. We then saw the Croydon Park Primary School debacle, and so on.

I would like to talk briefly about the Croydon Park Primary School debacle and what a set-up it was. I have not told the House previously, but when I came back from visiting the Governor with you, Sir, soon after we started the session in December after the 1997 election, one of the children in the Croydon Park Primary School group of protesters (who should have been in school getting an education instead of being taken all around the countryside protesting) said, 'Dad has just gone in there.' The only people who were walking in through that building were members of Parliament. That says to me that a member opposite had his or her children pulled out of school to be a protester. That highlights the debacle that the Croydon Park Primary School fiasco involved.

I want to talk about the positive aspects of education. They talk about financial and operational impacts on schools, learning and the introduction of IT. The Minister has supported this strongly already, but I remind members that there was virtually zilch done for IT development in education before we came to office in 1993. Over 11 years of Labor Government little was done. A few computers were in the administration area but, if you visited schools prior to 1993, the only computers were there through the efforts of diligent teaching staff and dedicated school councils who ran chook raffles and lamington drives to bring computers in themselves. Obviously, when you are coming into a new era of education with new facets of education, there is never enough money.

I remind members that currently we have \$85 million of public money going into IT alone and, on top of that, because Minister Buckby listens to what his colleagues say when they report on behalf of their public school communities, he has just injected another \$600 000 to allow flexible opportunities for each and every school, and some of the schools in my electorate got from \$14 000 up to \$54 000 to be able to put in landlines, new software programs and flex things up to allow for better IT. Those are the sorts of good initiatives that are going on in education. By and large, I have never seen education in better shape. We have good committed and dedicated teachers out there. The public education system is healthy. The biggest problem with the education system is the AEU, and we saw it with people such as Clare McCarty, who used teachers' hard-earned association fees to run a political platform and put trashy signs around the State prior to 1993.

Shame on her for taking those school teachers' association fees. We soon will see the same thing occur with Janet Giles. The good teachers are out there teaching our children, while the teachers who could not handle the system are in the AEU on Greenhill Road because they were never competent teachers anyway and probably just want a seat in this place. The competent teachers are committed to education and are out there working. We do not hear them carrying on like Janet Giles and Clare McCarty.

Contrary to what the member for Spence said, low fee private Christian schools have to battle against public schools for resources. In this respect I refer to Wirreanda High School in my electorate, of which I am very proud, because it is a

dynamic high school with a committed team. One need only look at the rooms of computer bases, the students' results and how they are progressing in university to understand that not only are they well educated by very committed and dedicated teachers but they are well resourced. I admit that they need more resources but, contrary to what the member for Spence said, if more and more families put their children into public schools it would be a bigger drain on resources and there would be fewer opportunities, higher school room classes, etc. It would work against the system we have at the moment.

On a per capita basis, we are putting more money into education now than ever before in the history of this State. It is something of which we should be very proud. Parents send children to private schools because they want to bring back family values and because they want to give their children a chance to learn Christian values. I know that because I have a lot of Christian schools in my electorate. When I talk to people they ask me, 'Why do you not bring back more Christian opportunities into public schools?' That is pretty difficult to do today because the religious instruction system broke down in the 1970s. In the early 1960s and 1970s when I went to school we had religious instruction every Tuesday—and most children attended these classes. This system then started to break down, and at the same time the family unit started to break down. Let us be serious about the main problem. That is one reason why some people have entered the private system. But the public system is healthy and it is alive. They are doing a good job there. The children coming through the system are doing well.

In conclusion, I suggest to those young people who do not want to go on to university that, if they get an opportunity to work at Mitsubishi or to learn cabinet making or whatever in year 11, they attend a TAFE course in parallel so that they can be assured of a good future. Young people should not miss the opportunity of capitalising on a job in the trades school area during years 11 and 12, because they can run their TAFE studies parallel to their employment. That is paramount. We need more people with trade skills. We need to be proud of young people who take up that opportunity, and we need to be proud of the public education system.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Administrative Services):** I did not intend to speak on this motion, but after hearing the member for Spence's remarks I felt it necessary to at least rebuke some of his diatribe. They would have to be some of the most ill-informed and bizarre remarks that we in this Chamber have ever heard.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** As much as the honourable member might think I am standing up for him, that is certainly not my intent. He is well and truly capable of doing that all by himself, and I look forward to seeing him do that.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** I will get to you in a minute. The member for Spence commenced his remarks by focusing on school closures in his electorate and then went from school closures—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Only a few minutes ago the member for Spence sought the protection of the Chair from members on my right. In the interests of fairness to both sides of the House, I now ask members on my left to be silent while the Minister speaks.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** The member for Spence went from advising the Chamber that the Government had closed three schools in his electorate to drawing the bizarre



conclusion that it was some sort of Government plot to force his constituents into Catholic schools within his electorate. I assure the member for Spence that the money from the sale of schools in his electorate is being well spent in other areas of education. I am pleased to share with the member for Spence the money that has been spent in my electorate, the money that has benefited constituents in your electorate, Mr Speaker, and money that has benefited constituents of the member for Mitchell; indeed, some of it is located within his electorate. In just the past five or six years, we have seen the expenditure of over \$3 million on the upgrade of Seaview Secondary School in the member for Mitchell's electorate. That is not in my electorate, but it directly benefits members of my electorate—

*Mr Hanna interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I caution the member for Mitchell.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** Over \$4 million was spent on the Hallett Cove R to 12 school, to take that school to year 12 level and to provide a performing arts facility, which is a fabulous facility and which will be opened shortly. At Brighton Secondary School—which was in my electorate until the last election but which is now in your electorate, Mr Speaker—over \$4 million has been spent, bringing that school up to an acceptable standard. At the Seacliff Primary School more than \$150 000 has been spent to bring that school up to a higher standard. If my memory serves me correctly, at the Hallett Cove East school some \$300 000 is being spent to provide new classrooms. Those are just some of the examples of moneys that have been spent to bring schools up to a better standard for Government education provision. That is hardly forcing people to send their children to schools run by other educational bodies.

Another point seems to have escaped the honourable member, even though he chooses to send his own children to a private school, for reasons he has stated. He has done so for religious reasons, and I accept and respect those reasons. Surely the member for Spence also accepts and respects that many of his constituents wish to have the freedom of choice to send their children to a religious school. It may be that they elect to send their children to a Catholic school or that they are not practising Roman Catholics but they still make that conscious choice, and the Catholic Church willingly accepts them into its schools.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** The honourable member interjects, 'Oh, yeah!' I don't know about the Catholic church bodies within his electorate, but certainly a number of fine Catholic schools operate either just inside my electorate or nearby; for example, St Martin de Porres at Sheidow Park; St Teresa's at Brighton; Marymount College, which is in the member for Mitchell's electorate and which also services my electorate; and Sacred Heart College, which is in the Speaker's electorate and which services my electorate. They are all fine schools that provide a high standard of education and educate many children who are not practising Catholics but who are benefiting from a religious education, as well as a fine academic education.

**Mr Atkinson:** That's assuming they still get a religious education.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** I thought the member for Spence indicated to the Chamber that his children went to a religious school for religious purposes. The schools I have mentioned certainly do insist on the teaching of the Christian doctrine and do so through their daily academic teachings and

instructing the students for whom they are responsible in the Christian doctrine and how that applies to their everyday life. That is a pretty important process in any school body. I applaud the Minister for Education's recent announcement that he is endeavouring to establish the Christian doctrine in primary schools with a further spread of school chaplains. That is, indeed, a move I personally welcome.

It was important to put those facts on the record to focus the member for Spence on what is before us, that is, the establishment of a select committee. I oppose the establishment of a select committee. I am sure that the honourable member has moved her motion with honourable intent in mind. However, it will serve to be nothing other than time wasting and unnecessary. The questions to which the honourable member desires answers can be quite easily answered if she seeks those answers from the responsible Minister, and I would encourage her to do so—to place questions on notice and question the Minister direct. In relation to a lot of the issues she raises, she also makes some bland statements that can also be answered appropriately by the Minister. I see no value in wasting parliamentary time and taxpayers' money in an unnecessary select committee that will finish up going around in the usual circles.

**Mr Atkinson:** At \$12.50 per meeting!

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** I assume that the honourable member is referring to the remuneration that is paid to a member of Parliament. The honourable member ought to be well aware that there is more to the cost of the committee than just the remuneration to the pocket of a member of Parliament. There is also the cost of the committee's proceedings, the printing of material and the running of the office to support that select committee. A lot of costs other than a simple \$12.50 are involved.

I encourage the member for Spence to go through the speech that he delivered in this Parliament and ask himself in all sincerity and honesty whether he really believes what he said and whether he was just endeavouring to stretch out the debating time on this motion.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** Like other members I did not intend to speak, but education is one of my great passions. I do not support the motion, because I do not think that a select committee will achieve a lot, but I do not suggest that the education system is operating as it should be and I think that we delude ourselves if we believe that everything is fine.

The question of values, which the member for Spence addressed, is an important one. People either have good values or bad values: there is no such thing as a person with no values. I support the idea that the State school system should explicitly promote the values that our community regards as important, for example, honesty, and I make no apology for that. In the last 20 years the system has slipped away from vigorously and explicitly promoting those values and that is one of the deficiencies in our system.

Over the last 20 years, under Governments of various political persuasions, there has been an inadequate allocation of resources to our State school system. That has happened throughout the country and many of our schools now require considerable expenditure in terms of making them appropriate learning places. I do not criticise the private school system, but we now have the irony of private schools getting new buildings, largely through Commonwealth funding, while the secondary and primary schools in the State system have tacky facilities. That is a paradox and an irony when one looks back to the system that was in place years ago where

there were struggling private schools, particularly Catholic schools—for example, those run by the Sisters of St Joseph. They were the schools on their knees but now the reverse is the case, and in many areas it is the State schools of Australia that need a considerable amount of resourcing devoted to them.

In the last 20 years the teachers union, which has moved away from being a teachers institute to a more militant, industrially focused union, has done a lot of damage to education in this State. I was a very active member of that union, and I am a great believer in teachers belonging to a union. In fact, I think that if people do not belong to a union they are silly. That is my view and I make no apology for that. We do not live in a world with an even playing field, and I used to be active in SAIT. Over time a bit of nonsense has crept in which has been reflected in the State school system in terms of phoney democracy, where principals and other people in leadership positions have both hands and both legs tied and are unable to drive their schools in the way that the parents want them to be driven. I strongly suggest to the Minister that, rather than continue as we are, school principals and school councils should be given some real teeth so they can make meaningful decisions and so that in greater numbers parents will bring their children back to the State school system.

In my electorate the State schools are excellent, and they have very dedicated teachers. I believe that school principals in particular are grossly underpaid for the responsibilities that they have. One of my high schools has 1 300 students and well over 100 staff, yet the school principal earns a little bit more than a press secretary to a Minister. That does not reflect very well on the priorities of our community. I should indicate that my brother is a principal of a special school. When I look at the hours and commitment that he puts in and the amount of financial reward, I believe it is really quite a sad reflection on our society.

Other aspects of our education system in particular that need to be addressed include statements and profiles, from which the UK is moving away. I do not think anyone ever really understood what that was about. Parents want to know where their child is at a particular point in time. We have got away from the harsh reality of telling someone, 'You are not up to speed', 'You have not passed', 'You have to repeat' or 'You need to do extra work.' We have gone into this fairy floss nonsense of trying to be ultra kind to people but actually doing them a disservice in the long run. We have had a nonsense of people who are intellectually retarded being told that they can do a SACE program in small business. That sort of nonsense does not help those people or the community.

What we have had within our Education Department for too long is a lot of fairy floss thinking which has actually worked to the disadvantage of our young people and the community. We have teachers still spending too much time on paperwork and involved in committees, without being able to get on with the job of teaching. That is what teachers are there for. They are there because they love children and want to assist learning. Instead of having experts being the curriculum designers and inventors, with the teachers tailoring that to the circumstances of their particular district or class, we have every teacher being a curriculum innovator, and they just cannot do it. The teachers are tired and exhausted, and it is beyond their capability to be good teachers, looking after classes which often include children with disabilities who are trying to be integrated as well as writing the curriculum for every subject in the school. It is just a

nonsense, and, as soon as the Education Department or DETE gets rid of that false approach, the better.

Those sorts of things can be done almost overnight. They can happen quickly. That is the responsibility of the Chief Executive Officer. The Minister does not control curriculum matters in this State. It is one of the few States where that is the case. Some of those changes in terms of giving principals some real authority, making school councils meaningful instead of being the charade they often are, and allowing teachers to get on and teach must be invoked. We must take away all the paperwork nonsense where teachers have to record the number of blowflies going up the wall at any particular time of day. That sort of nonsense ought to end.

We do not need a select committee. What we need is some tough decision making involving teachers and the schools, but we must move quickly to bring the State school back into the pre-eminent position that it held more than 20 years ago. And private schools must take into account that they are no longer independent schools. They are now dependent on the Government for money, and I believe that that is at great cost to them.

The member for Spence also highlighted the fact that we are seeing a watering down of religious aspects in the independent system because, in many schools, half the children are not from that particular denomination. With respect to the techniques used, lay teaching is dominating in the so-called independent Catholic school system. There will come a time when the Catholic school system will be almost a non-Catholic school system, when the independent school system is no longer an independent school system, and I believe we are on the brink of that right at this moment.

Members need to be careful when they talk about Christian values in schools. I am not decrying that, but we have to remember that, in a multicultural society, we now have Muslim people: we have a school set up to promote that faith. Also, when we promote division or different outlooks in our community, which is part of our heritage and right, we should be very careful that we do not promote them to a point where the cohesion of our society becomes threatened. I am not saying that everyone has to be the same, think the same or be taught the same. I am just issuing a caution that, with the development in the whole range of schools, including small fundamentalist schools and so on, if we are not careful, we will end up with a series of tribes rather than a State or a nation. I issue a caution in that regard.

To return to the main point, we do not need a select committee or people sitting around pontificating. What we need, with due respect to Dennis Ralph (and I have known Dennis for a long time), is for Dennis and the Minister and the people in Flinders Street to move quickly to restore the State system to an even higher level and to build on the good work that our teachers are doing. But let them get on with the job of teaching, and let us have an education system once again that is the leader not only in Australia, but in the world.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN** secured the adjournment of the debate.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

#### MEMBER'S REMARKS

**Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith):** I seek leave to make a brief personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr CLARKE:** During the most recent debate in this House this morning, the member for Spence accused me of being an opponent of State aid to Catholic schools. I reject that unreservedly—particularly given that, as my daughter is a student at a Catholic secondary school, it would be somewhat difficult for me to oppose it.

Also, the member for Spence said that I had accused the Catholic Church of harlotry in gaining State aid for Catholic schools, which also is not true and which is totally unsubstantiated. I did use the word 'harlot' with respect to members of the Democratic Labor Party and their particular principles, and I might say, with respect to members of the DLP, past and present, that I have despised them and continue to do so.

### FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (PUBLIC OPINION POLLS) AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 26 February. Page 548.)

Clause 2.

**Mr McEWEN:** I move:

Page 1, lines 15 and 16—Strike out all words in these lines and substitute:

(a) if it merely consists of factual or statistical material (including public opinion polling) that does not—

- (i) disclose information concerning any deliberation or decision of Cabinet; or
- (ii) relate directly to a contract or other commercial transaction that is still being negotiated; or;

From a fundamental philosophical viewpoint, I support the intent behind the original clause 2, but I believe that further protection needs to be put in place. The original clause 2 related to schedule A of the Freedom of Information act 1991, which sets out what documents are restricted documents. I understand the practice has been to add, as an addendum to Cabinet documents, information that has been gathered in public opinion polls and in so doing not allow access to that information under the Freedom of Information Act 1991.

Notwithstanding who is in power, I do not support that practice. If public dollars are used to gather information, that information should remain in the public domain. It is public information, it has been funded by taxpayers' money and it should then be the property of the taxpayer at large. If this clause relating to the restricted documents part of schedule 1 of the Freedom of Information Act is being used to refuse access to that information, we need to amend clause 2 to allow access thereto.

However, there should be some codicils on that. I respect the fact that there will be occasions when that information could be commercially sensitive, and to that end my amendment actually allows information gathered in this manner to remain attached to Cabinet documents for the duration of any commercial-in-confidence considerations. However, at the end of that time the information would then be accessible under freedom of information. It ought then be available to the public: the public has paid for it. If public dollars are to be spent in gathering information, that information ought not be protected.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** As the Minister responsible for the administration of this Act, I appreciate the endeavours by the member for Gordon to clarify the original Bill put forward by the member for Spence. Unfortunately, I obtained these amendments just a few minutes ago and therefore have not had the opportunity to establish their legal

veracity to ensure that they act in the way the member for Gordon intends. I understand that the member for Gordon is eager to have this deliberated today, so with that in mind I put to him that the Government is happy for that process to continue on the understanding that, between the time of debate today and the consideration of this Bill in another place, it will have that legal analysis of the amendment undertaken and will perhaps discuss the matter further with the member for Gordon, should any concern thereby arise.

So, at this time, while there appears to be a reasonableness associated with the wording put forward, the Government is not absolutely sure yet whether or not it will be supporting it in another place but is happy to allow the process to continue at this stage in the interest of moving forward the Bill which is before the House.

**Mr ATKINSON:** As the Minister says, not only is there a reasonableness associated with it but it is actually reasonable. In commenting on the old and new versions I should explain to the House that an exempt document is a Government document that is exempt from freedom of information. The section as it is currently in the Act provides:

A document is not an exempt document by virtue of this clause—

(a) if it merely consists of factual or statistical material that does not disclose information concerning any deliberation or decision of Cabinet.

The Opposition takes the view that that clause is probably strong enough by itself to allow the public access to opinion polls commissioned by the Government. We believe we would have obtained by ruling of the District Court the opinion polling on the water contract commissioned by the Government, but we did not proceed to the District Court to have the matter tested because a prominent South Australian from the Liberal Party was kind enough to supply us with those documents in any case and the court hearing was no longer necessary. Therefore, the matter was not tested. However, out of an abundance—

*The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** The Minister is familiar with the person. Out of an abundance of caution the Opposition decided to put the matter beyond doubt by amending the schedule to the Freedom of Information Act. After the amendment from the member for Gordon this provision in the schedule would now read:

A document is not an exempt document by virtue of this clause if it merely consists of factual or statistical material (including public opinion polling) that does not—

- (i) disclose information concerning any deliberation or decision of Cabinet; or—

and here are the words added by the member for Gordon—

- (ii) relate directly to a contract or other commercial transaction that is still being negotiated; or;

The Opposition is happy to accept that amendment. I am not sure whether it is an improvement to the legislation in that it makes information freer, because the qualification, 'relate directly to a contract or other commercial transaction that is still being negotiated', applies not merely to my amendment, which is about public opinion polling, but also applies to matter that 'merely consists of factual or statistical material'. So, it is a qualification, if you like, a hindrance to freedom of information, that was not previously in the provision.

When the Government thinks about this amendment it may embrace it enthusiastically and rush it through the Legislative Council. I do not know what will happen. In the interests of making it clear that public opinion polling should not be suppressed except for a very good reason, the Opposi-

tion is content to support the amendment and wishes its speedy passage today.

**Mrs MAYWALD:** I support the amendment also. I believe that the intent of this Bill is to be commended. The public has made it extremely clear that they want more openness, honesty and transparency in Government. It is not the intent of this amendment for freedom of information to enable access to confidential Cabinet documents or the deliberations of Cabinet. The intent of this amendment to the Bill is to ensure that public opinion polls will be available to the public and remain the property of the public, if commissioned by the Government. That is vitally important because public opinion polls are just that—public opinion polls. I fail to see that the opinion of the public should be a secret Cabinet document. In closing, I add my support to this Bill.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

New clause 3.

**Mr McEWEN:** I move:

Page 1, after line 19—Insert new clause as follows:  
Transitional provision

3. The principal Act as in force immediately before the commencement of this Act applies to a document that came into existence before that commencement as if this Act had not been enacted.

I compliment the member for Spence on his appreciation of the subtlety of the amendment to clause 2. The Government did not have the ability to appreciate such subtlety, and I would be bitterly disappointed if it found any reason to resist this amendment in any way in the other place. This transitional provision is to put in place some protection. It was not my wish under any circumstances to allow anyone in Opposition at any time to use this as an excuse for a fishing trip. This is designed to enable us to move forward, not backward, and to ensure that the legislation is put in place correctly. As the member for Spence has said, that situation may have already existed but it has never been tested in court. I believe that this new clause enhances that position.

In moving forward, I do not want to create an opportunity to move back. So, this transitional clause is simply to say that this is not to be used as a fishing trip in relation to past matters. I was not aware at the time, of course, that all the information required on the water contract was already in the hands of the Opposition, and I would not have liked members opposite to use this process to get that information. They already have it now, so it may not be of any use from that point of view, but if they believe something exists this will simply preclude them from looking backwards. We need to start looking forward.

**Mr ATKINSON:** Whilst we are sure there are many skeletons in the Government's cupboard, we have no wish to open that cupboard and search it. We merely wish to have a better and clearer law for the future so that we can discover future skeletons.

**Mr HANNA:** I wish to ask the member for Gordon a question about this amendment. It is all very well to say that we do not want to look backwards, that we want to look forward, but the issue of the privatisation of ETSA is looming in the future—it is on our doorstep. If public opinion polling has been conducted by the Government—or more likely at the Government's instigation—during the past couple of weeks (a not unrealistic hypothesis), would not this amendment prevent the Opposition or the member for Gordon obtaining that data? Perhaps that does not concur with the honourable member's intention.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I move:

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

We are happy that the Independents and the Opposition have cooperated so well on this Bill and that we now have a minor legislative monument for ourselves. We hope this is the beginning of a beautiful, long and productive friendship.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## HEALTH SERVICES

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** I move:

That this House condemns the Government for cuts to expenditure on health services and funding to hospitals during its previous term.

I have great pleasure in speaking to this motion today. I move it in response to the constant habit of the former Premier and the current Premier in their attempts to rewrite history in terms of their Government's role in the current crisis that faces our health system.

It is particularly pertinent today, of course, because it is today that the Premiers are debating the Medicare Agreement in an attempt to find some way of getting more money for the States from the Federal Government. Before I talk about the State Government's hypocrisy, I put it clearly on the record that Labor absolutely believes that the stand that State Ministers are currently taking against the Federal Government is the correct stand; that the current offer from the Federal Government to the States in the renegotiation of the Medicare Agreement is manifestly inadequate; and that if the Commonwealth persists with its position we will be in real trouble.

Of course, we all know that this is precisely what the Commonwealth Government wants because it has always made no bones about the fact that Medicare is not a priority for it. In fact, the current behaviour of the Federal Minister, the Prime Minister and the Treasurer certainly bears this out. However, what is of concern in this whole matter is the weakened and compromised position of our own State in going to the negotiating table. What has been and is happening since the last election is that this State Government, this State Minister, and now this Premier, are refusing to acknowledge their own part in the crisis that is affecting our State's health system.

How can you credibly go to a tough negotiating table when it is quite clear that your part has been quite the opposite to what you are putting forward and, of course, this is what is happening. Last Tuesday, Minister Brown put out a press release entitled 'Hospitals facing crisis from lack of Federal funds'. We should all think clearly and long about this. It is a blatant misrepresentation of the facts and a dishonest attempt to hoodwink the public. Of course, John Howard and Michael Wooldridge should be attacked for their disgracefully low offer. However, by our own representatives' (Dean Brown and John Olsen) complete refusal to acknowledge their own part in this they put our position at risk.

On a number of occasions the Federal Minister for Health has said, 'What is the point of our offering more money when, in fact, you people have been pulling money out of a State system?' Of course, that is exactly true. When you go to a negotiating table and refuse to tell the whole truth and to put the whole picture it enables the other person to take a free kick; and, of course, the Federal Minister and, no doubt, John

Howard have taken the opportunity of the free kick. Who stands to lose in this Mexican stand off? The answer is: health care in Australia and all Australians.

Let us be quite clear: health funding is a joint responsibility. It is a responsibility between State and Commonwealth. It is a two-way street. The health budget brought down in this House every year includes a Federal component which is almost half the total funds. Because it is a joint responsibility, both parties need to be committed to a high quality, accessible health system for all Australians, and both need to back up this commitment with adequate funding. Finger pointing, stand offs and insults at 20 paces do not do anyone any good.

So, I condemn the Howard Government for its blatant attempt to undermine and destroy Medicare, for its incompetence in allowing the further deterioration of private health insurance, but I also condemn the State Liberal Government for the cuts it has made in its time.

I would now like to spend time looking at that issue. What are the facts about the South Australian health system over the past four years? I invite members to take out their budget papers for the past four years and check this out, because they will find that what I am saying is correct. In the four State budgets from 1994-95 to 1997-98, there was a cumulative cut of \$234 million in real terms compared with the 1993-94 budget, which, of course, was State Labor's last budget.

At the same time, excluding the Daws Road transfer, Commonwealth specific purpose payments to South Australia increased by \$121 million in real terms compared with the 1993-94 budget. It is interesting to note that only the last of these Federal budgets was a Liberal Government budget, the rest being Labor budgets with a strong commitment to health care. The Minister was clever in his press release on Tuesday when he talked about hospital funding, as follows:

In this financial year we are putting in an extra \$77 million compared with 1993-94, compared with only \$13 million from the Commonwealth.

It was a particularly devious strategy by the Minister to misrepresent the facts. A careful analysis of budget papers over those years, and again I invite members to look at the facts, tells a different story.

Those papers and the figures show that, in the three preceding years, the three years before last year, during the previous term of this Liberal Government, State funding to both metropolitan and country hospitals decreased quite significantly, and this decrease was particularly so in country areas. The important point is that the overall decrease was quite significant. As I said before, I invite members to check out the figures. We must also consider the Commonwealth contribution to hospitals. If we look at the Commonwealth base grants and bonus payments to hospitals over the past four years, again we see that they have increased. Over the past three or four months since the last State election and particularly in the run-up to the negotiations on Medicare, we have seen a blatantly dishonest attempt by Dean Brown and John Olsen to misrepresent the true situation.

Yesterday in Parliament in answer to a question put to him in Question Time, I was interested to hear the Minister say:

We will start to see a significant number of mistakes made, patients being held up in corridors, particularly in emergency departments where there is an unpredictable load and an increased number of outpatients coming into the public hospital system.

Where has the Minister been for the past four years? For half of the past four years he was the Premier of this State and he sat in this House for Question Time after Question Time as questions came from this side of the House to the then

Minister for Health and to him, and most of the questions put to him he deflected and refused to answer. Where was he when we talked about those very things happening in the State hospital system, as a result of the ongoing cuts levied by his Government?

So, to sum up, health is too important to be a political football. What needs to happen is that both sides in the funding of health, that is, State and Federal Governments, must accept that adequate health care is an investment in the future of our country, and that adequate health care requires an adequate level of funding. If we do not pay now, we will pay more later. Both sides must accept that, and blatant politicking, finger pointing, grandstanding and blaming do nothing to solve this situation or move it forward. Health care in Australia faces a challenging time ahead. We completely agree with that, it is obvious; there is an increased demand, there is an ageing community, there are demands in terms of technology, there are demands and challenges in terms of the expectations of our people for health care. It is a challenging time, but it requires people to deal with that situation honestly; it requires both State and Federal Governments to acknowledge that they both have a responsibility and that they back up that responsibility with a commitment for adequate resources to enable the solutions to be found.

In closing, I condemn this Government for its approach to those negotiations, I condemn it for its dishonesty, and I condemn it because its dishonesty puts at risk our ability to get sufficient funds in this State to provide an adequate level of health care for all our people.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## CITIZENSHIP FEE

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I move:

That this House urge the Federal Government to waive the citizenship fee, as an act of goodwill, for people who have resided in Australia for 20 or more years in order that they may fully participate as Australians in the Centenary of Federation celebration in 2001.

I move this motion because it is very important that in the year 2001, which will be a milestone in our history, we celebrate the Centenary of Federation with as many participating and contributing Australians as possible. Many permanent residents in Australia are not Australian citizens. That is a real concern to me and it should be a real concern to members in general. In fact, I have been told by the Electoral Education Centre that there are about 750 000 Australia-wide who to all intents and purposes are Australian but who are not Australian citizens. To go into the Centenary of Federation with so many people who are part of the population of Australia but who are not citizens should be a major concern to us.

I believe that, as a sign of goodwill by the Federal Government, the citizenship application fee for those residents of 20 years standing or more should be waived. One might ask the question: why not make it for everyone? Strictly speaking, I believe that that should be the case, but in South Australia alone some 21 510 permanent residents have been here for over 20 years. If we took the whole lot, it would be 79 964 people. Members would be aware that at the moment the citizenship fee application is \$120. It is quite a considerable sum.

To give some history of the citizenship fee: members would be aware that it was the Australian Labor Party that introduced the current fee system, on 20 August 1986, at an initial cost of \$35.

**Mr Hanna:** That is reasonable.

**Mr SCALZI:** As my colleague the member opposite says, that is reasonable, and subsequently there were increases on 1 October 1991, and I believe the Labor Government was in power then, to \$50. In July 1994, it went to \$55; and in October 1996, under a Liberal Government, it went to \$80; and it is now \$120. We could go on to say which political party in power increased the fee at a greater rate, and so on, and we could say it was the Labor Party that introduced it in the first place and that it was free when the Liberal Party was in power, but I am not interested in those arguments. What I am interested in is getting as many people who are living in Australia as possible to fully participate in and contribute to the Centenary of Federation. That is my concern, because this really should be of a non-political nature. It is about being proud to be an Australian, and I believe that that should be the foremost consideration for everyone.

I have written to the Federal Minister suggesting that. On 22 January I wrote to the Hon. Philip Ruddock, the Minister responsible, making that suggestion. I have a reply. I will not read the whole letter, but it states, in part:

At \$120 the fee for an application for Australian citizenship is still significantly lower than citizenship fees charged by some other countries. Also, in recognition that the full application fee may be a significant barrier to acquisition of Australian citizenship for people who are permanently financially disadvantaged, there is a fee concession available for people who receive certain types of pensions.

I believe that is \$20. So there are provisions for people in financial hardship, and I thank the Federal Minister for that. I also thank him for his suggestion:

You may also be interested to know that the Government is establishing an Australian Citizenship Council which will undertake a comprehensive review of citizenship in Australia. The council will also advise the Government on how to promote increased community awareness of the significance of Australian citizenship, including how best to celebrate the 50th anniversary of Australian citizenship in 1999. All Australians will have the opportunity to contribute to the review. . .

Again, I think it is good that such a review will be established in order to get as many people to participate as possible.

With respect to the citizenship fee application, in New Zealand people pay \$260 to become a citizen. Perhaps that is why so many New Zealanders come to Australia. Certainly, the sum of \$260 is a considerable amount, so the Federal Minister is correct when he says that the fee, compared with other countries, is not exorbitant. In Canada it is \$100 for people under 18 and \$200 for people 18 years and over. Again, the Minister is correct but, despite what other countries charge, I believe we should waive the fee, especially for people who have been in Australia as permanent residents for 20 years or more. We must also remember that a significant number of permanent residents are also on the electoral roll. Indeed, members would be aware that prior to 1984, when people migrated from Great Britain, they could be put on the electoral roll.

They were able to vote but were not Australian citizens. We should also deal with that anomaly so that people can fully participate as Australians. That is what the motion is about. It is about getting as many people to fully participate as Australian citizens and contribute—

**Mr Atkinson:** To participate fully!

**Mr SCALZI:** The member for Spence continually grooms his thesaurus. I know what to get him for Christmas, because it must be nearly worn out. I thank him for the suggestion. Full participation is required of all permanent residents, and that is what the motion is about. Another important matter to bring to the attention of the House is, as I said, the concept of Australian citizenship being less than 50 years old. Prior to the Nationality and Citizenship Act 1948 (renamed the Australian Citizenship Act 1948), which came into effect in 1949, Australians were simply British subjects. Between that day and 31 December 1995, 2.8 million grants of citizenship had been made. Citizenship has been increasing over a long time and I am saying that, before the year 2001, we should have, if possible, the whole population becoming Australian citizens.

**Mr Atkinson:** Including tourists?

**Mr SCALZI:** Permanent residents. In 1991, 60 per cent of overseas-born residents were Australian citizens. People from non-English speaking countries were more likely than those from English speaking countries to become citizens. That is a misconception. For example, in the *Australian* of 27 January it states:

Iraqis first in queue to take up citizenship. Malaysians and Indonesians have displaced British migrants as the most reluctant to take out Australian citizenship, Immigration Minister, Philip Ruddock, said yesterday, as a proportion of applicants.

To fully understand that, I point out that people from Britain were not required to become naturalised in order to vote. That is an anomaly, and that is why the participation rate in citizenship is lower for people from Great Britain. If my motion is adopted by the Federal Government, it will deal with that anomaly and make it possible for those permanent residents to become citizens. So, the citizenship rate for people of non-English speaking background is quite high.

In conclusion, as we move toward celebrating the Centenary of Federation and 50 years of the Citizenship Act, I urge all members to support this motion. For me, it was a great privilege to become an Australian citizen. I was 21 years of age when I took the citizenship oath at Payneham council.

**An honourable member:** It's now a sacred site!

**Mr SCALZI:** I do not know about that but, whenever I attend citizenship ceremonies, I always remind those fellow migrants who are taking the oath that they can participate fully in this great democracy. There is no doubt that Australia is one of the greatest democracies in the world. There are not many other countries in the world where as a migrant one can take up citizenship and serve the community as a member of Parliament. One can serve in any office, including the Prime Minister, the Governor—

**Mr Atkinson:** You can't become the Queen!

**Mr SCALZI:** I have no intentions of becoming the Queen. I point out that in order to become President of the United States of America, which is acknowledged as being a great democracy, you must be born there. It is an anomaly that in such a great democracy as Australia we have so many permanent residents who are not naturalised and who do not fully participate and contribute. I am aware that there are members of local government who have been elected because they are ratepayers and not because they are Australian citizens.

We need to put in place as many incentives as possible to encourage people to become citizens. The simple gesture of waiving the \$120 application fee for people who have been residents for more than 20 years will aid that process. Many

people have failed to take up citizenship because either they have not got around to it or because it is too costly—not because they do not want to become a citizen. I have moved this motion to encourage people to take up Australian citizenship.

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

### ELECTORAL DISTRICTS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Atkinson:

That this House advise the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission that its policy for naming State Districts should give priority to city, town and district names ahead of the names of deceased South Australians.

(Continued from 11 December. Page 268.)

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out 'that its policy for' and insert 'to consider the option of'.

Leave out 'should give priority to city, town and district names ahead of the names of deceased South Australians' and insert 'after city, town or district names and deceased persons'.

Amendment carried.

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** It was my intention via the motion to advise the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission that the House did not approve of its longstanding policy of substituting for city, town and district names the names of deceased South Australians, which I refer to as abstract names, because those names do not relate to the electorates to which they are applied. It is my experience, as the member for Spence—

*The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** The member for Unley interjects about the electorate name 'Playford'. In fact, Playford now embraces the suburbs of Ingle Farm, Para Hills and Pooraka. What does that have to do with a Norton Summit orchardist? It beats me. Playford is a good illustration that the use of the names of deceased South Australians means nothing to the electors. In order to allow South Australians to imagine their electoral system, to make sense of what happens on election night, the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission should give priority to city, town and district names. When the electorates of Gordon or MacKillop come up on the tally room board on election night and people are watching the election coverage, no doubt they are confused. They do not know where that electorate is. Similarly with the electorate of Waite. It makes no sense on election night to hear that the Liberal Party is retaining Waite. It would be much better if Waite was referred to as Mitcham, then people would know what seat was at stake.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** The local government body of Mitcham is much greater than the District of Waite. However, when people think of Mitcham, they do not think of the Mitcham council, still less of Blackwood or Belair: what they think of is the suburb of Mitcham—Mitcham, Brownhill Creek, Belair Road and Lower Mitcham. That is what they think of, and that is what is in Waite. That is the core of Waite, and that is where the honourable member's electorate office is.

**The Hon. M.K. Brindal:** So, would you be the member for Bowden or Brompton?

**Mr ATKINSON:** No, I would be the member for Croydon and Woodville, and that would explain to people

who live in my area what my electorate comprises. In fact, my electorate comprises 17 suburbs.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** You make the choice which is most familiar and most central and which best explains the electorate. You do not solve the problem by referring to my electorate as Spence, a nineteenth century suffragette and novelist who had no relationship whatever with the area. When I go door knocking and I introduce myself as the member for Spence, it makes no sense to people. However, if I introduce myself as the member for the Croydon area, whatever suburb I am in, people know what I am the member for; it makes sense to them.

There is a real danger that the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission will abolish the four remaining sensible names—namely, Unley, Elizabeth, Adelaide and Norwood—and I hope this motion will forestall that. I do not think that the amended form is quite strong enough, but I hope that we can pull back some of the silly abstract names that have no relationship to the districts in question. I accept the Government's amendment and urge the House to support the motion as amended.

Motion as amended carried.

### WATERFRONT REFORM

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Clarke:

That the House condemns the Federal Liberal Government and the National Farmers Federation for their provocative approach to waterfront reforms in Australia, and in particular:

- (a) their support for current and past serving members of the Australian Defence Forces to participate in an ill-fated overseas strike breaking training exercise;
- (b) their support for the conspiracy entered into between Patrick Stevedores and the National Farmers Federation front company to establish a union busting stevedoring company at Webb Dock, Victoria;

and calls on the Federal Government and the National Farmers Federation to recognise that just and fairly negotiated settlements between management, unions and the workers involved can achieve more in terms of productivity and improved labour relations.

(Continued from 26 February. Page 559.)

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** I had a few minutes last week and I will get the same this week, but I was proceeding to strongly support this motion moved by the member for Ross Smith in relation to the National Farmers Federation and the trouble it is causing at Webb Dock in Melbourne. Last time I spoke about the contribution that the trade union movement has made to the community and in particular the contribution of the Waterside Workers Federation over a long time in taking action and making sacrifices—both its members and their families—on behalf of the whole community to win award conditions, wages and working conditions.

I referred to the enormous sacrifices that the waterside workers made and the terrible conditions that they had to work under on the wharves in the early days. They were very dangerous and dirty conditions and they worked long hours, being on call virtually 24 hours a day, not like doctors of the time who, although they were on call 24 hours a day, received lucrative remuneration compared with the waterside workers. They had to keep an ear on the radio at all times and sometimes they were summoned to work with their gang at all sorts of hours—even midnight on Sunday night. These trailblazers set the scene for what is an improved standard of living for everybody in our society, so they deserve much credit for that.

The Maritime Union of Australia is the target of the initial attack on unions because it is the toughest union to crack. If successful, the Federal Government and the National Farmers Federation will proceed to pick off all other unions in Australia one by one and the whole community will suffer. This danger must be recognised. Over the years there have been many moves to undermine the Maritime Union of Australia with all sorts of political infiltration methods, but fortunately those attempts have all failed, and I am sure that this latest effort will fail also.

The Webb Dock situation has been dishonest because, although it has been claimed that they are trying to protect farming produce for export, the strange thing is that Webb Dock handles virtually no primary industry cargo. It is a farce set up by the Federal Government and the National Farmers Federation.

Debate adjourned.

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

### MUTUAL RECOGNITION (SOUTH AUSTRALIA)(EXTENSION OF OPERATION) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

### ELECTRICITY CORPORATIONS (RESTRUCTURING AND DISPOSAL) BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

### EUROPEAN WASPS

A petition signed by 1 425 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the Government to provide ongoing funding for the eradication of the European wasp was presented by the Hon. R.B. Such.

Petition received.

### REGISTER OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

**The SPEAKER:** I lay on the table the statement of the Register of Members' Interests as at March 1998.

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

That the report be printed.

Motion carried.

### QUESTIONS

**The SPEAKER:** I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 45, 50, 52, 54, 58 and 67; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

### GLENTHORNE

In reply to **Mr HANNA (Mitchell)** 3 December 1997.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The Government has set out its development policies in its 1997 'Focus on Urban Development' document. The policies are framed with a view to protecting South Australia's unique natural environment, minimising urban sprawl, regenerating our city, preserving productive agricultural land,

promoting ecologically sustainable development and recognising the importance of open space in the metropolitan area.

The Government's Planning Strategy, released on the 30 January 1998, gives effect to these policies and provides a framework within which the Government considers regional open space issues and management of key sites such as the CSIRO land at Glenthorne.

The Glenthorne research station site is in Commonwealth ownership and is surplus to requirements. A number of broad options for the future use and management of the land are currently being considered by a steering committee established by the Federal Minister. The State Government is represented on the steering committee by two senior officers from Planning SA. The State Government regards the open space value of the land as a key factor in determining the future use of the site.

The Government, through Planning SA's Open Space Development Unit, is actively working with Councils in the metropolitan area to prepare open space strategy plans for individual council areas. These plans are prepared in consultation with the community and include an assessment of the quality, quantity, distribution and use of open space within the community. Every plan aims to ensure that an appropriate range of open space opportunities is provided to the community.

The Open Space Development Unit is also working with councils and communities across the metropolitan area to enhance the Metropolitan Open Space System. MOSS is a linked system of publicly and privately owned areas of regional open space character, including the hills face, riverine and linear parks.

The 'Laffer Triangle' site is bisected by the Sturt River which forms part of MOSS. This riverine part of the triangle has been designated as the Warriparinga Reserve and has been transferred free of charge by the Government to Marion council. This existing reserve adequately covers the area required for open space under MOSS.

The balance of the triangle site is in the ownership of the Land Management Corporation. The LMC is examining various options for the site and is negotiating with interested parties to attract appropriate development to the site, known as Science Park.

In assessing the future of Science Park, the LMC have had extensive negotiations with various interest groups and in particular the Kurna people to ensure that their sites are protected and that other environmental issues are taken into consideration. In a recent transfer of land to the Bankers Trust the LMC excluded a stand of trees from the transfer at the request of the Kurna people. This parcel has been set aside for preservation.

Other negotiations taking place are with the Patawalonga Catchment Authority on the potential to establish a wetland near the north west corner of the site in the vicinity of the Marion and Sturt Roads intersection.

With the existing Warriparinga Reserve and the potential for the establishment of a wetland area, Laffer's Triangle accommodates the needs for open space whilst also providing appropriate development opportunities.

### CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY TRAINING BOARD

In reply to **Ms KEY (Hanson)** 18 February.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:**

1. I assure the honourable member that the Construction Industry Training Board does apply appropriate management processes to the management of its risks.

The Board has been working in conjunction with the South Australian Auditor-General on this matter.

In this undertaking the Board has established a Risk Management Steering Committee. Draft risk profiles have been developed for each functional area of the Construction Industry Training Board and the Statement will be implemented by 1 July 1998. Once prepared, the honourable member may obtain a copy of the statement that will be available to the public.

Should the honourable member require further information on these matters Mr Doug Strain, Chief Executive of the Construction Industry Training Board would be pleased to discuss them with you.

2. Under the Construction Industry Training Fund Act 1993 members of the Construction Industry Training Board are appointed by the Governor on my nomination. My nomination is made after consultation with the employer and employee associations referred to in Schedules 1 and 2 of the Act. Specifically, the employee associations listed in Clause 1 of Schedule 3 of the Act include:

- Australian Building and Construction Workers Federation
- Australian Workers Union



- Construction Forestry Mining Energy Union
- Electrical Electronics Plumbing and Allied Workers Union—Plumbing Division
- Federation of Industrial Manufacturing and Engineering Employees—Building Construction and Joinery Branch—South Australian Sub Branch

The Act further states (under Clause 2 of Schedule 3 of the Act) that 'the Governor may, by regulation, amend Clause 1 by adding or deleting specified employee associations'.

With regard to representation on the Board by the Electrical Division of the Communications Electronics Plumbing and Allied Services Union I understand that there has been no formal request made to the Minister since I have been Minister or to any of my predecessors.

The recent independent review of the Act sought advice and input from a wide range of interested parties in the industry and I understand the Electrical Division of the Communications Electronics Plumbing and Allied Services Union was informed of and made public submission to this review.

Should the Electrical Division wish to pursue this matter further the situation can be addressed in a number of ways:

- Making formal representation to the Minister seeking to amend (by regulation) Clause 1 of Schedule 3 of the Act
- Making formal input to the Minister in relation to the tabling of the Review of the Construction Industry Training Fund Act 1993 by 30 April 1998.

### TRAIN SERVICES

In reply to **Mr ATKINSON (Spence)** 17 March.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Following the State Government's successful negotiations to secure the Australian Open Golf Challenge, TransAdelaide has been approached by tournament organiser (IMG) regarding the temporary closure of a section of the Grange rail line which runs through part of the Royal Adelaide Golf Course.

In its continuing negotiations with IMG, TransAdelaide has nominated that for a three week period only, the Grange Rail line be closed, leaving the last two stations (East Grange and Grange) to be serviced by a shuttle bus.

A report in The Advertiser newspaper on Thursday 12 March 1998, indicating that the rail line would be closed for six weeks is not correct.

The service changes under discussion for the Australian Open are no different to the support TransAdelaide has given to other major events, including the recent Fringe Festival, former Grand Prix's, annual Christmas Pageant.

On Friday 13 March 1998, TransAdelaide issued a Passenger Briefing to inform customers on the Grange line that negotiations were still being finalised.

Event organisers are requesting closure for two main reasons:

- Public Safety (a crowd of around 100 000 is expected)
- To cater for the large crowd, seating is to be erected in the vicinity of the rail line.

This is the first time in 26 years that Adelaide has hosted the Australian Open Golf Tournament. It was last staged at Kooyonga Golf Course in 1972.

Organisers suggest \$8 million in capital income may be generated in South Australia from the event.

The tournament will be staged by IMG from Monday 30 November until Sunday 6 December 1998.

### CURRICULUM STATEMENT

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** Today I am very pleased to advise the House that the Government is taking another major step to ensure our education and children's services are of world class standard. For years teachers and parents have requested clarity about what should be taught, to whom, how and when. It is vital that those most involved in education and care share the same language when talking about the progress of young people.

As a consequence of this, a major statewide consultation with all stakeholders will now be undertaken to develop 'Leading in Learning', a curriculum statement for children's services and public education in South Australia led by the Chief Executive, who is responsible under the Education Act for curriculum.

In September last year the Government launched *Foundations for the Future*—a document which sets out values, principles and strategic directions for public education. *Leading in Learning* will be the companion statement to this. It will provide the detail on learning in our schools and centres. It is critically important, as we move into the twenty-first century, that schools and our teachers are clear about what is required in terms of teaching and learning. It is also very important that parents, students, employers and the general community know what schools teach and do.

Getting the curriculum right for all learners is a huge challenge. It is one in which South Australia has provided leadership over many years. *Leading in Learning* would ensure that the leadership this State has shown and enjoyed will continue in future. When the Government developed *Foundations for the Future* it consulted widely. Many thousands were directly involved, and it is instructive for all of us to note that the community is clear about what it expects of schools, particularly in terms of fundamental values like trust, honesty, respect and excellence. The community is also very clear that it wants our schools and children's services to be guided by some fundamental principles, such as constantly focusing on quality and standards.

To ensure that *Leading in Learning* accurately reflects what the community wants schools and centres to do—to teach, assess and report—I am pleased to inform members that a broad consultation process will be undertaken similar to that used for *Foundations for the Future*. To assist with the consultation, a discussion paper will be sent to all stakeholders and be freely available from my department. It will also be placed on the department's website. The discussion paper has five sections to guide readers and assist them to respond. The emphasis in the discussion paper is helping people understand the basic structure of schooling and learning and the extensive range of supports and guidelines already available to teachers and students.

This Government has tackled head-on many of the fundamentals needed to make sure that the standards achieved by our students are the best possible. It has addressed and is continuing to address the basics of literacy and numeracy, and \$32 million this term has been allocated for early years strategy. It has provided record funding for computers and information technology services—\$85.6 million over five years. It has greatly increased resourcing for special education. It has established a network of special interest schools to give families greater choice, and *Leading in Learning* is another fundamental contribution by the Government to raising standards in our schools and centres. Our students deserve the best curriculum we can devise. I commend to all members the consultation process that will be used to develop *Leading in Learning*.

### QUESTION TIME

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling for questions, I advise the House that questions directed to the Premier will be taken by the Deputy Premier and questions directed to the—

**Mr Clarke:** You mean the State's in your hands? Let's nick off!

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Questions directed to the Minister for Youth and Minister for Employment will be taken by the Minister for Education and Children's Services and Training. I will notify the House as to who will take questions directed to the Minister for Primary Industries as soon as the Chair is informed.

### ADELAIDE AIRPORT

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Acting Premier give the House the details of the new multi-use integrated air terminal combining domestic and international facilities, retail facilities and including air bridges to be constructed at Adelaide Airport and scheduled to be announced in 10 days time, and will he confirm whether Adelaide Airport Limited, a consortium comprising Manchester Airport, Serco and Macquarie Bank, together with Hansen and Yunken, Hassell and BYVAN and a team of other consultants and investors, are the short-listed and successful bidders for the Adelaide and Parafield Airports?

The Opposition has been advised that a joint announcement regarding the construction of a new multi-use terminal and the new operators of the airport will be made during the next week or so by the Federal Government's John Fahey and the Premier. During my meeting with Manchester Airport executives a few weeks ago, we were told that Adelaide Airport Limited's vision for the airport included: expediting the optimum development and construction of a world-class multi-use integrated terminal; the development of Adelaide as an aircraft maintenance centre; and operating Adelaide Airport as a self-contained operation rather than as an add-on to Melbourne or Sydney.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** The Leader of the Opposition answered his question at the beginning: it will be at least eight to 10 days before any formal announcement is made.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** Yes. What is fantastic about this whole exercise is that, with the support of the Commonwealth Government, we have been able to work with the three major groups: the Macquarie Bank group, the BT Group, and the Commonwealth Bank. Those three consortia have made excellent contributions to the process. The major part of the process is to provide a total upgrade of the Adelaide terminal bringing together the international and national systems. This is a tremendous opportunity for us to have for the first time a totally integrated international airport in Adelaide.

This will also create a tremendous amount of opportunity for South Australia to stand alone in the market and promote not only our city but our State in general from a tourism perspective and to expand our export business. The increase in the length of the tarmac together with this upgrade will give us a fantastic opportunity to jump into the year 2000 and beyond. I wish I could announce the position today, but I have not been informed of that, and I am not prepared to speculate one way or another, as the Opposition quite often does.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I inform the House that any questions for the Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development will be taken by the Deputy Premier.

### STATE INVESTMENT

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** Will the Deputy Premier advise the House of the efforts the Government is making to assist South Australian industry and at the same time attract new investment to South Australia? The Opposition continues to claim that the Government is devoting too many resources to attracting new investment and that not enough help is being given to assist existing local industries.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** Clearly, the first question asked by the Opposition today related to part of our whole investment program. The Government is putting \$10 million into the development of the Adelaide Airport terminal and, together with the Federal Government, it has invested significant sums on the extension of the tarmac. We make no apology at all for our aggressive policy in terms of chasing investment in this State, unlike in the late 1950s, the 1960s, the 1970s and the 1980s when very little attempt was made by the previous Labor Government to chase investment. With globalisation and the expansion of our airport and our export business, clearly we need to—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I inform the television media and anyone taking photographs that only the speaker who is on his feet can be photographed and that they cannot take shots of other members or other activities taking place in the Chamber.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I state clearly that the Government's investment programs have brought into this State \$2 billion worth of new investment—mainly international investment. That is fantastic for our State. There has been the sale of the Moomba-Adelaide gas pipeline and Forwood Products, both of which involved international investment in our State. At the same time, we have also invested significantly in our own industry. In 1995-96 and 1996-97, 1 302 firms in this State (of which 1 284 were local businesses) or 98 per cent of all investment and investment attraction money went into small business in South Australia. We are committed to our State, we are committed to making it grow and, along with investment in airports and other infrastructure, we see a huge opportunity for our State for the year 2000 and beyond.

### MEDICARE

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services. Given that the Premiers' Conference starts today, and the fact that the Minister has stated, 'South Australian public hospitals are facing unsustainable pressures', what must South Australia achieve and what is the minimum increase in the Medicare funding needed from the Howard Government to restore quality health care for South Australians?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** As the State Ministers of Health have said on numerous occasions, we are concerned about the quality of health care over the next five years. That means that there must be an adequate base from which to start that health care funding with appropriate indexation to take account of population increase, further decline in private health insurance and the ageing of the population, in addition to changes in medical technology and community expectations.

The State Health Ministers have done some calculations on that, and they believe that the figure is about \$1.1 billion per year for each of the next five years. That amounts to \$5.5 billion over the five-year period. I can give some break

down on why we have come to that figure of \$1.1 billion. It was not plucked out of thin air: it was carefully worked through.

First, if you take the decline in private health insurance that has occurred since the beginning of this Medicare agreement—and, as I pointed out the other day, we get no reimbursement because of the way in which that Medicare agreement was, unfortunately, signed where there was no commitment on the Federal Government to reimburse for the decline in private health insurance—it is about 37 per cent, down to 31 000. So, about 80 000 extra people in South Australia have moved off private health insurance. If you take that figure across Australia and use the Commonwealth Government's own formula, we are looking at a figure of about \$620 million a year as compensation.

I stress that there is indexation in the new agreement, but the new indexation takes effect on the level of private health insurance on 1 July. It does not go back five years and provide compensation for that period. So, we will have to pick up the full cost of that slump in private health insurance not just for the past 4½ years or five years but also carry that on into the future.

The second area is that we are asking for a restoration of the cost-shifting penalties which were imposed by the Commonwealth Government and which was \$80 million a year. There has been no cost shifting in South Australia yet we are being penalised, along with the other States, for that.

The third area was the provision for past growth due to changing clinical conditions introduced as a result of both new technology and increasing community expectations. Community expectations is a very difficult area to define but, clearly, there has been a change in demand. It is partly covered because even people with private health insurance are now presenting themselves to public hospitals to take advantage of the fact that they do not have to pay three times—like they would if they were a private health patient.

As a private health patient, you pay the Medicare levy, your insurance premium and the gap, whereas a public patient pays the levy and that is all. Part of that community expectation figure allows for the fact that, quite clearly, additional people are coming on to the public health system even though they have private health insurance. That bottom figure is \$400 million. If you put those together, you get \$1.1 billion a year.

I stress the fact that there are several ways in which you can deliver that money. It is not all in terms of up front, immediately. Some of it can be delivered by altering the indexations that apply in the future, and we would support that. As State Ministers, we have made that point strongly to the Federal Minister, Michael Wooldridge. But, clearly, about \$5.5 billion over a five year period is the sort of money that the Health Minister has been expecting.

I assure the honourable member and other members of this House, because we are concerned about health care for Australians over the next five years. There is no point in our going into a Medicare agreement that fixes this up for the next 12 months and then three years down the track finding that our hospitals just do not have the money to cope with demand. Given the ageing of the population and increasing demand, which is up 7 per cent to 8 per cent this year compared with the same period last year, if that continues for the next five years, there is no point in having a hospital system that is literally falling apart at the seams and cannot cope with demand.

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

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I have said that an expectation of about \$1.1 billion per year is the figure that the State Health Ministers have been suggesting. That is a publicly known figure which we have talked about a great deal. So far, the Federal Government has offered us about \$2.2 billion to \$2.3 billion and some small additional amounts, which included \$120 million from guns, \$150 million for Veterans Affairs and about \$500 million for a national development fund.

**An honourable member:** Over what period?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** That will be over five years. The \$120 million is a one-off component for guns. Very importantly, we want to make sure that we get from the Premiers' Conference the same absolute commitment that the Health Ministers have been making over the past 15 months. My predecessor sitting alongside me here was one of the first Ministers to go in and ask for this additional money. I have maintained that stance very strongly and we certainly want to make sure that the Premiers hold together with the same vigour that the State Health Ministers have shown so that we get the best outcomes, because at the end of the day the Health Ministers do not want to be held negligent for a health system in Australia that just cannot stand up to the public demand.

#### STATE CAPITAL INVESTMENT

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** Will the Deputy Premier provide details of new private sector capital investment and outline the implications for employment and economic growth in South Australia?

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I thank the member for Fisher for his question. Clearly, business investment is the most important single index for the State, because along with business investment comes new jobs. New jobs and business investment are one and one. It is very important to note that private sector investment into our State now stands at the highest we have seen in the State's history. In the year to December 1997, new capital expenditure in the State rose by 29 per cent—a huge increase in capital expenditure into our State and the strongest growth among all the States of Australia. Spending on plant and equipment—which is directly related to jobs—was 42 per cent up on the previous year. Clearly, any gearing up in plant and equipment is all about new jobs; in essence, it is the only reason that you gear up for better plant and equipment.

It is also important to note that this is not a one-off result: this trend has been developing right through the past four or five years. There has been a sustained improvement in business investment in our State for the whole five years that we have been in government, the estimate being some 20 per cent higher over the previous financial year.

Business investment is about jobs; it is about attracting getting investment in South Australia and increasing jobs. I am always fascinated when the Opposition talks about jobs and investment not being linked. Clearly, some companies will be putting people on and others will be putting people off; that is standard procedure in any economy. If investment increases, that equation gradually edges up. That is what it is all about—making sure that we get investment, because without investment there are no jobs. This applies particularly in the small business area. As I mentioned yesterday, the Yellow Pages index on small business shows that confidence and investment gradually improved over the past year.

The South Australian Centre for Economic Studies and the *Bank SA Quarterly* both predicted a significant increase in confidence in small, medium and large business—and it is a significant increase over the past 12 months. Finally, this is clearly a significant difference from the last five years of the Labor Government, when all we had in South Australia was capital leaving the State and, along with it, the depressed conditions that we inherited back in 1993.

#### SOUTH-EAST DEVELOPMENT

**Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question to the Deputy Premier is appropriate, given his previous answer. Will the Government take up the challenge of the *Border Watch* newspaper to 'detail the actual areas in which Government has instigated new development in Mount Gambier and the South-East in your time in office'; and can the Deputy Premier inform the House of the details of any new development? The *Border Watch* published a 12 page feature titled 'South-East Crisis: Money Before People', which details dozens of articles dealing with negative action by the State Government in relation to the South-East. The feature quotes the member for MacKillop as saying, 'State Government has turned its back, said nothing was wrong and dictated the closure of one service after another'; and the member for Gordon as saying, 'It takes a champion of the cause to mobilise the community; maybe we need a march against economic rationalism—it is bloody crazy.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Ross Smith and the member for Elder! The Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I thank the Deputy Leader for her question. I happened to see the article this morning and it is fascinating that it was put out, particularly when only last Wednesday the previous Deputy Leader of the Opposition was swanning at the opening of the \$20 million investment by BRL Hardy at Padthaway in the South-East. This is a significant investment by a large South Australian and international company in the South-East, making sure that the South-East of South Australia remains a significant part of the wine industry in our State.

I understand on advice that \$13.8 million was invested by the Government in TAFE in Mount Gambier and I know for a fact that a significant amount, I think about \$5 million, is to be spent on a new police station in Mount Gambier. I know there is on the drawing boards a new development for the MFS-ambulance in Mount Gambier. I know that those things are to be undertaken and they have been brought forward—

*The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:**—as the Minister for Government Enterprises rightly points out—after 13 years of waiting under a Labor Government for nothing to happen in the South-East. I noted with interest the articles—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Hart and the member for Ross Smith!

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** I noted with interest the articles from the members for Gordon and MacKillop. The photographs were good and I am sure the stories are of interest but, behind all local members, there needs to be some substance to those articles and, if they have the substance and if they come to the Government as all members on this side of the House do, their arguments will be looked at properly. If there is a need for us to have a special look at the South-East, this Government will do it. Let us not forget one issue.

Why have all these cut-backs taken place? That is the question we have to ask ourselves. Why have they taken place? We need to remember, including members from the South-East and all members on this side—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I caution the member for Elder.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** Every member on this side of the House would be aware of the \$2 million a day interest we now pay. Every electorate in the State, including those electorates in the South-East, is experiencing cutbacks because of members opposite. That is the reason—because of the Labor Party. That is why these cutbacks have had to occur—not because anyone with good economic management would want to do it in the first instance but because Labor left this State in an absolute disaster. The member for Hart knows that too well, as he was part of the then Premier's advisory group. He was the one who was giving economic advice to the poor Leader of the then Government, who was in office for only one year. And now he is the potential Treasurer of this State—but not for a long time.

I note this as a good advertisement for the South-East. I respect good lobbying, and I would have thought it was a good lobbying exercise. If all members of this Parliament want to get the support of the Government, it would be much better if they sat down with Government Ministers, examined the issues and worked together to solve the problem.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Ross Smith will come to order.

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mawson will also come to order.

#### INDUSTRIAL SUPPLIES OFFICE

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** Will the Deputy Premier advise the House of assistance being provided to identify opportunities for companies to buy local products? In the economic discussion paper released by the Leader of the Opposition in January, it is claimed that the Industrial Supplies Office needs to be given more resources to carry out its work in this regard.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** How we work better with small business, particularly in regional areas, is an issue of major concern for our Government. In the Business Centre we have set up a Special Industrial Supplies Office, involving a new \$200 000 program, so that small business can better access the \$3.2 billion market of State and Federal Governments. It is absolutely critical that we in Government have an assistance program that enables small business to get through all the hierarchy, understand all the contractual positions and make sure that they are able to be very much part of our economy. It has been estimated that on an international basis \$30 billion a year is involved in Government contracts, and we need to ensure that small and medium size business are able to get into this area. Through our department we have also significantly increased a whole range of issues for small business, and that includes the new small business centres now located in five regions throughout the metropolitan area, with one in the country region. Small business charters have been set up through the Government and are now being considered at local government level.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Premier will resume his seat. I direct the person operating the third television camera on my right to stop filming anywhere other than the

member who is on his feet. The camera is still filming. I earlier warned the operators of television cameras about this matter. As the gentleman who operates camera in question was not present at the time, I will treat this as a further warning. Cameras will film only members who are speaking and not film other parts of the Chamber at the same time.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** The establishment of the Business Centre, and the business network client manager is an important program to set up contact points for small business in our Business Centre. We are interested in streamlining all the regulations so that we have the minimum effect on small business. Finally, and most importantly, our aim is to improve communication between Government and small business, particularly as it relates to the whole program of supply of Government services and contracts. The \$200 000 program involving the Industrial Supplies Office within the Business Centre will be one of the most positive things the Government can do for small business in South Australia.

#### ISLINGTON RAIL WORKSHOP

**Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith):** My question is directed to the Minister for Infrastructure. When was the Commonwealth study into the remediation of the Islington rail workshop site handed to the South Australian Land Management Corporation, and why has a copy of that study not been handed on to the Federal Government? The Opposition understands that the study was completed in October last year. The Federal Government says it is waiting to receive a copy of the study before it will deliver its \$5 million promise to clean up the contaminated Islington workshop site.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I am unclear about the exact detail of the question, but I am very happy to provide a considered answer to the member for Ross Smith. But that is not the issue: the issue is when will the remediation start. The honourable member—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** No, there are many issues before that, but probably the honourable member would be pleased to know that the Minister for Transport in another place and I had a meeting with senior representatives of ASR approximately two hours ago and we believe there are some very promising signs. If the Port Adelaide Enfield Council is able to identify some particular matters in relation to the remediation process, we believe it can start very soon, and that would obviously be a good result.

#### UNION MEMBERSHIP

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** Can the Minister for Government Enterprises update the House on the latest figures of union membership? I understand that union membership density has dropped from 53 to 35 per cent.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I thank the member for his question, which is an important issue. In fact, union membership has been on a downward spiral for some time in Australia. Having founded the Labor Party to be its political wing, the worm has well and truly turned, and the ALP has made the union movement into its training wing. The union movement frankly has abandoned the work force and, in turn, the workers are abandoning the union movement and the ALP in droves. In 1972, the union density was 53 per cent; in 1982, it was 50 per cent; and by 1995 this had dropped to 35 per cent, and of this figure only 27 per cent of private sector

workers were unionised. Unionisation in Australia is now at its lowest level since the 1930s.

I understand that the Labor Party, recognising the benefits of the financial contributions from unions, is actually attempting a recruitment drive to win back the hearts and minds of the true believers. The slogan, I am informed, is, 'For the price of a pizza, you can invest in the future of South Australia'. As we all know only too well in this House, every South Australian could eat their fill of pizza for the rest of their lives with the money which the present Labor Opposition wasted in the State Bank fiasco. Millions of average workers have become Liberal voters because, faced with a union movement that is happy to be the training ground—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** Well, it is interesting that the member for Ross Smith is making such a lot of noise about this, because he has suffered greatly, as this House knows only too well, at the hands of the factions and the ALP bosses on South Terrace. I have read a number of things here—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** No, I am not displaying, I am reading.

**Mr CONLON:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I refer to Standing Order 98 as to relevance. This is completely irrelevant to the subject matter at hand. It is nothing more than provocative.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair has been carefully listening to the answer. The question related to the drop in union numbers. The Minister did stray a little away from that subject when he got into the matter of increasing membership of the Liberal Party. I would now ask the Minister to relate his remarks to the question put to him.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I am more than happy to do that. At the risk of taking up the issue of the member opposite, I am far from being provocative: I am merely being factual. I am actually reading that the member for Ross Smith, Labor's hard man, warns, 'I won't forget.' We see that on a daily basis in this House. In fact, it was noted in the *Advertiser* this morning, because it seems as if the Labor Party has not learnt its lesson.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the member for Elder. Just be well aware of what that means.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** It would seem that the Labor Party has not learnt its lesson despite Labor's hard man warning it. We read in this morning's *Advertiser* that the shifting sands of unionism and the decreasing numbers are indeed leading—

**Mr Koutsantonis:** Not true.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** Not true? Well, let us just ask the member for Elizabeth about that, because she obviously thinks it is true. Let us ask Senator Chris Schacht and Senator Rosemary Crowley whether they think it is true when they do not get preselected, because that is what will happen. I know that only too well, because my sources in the Labor Party tell me regularly that that is what will happen. Factually it is true.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hart is now cautioned.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** As the Minister responsible for industrial affairs—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** As the Minister responsible for industrial affairs, I do not rejoice over the demise of unions, because in fact there are many—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** Members opposite laugh. They do this frequently about serious issues. Factually there are a number of industrial issues upon which unions could well constructively focus and which they could address regularly to promote the interests of workers, but they do not. What unions do is focus on the future parliamentary careers of union leaders. The present Deputy Premier and I at one stage a few years ago went to visit the particular union in an area in which I had an interest, and we were going to discuss a number of issues involving the future of the industry which that union was representing. In one hour of discussion, the only thing that this union wanted to address was whether a Liberal Government in fact would allow union membership to be deducted at source.

We were there to discuss the future jobs of unionists. The union leaders were very interested in jobs, but not of their union membership: their own. The only thing they were interested in was their own job, and that is why the union members are deserting the unions in droves. Union membership now is the lowest it has been since the 1930s. I think the Parliament is the poorer because of it. Instead of worrying about good government and good issues for South Australia, members opposite are worried about the shifting sands beneath their own feet.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The House started off pretty well today. Let us just keep it that way.

#### HILLCREST RETIREMENT VILLAGE

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** My question is directed to the Minister for Government Enterprises. Given the failure of the Government to rule out—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Stuart will come to order. The Chair wants to hear the question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are two members already warned, and some have been cautioned. The Chair's patience is running thin. The Chair expects to hear the questions being asked and also the answers given.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Given the failure of the Government to rule out increased water rates after 1 July, will the Minister join me in visiting residents of the Hillcrest Retirement Village to explain to them why their water bills may rise yet again? I have been contacted by elderly residents of the Hillcrest Retirement Village who are already concerned about last year's increase in water rates, which saw the charge for the first 125 000 kilolitres rise from 25 cents to 35 cents per kilolitre. This means that the village's water bill has risen by \$2 583 as a result of last year's increase alone.

**Mr Clarke:** Laugh your way out of this one.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I will. I will obtain for the honourable member a copy of the article written in the paper after we announced the decision on water rates for the ensuing 12 months. I look forward to her taking it out to all of her constituents on her own because it shows there will be a decrease.

*Members interjecting:*

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

#### WATER SUPPLY, BAROSSA VALLEY

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** Will the Minister for Government Enterprises advise the House of the benefits of the recent clean water for the Barossa Valley and South Australia's Mid North?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I thank the member for Schubert very much for his question about this particularly important issue that has nagged residents of the Barossa Valley for many years. Customers in the Barossa Valley have reported already, particularly to the member for Schubert, great improvements in water quality, brought about by the operation of the Swan Reach water treatment plant. The Swan Reach water treatment plant is located near the Murray River at the head of the Swan Reach-Stockwell pipeline and is about 12 kilometres from the town of Swan Reach. It filters water pumped through the pipeline, which then feeds it to the distribution areas of the Barossa Valley, the Mid North and Yorke Peninsula.

The quality of water produced by the water treatment plant is better than the latest National Health and Medical Research Council drinking water guidelines of 1996. The water is clear and colourless, to the same high standard as water supplied to elsewhere in South Australia. As of 13 March this year the plant is fully operational, having passed all performance tests, and it continues to supply filtered water into the system, meeting current demands. The benefits of clean water in the Barossa and Mid North region do not only accrue directly to the people living in those areas but clearly go a long way towards improving the region as a significant tourist destination in South Australia. I am advised that the indications are that the people living in the Barossa area are particularly delighted with the water quality.

**Mr Venning:** Rapt.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** The member for Schubert says that the Barossa people are rapt about the water quality they are now receiving. The filtration plant has, from all reports, exceeded the expectations in terms of water quality, and the Government will continue to strive for such high standards, as it has done in the Adelaide Hills, as the member for Heysen identifies, and in Strathalbyn, as the Minister for Human Services identifies. Those areas were the first to receive filtered water under the program that the Government brought in to see a world-class water industry in South Australia.

My recollection is that there are 100 000 extra consumers, who through this process will receive clean filtered water. They are the benefits that accrue to the people of South Australia because of the fact that the Government now has an internationally best practice focused water industry. I am pleased that people living in country regions like the Barossa, the Mid North, the Hills, Strathalbyn and so on have been provided with quality services of the same standard as those people living in and around metropolitan Adelaide. It is a direct result of the international best practice standards water industry that this Government developed.

#### SMOKE ALARMS

**Ms RANKINE (Wright):** Will the Minister for Human Services advise what assistance the Government is providing our elderly, disabled and financially disadvantaged in complying with the new regulations under the Development Act 1993? The Development Act now makes the installation of fire alarms compulsory in all existing homes within two

years. I have been contacted by a number of elderly residents and people with disabilities who are physically unable to undertake the tasks of installing and maintaining fire alarms in their homes. I have approached community service agencies within my electorate and, while they are able to assist in a limited way, no formal action plan or financial assistance has been put in place by the Government to assist those most at risk of house fires.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** It was a very good initiative of the Government before the election last year, following the rather tragic couple of years where so many elderly people in particular died as a result of house fires. It is now absolutely compulsory for all homes within two years to have smoke detectors. Up until now the law has been that any new house had to have hard-wired smoke detectors installed in appropriate locations. It was very important that that be extended as quickly as possible. We are implementing this with the Housing Trust making available special funds. The Housing Trust will make smoke detectors available in all of its homes as quickly as possible.

In terms of other people, particularly those who are disadvantaged, who have disabilities and so on, I will have to get a more detailed report. The Minister responsible is the Minister who oversees the Development Act. As Minister responsible for the Housing Trust I have covered that area, but I will check with the Minister whether any special schemes are available whereby those with special disabilities or disadvantages are able to get any financial assistance. The cost is not great—about \$18 to \$20 per smoke detector. If there is a cluster of bedrooms, normally one smoke detector will cover the entrance to all bedrooms. For the average home the cost is between \$20 and \$40. I will follow through on the question of whether some help can be given to those who cannot afford them.

#### ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** Will the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs advise the House of the most recent initiatives to help foster economic development in South Australia's Aboriginal communities?

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** This is a very important question because there is now general agreement that economic development holds the key to Aboriginal self-determination and greater self-esteem. Last week I attended a ministerial council of all State and Federal Ministers responsible for Aboriginal Affairs where the topic was specifically economic development. There were many tremendous presentations by successful Aboriginal business people and organisations which gave a very clear message that economic development that fosters skills and provides real employment and training opportunities is the best way to reduce the dependency we have seen over many years on the welfare system. This Government has certainly been innovative and pro-active in its employment creation and has demonstrated a very strong commitment to helping indigenous people establish enterprises and find work.

An economic development team has been set up within the State Department of Aboriginal Affairs, and that team is currently developing a comprehensive plan which, in itself, will form the platform from which a wide range of sound and economically viable Aboriginal enterprises will be focused and formed. This team will ensure that the Aboriginal people receive appropriate advice when contemplating a new enterprise or restructuring existing enterprises. South

Australia is already home to some excellent indigenous enterprises including Raukkan Farm, which is situated near Lake Alexandrina. The Aboriginal community that runs Raukkan Farm has moved into the beef export business which in itself is a challenge, and they must be complimented for that. The farm runs about 600 head of dairy cattle, 268 of which are milked by the community. Through its production methods, this farm supports a community of 120 Aboriginal people.

One of the new ventures that has been planned is the establishment of an art and craft gallery and a café to be run by the Salisbury Women's Group. Heritage tours near Port Lincoln will be operated by Kuju Enterprises, and an olive farm has been contemplated also at Raukkan as well as a South-East tourism trail. Aboriginal people in South Australia live in a wide range of urban, rural and remote localities often with access to a limited range of employment and enterprise development opportunities. This plan aims to turn around that situation by creating opportunities where none previously existed. The honourable member who asked the question has a great interest in this matter. He and I—and I am sure all members of this place—look forward to the outcome of these processes.

#### AUSTRALIAN FOOTBALL LEAGUE

**Mr WRIGHT (Lee):** Will the Minister for Recreation and Sport contact the AFL Commission and ask it to reconsider its decision on the melee rule which is putting at risk employment conditions of AFL footballers? Currently, 70 AFL footballers in South Australia are having their employment put at risk by the AFL Commission's enforcing the melee rule and not allowing players to support their team mates. They are trying to put velvet gloves on young South Australian athletes.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The best thing that Governments can do for football is to stay out of its administration. The answer is 'No'.

#### WORKSKILL FOUNDATION

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** Will the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training advise the House of the progress that is being made by the WorkSkill Foundation and also of any future initiatives to assist our young South Australian people?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** I wish to commend the WorkSkill Foundation. It is a particularly powerful force in promoting excellence of trades and skills and recognising the achievements of our young Australian workers. It is a national, independent, non-profit organisation substantially funded through both business and Government. There is a strong community commitment to the foundation, particularly in South Australia. The Adelaide regional organising committee is chaired by Mr John Marshall, the Managing Director of Marshall and Brougham. I pay tribute to his leadership, because it is as a result of that leadership that the foundation is continuing on a successful path and young workers are being given the chance to show their talents in their particular vocation at a national level.

The committee organises an annual vocational training exhibition. Over three days in 1997, 40 000 visitors (mainly students, teachers and their parents) attended this exhibition to look at what young South Australian workers are doing. Every two years, South Australia sends successful competi-

tors to the national competitions, and winners are selected from here to participate in the International Skill Olympics. Last year, our tally of gold medals at the national competition was four—an excellent result.

We readily acknowledge our sportsmen and sportswomen with intense national pride, and it is critically important that as a community we recognise these workskill achievements in a high profile way to reflect the importance of these winners to our future national wealth and prosperity. I commend the work of the WorkSkill Foundation.

#### PRINT MEDIA

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** Does the Deputy Premier agree with the Minister for Information Services who, when speaking on behalf of the Government at the launch of the electronic newspaper on Monday, said:

People I speak to all lament the changes to print media in South Australia and lament the fact that we are down to a local daily tabloid of declining quality.

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:** That question seems to be hypothetical, as we have *The Australian* and the *Financial Review* daily, the *Advertiser* and *Messenger News*. At times, those newspapers write good news about people, including me, but at other times they go the other way. I would have thought that the general media coverage in this town is reasonable and that if we believe it needs improvement we ought to consult the journalists concerned and ask them to lift their game.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT WEEK

**Mr CONDOUS (Colton):** Will the Minister for Local Government report on the success of Local Government Week, and what was the nature of the Government's involvement?

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** I thank the member for Colton for his question. All members of this House would be aware of his long and deep commitment to local government.

*Member interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** One of my colleagues says that it has been a distinguished commitment. I apologise for omitting that word. Local Government Week provides an excellent opportunity for people with a common interest in local government to meet and exchange views and experience.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** This week was no exception with some 350 members of local government in attendance. Unlike some members of the Opposition, this Government does not take local government or this question flippantly. The Government's commitment to Local Government Week was illustrated by the fact that the Premier opened the conference and attended the dinner. I was a speaker at the first session, as I acknowledge was the shadow spokesperson for the Opposition. The Minister for Environment and Heritage, the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training and the Deputy Premier were guest speakers at a reception on the first night. The Minister for Infrastructure spoke to the Institute of Municipal Management. I attended the dinner for women in municipal government on the first night, and I was very disappointed that no member of the Opposition attended that dinner—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** —or the breakfast on the Wednesday morning, or the luncheon for the Institute of Municipal Management on the Wednesday.

I commend to all members of this House—just in case the House rises early today—the local government expo currently being held in the South Parklands. Every member of Parliament should go there and look at the new innovations in play equipment for children. There is a lot worth seeing, and instead of chortling and thinking of the next smart remark that they could make, members opposite would apply themselves better to the business of good governance of this State by seeing some of the innovations that are being put in place by our industry and by our local government, by getting out there among the people and doing a bit of work. This Government—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will resume his seat. I remind members opposite that there is four minutes of Question Time remaining. The members for Hart, Elder and Ross Smith have all been warned. If I have cause again to refer to any of those members, I will take the appropriate action and I question whether it is worth that happening with only four minutes of Question Time left.

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** South Australia is the only State in South Australia to have established a joint State—local government partnership program which promotes Local Agenda 21, and the demonstrated success of the partnership is attracting growing attention from both interstate and overseas.

This Government is determined to create and to forge a new working relationship between all levels of government. This Government is not given to signing hollow memorandums of understanding, and making new resourcing agreements, shifting responsibility from State to local government. This Government is committed to a partnership with local government to promote regional economic development, to promote tourism and, above all, to strengthen our infrastructure and to create new jobs for all South Australians.

This week, the Premier, the Deputy Premier and all Ministers with major relevance in the area have addressed the conference and have shown that commitment from the Government. I am not surprised that members opposite hide their embarrassment by chortling and laughing. They had 21 years, virtually, to help; they had 21 years to assist local government, yet they mainly mucked it up. What they did was to give this Government an enormous rod to bear, because every time we say, 'We want a new, constructive relationship,' there is just about a yawn. They have heard it all before, and before it meant absolutely nothing.

This Government has a difficult job. It has to sit down, work with them and prove our *bone fides*, because a succession of Governments in the past have not managed to do it. A succession of Governments in the past have passed the buck, and passed it continually. If members opposite are proud of that, let them continue to laugh. I wish that people from local government were in the gallery to see how disdainful members opposite are of local government. This Government is not. Every member on this side of the House continually comes to me to say, 'This is what our local government needs.' All our members are trying to work with local government to achieve better governance in this State.

I know that a few members opposite have a genuine commitment and I am sorry that they are not supported by the rest of their Party. I know that the Independents and the National Party member have a great commitment to local



government in their areas and they are always seeking to make representations on their behalf. Rather than smart politics, the Australian Labor Party would do well to take a leaf out of the Independents' books, a leaf out of the Liberals' books and, indeed, a leaf out of a few in their own Party's books—like the member for Norwood—and stick up for local government instead of turning it into a joke.

## GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

**Ms WHITE (Taylor):** I rise, yet again, on an important issue of public health for the electors of Taylor and other areas. Members have heard me talk often in this House about the mosquito problem at Globe Derby and Bolivar.

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms WHITE:** Maybe members are getting a little tired of my talking about the mosquitoes in my electorate—

*Mr Hill interjecting:*

**Ms WHITE:** Wasps are important also. I point out to the member for Kaurna that they are moving slowly towards his electorate. These little insects can travel 50 kilometres, so they are moving outside my electorate. Today, I received a letter—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber. Members will either resume their seat or leave the Chamber.

**Ms WHITE:** I received a letter dated today which was from the Mosquito Research Unit of the University of South Australia and which was signed by Dr Michael Kokkinn, Senior Lecturer. In that letter, Dr Kokkinn raises an alert to what he describes as a potential epidemic that can arise from this mosquito problem within my electorate. It is an important issue. I note that the Minister for Human Services is in the Chamber at the moment and I urge that this matter be dealt with quickly and effectively.

**The Hon. Dean Brown:** I will make a ministerial statement—

**Ms WHITE:** The Minister has guaranteed to make a ministerial statement, and I thank him for that. The letter states:

Dear Trish,

I write to you regarding the serious problem caused by mosquitoes in the northern coastal suburbs of Adelaide and into the country beyond. I visited a site on Globe Derby Drive on Tuesday (17 March) and was distressed by what I found:

- mosquitoes attacking humans in thousands at all hours of the day
- horses being tormented by mosquitoes to the extent that they could not remain still and causing them to spend the entire night (and even day!) tossing and running about in their paddocks
- reports of drains teeming with mosquito wrigglers
- suggestions of numerous septic tanks providing mosquito habitat
- residents who feel betrayed by representatives and Government institutions refusing to take this problem seriously.

Having experienced the problem first hand and being someone who has conducted research on mosquitoes for the past 10 years, I wish to add my voice to those asking for some serious attempts to address this problem. Although veterinary consultants and epidemiologists see no immediate danger from disease, I believe that there is the potential in this area for an epidemic which could have serious consequences.

The fact is that relatively little is known about incubation and transmission of mosquito borne viruses such as Ross River virus and

Murray Valley encephalitis virus. And the fact that in the northern suburbs there is the mixture of humans, horses, dogs and poultry with an enormous mosquito population renders it as a likely focus for a viral epidemic. In addition, there are mosquito borne viruses in other parts of the world (Japanese encephalitis—Torres Strait, equine viruses in USA) which should be of concern to quarantine authorities because of the proximity of this massive mosquito population to Port Adelaide and Outer Harbor (mosquitoes may travel up to 50 kilometres from where hatch!).

I would propose that the resource be made available for an immediate assessment of the problem.

The good doctor talks further about what that investigation should entail and what steps should be taken. Because of time constraints I will not cite the entire letter but I reiterate the Mosquito Research Unit's call for this issue to be taken seriously and urgently addressed by this Government to avert what, in the words of Dr Kokkinn, could be an epidemic in Adelaide.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** I refer again to child care and, in particular, I will dispel further some of the misinformation that is being put out into the community about the costs of child care. It is causing considerable alarm amongst families right across the State; there is a perception that child care—and particularly formal child care in long day-care centres—is now beyond the reach of ordinary families. This is not the case, and the media and the public are being manipulated by a program coming forth from the community-based child-care centres and linked to the cut in subsidies to those centres alone.

By way of background, I point out that subsidies to long day-care centres were introduced by Labor Governments going back into the 1970s, with the good intention of helping long day-care centres to provide affordable care to families. The theory was that the subsidies would enable those centres to reduce their fees. In fact, this failed to eventuate and over a period of time the subsidies were consumed by a range of inefficient management practices in those community-based long day-care centres, to the extent that at present, and for the past several years, the costs of care for families using community-based child-care centres have been equal to or exceeded the costs of care in private child-care centres.

How can this be so? How can it be that a community based child-care centre, licensed for, say, 60 children, can receive, on top of the parents' fees, an additional \$60 000 or so in operational subsidies yet fail to deliver a child-care place to a family at a lower cost than can a private sector service across the road or down the street? How can this be? The private centre is frequently meeting all its commitments, providing a licensed, accredited service equal to or better than the community-based service while servicing its debt from borrowings used to establish the service and still making a small profit. How is it then that the community-based centres are failing to cope? This is the fundamental question that led the present Government to conclude that the best course was to remove operational subsidies, redistribute that funding and target it better towards low and middle income families through child-care assistance and in other ways. That approach has been and will continue to be borne out as an extremely logical and sensible targeting of taxpayer money.

It is completely wrong to create the impression that child-care fees have gone through the roof. I have done some homework on this, and I will cite some facts. I would encourage every member in the House to ring some child-care centres in his or her electorate and get the real facts. A child-care centre in Belair is charging \$160 a week or \$32 a day; in Colonel Light Gardens, \$170 a week or \$38 a day; in

Parkside, \$160 a week for full-time care or \$36 a day; in Glenelg, \$160 a week or \$33 a day; in Glandore, \$160 a week or \$35 a day; in Marion, \$170 a week or \$34 a day; and in Woodcroft, \$150 a week or \$33 a day. Where is all the information coming from that supports the case that child-care fees are \$200 a week and beyond the reach of families? It is simply not true.

Further to the point, the current argument about before and after school care is being misrepresented to the people. Minister Warwick Smith has decided to take away inefficient subsidies and to give that money to families through child-care assistance. It is the needy families that will benefit as a consequence of that decision; it is the right decision for families in need. The reality is that subsidies are simply soaked up by the administration of centres. It is very easy to run a business not for profit; anybody can do that.

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

**Mr HILL (Kaurna):** I refer to the proposed trade school that the Premier announced a week or so ago. When the Premier made the announcement, he said that South Australia needed a trade school, but he did not give much detail about it, nor where it would be located.

*Ms White interjecting:*

**Mr HILL:** Neither did he say how much it will cost, as the member for Taylor said. When I heard this announcement, I began a process of lobbying to have the trade school located in the southern suburbs. Wearing my hat as the shadow Minister for the south and also as the local member for the area, it seemed to me that, if we were to have a trade school, whatever it was going to look like, I would like to have it in my area, because I believe there are very good reasons why it should be there, which I will come to in a moment.

When the Premier made the announcement, he said that the school would be established because there was a lack of trade skills in the community and that a trade school would in some way fill that gap. That is a bad, a wrong, argument: I do not believe that a high school, no matter how it is constructed, will provide the sort of skills that industry needs—and I will get to that in a minute. Certainly, that is the job of TAFE.

However, there is a good argument for having a trade school—indeed, a series of trade schools—and certainly for vocational courses in existing secondary schools because, as we all know, there is an alarming drop-out rate in South Australia, especially among boys. I do not have the exact figures in front of me, but I believe that currently about 50 per cent of boys fail to complete year 12. It might be slightly over or under that figure, but roughly 50 per cent fail to complete year 12. No doubt there are a variety of reasons why boys—and, indeed, many girls—fail to complete year 12.

I suppose some of the reasons are to do with the reduction in resources, a lack of optimism about the future and a whole range of things, but one of the reasons is that current SACE courses—very good as they are—do not suit the needs of all students. There have been moves over the years to make SACE courses more flexible to allow those students to participate, but I do not think they suit the needs of all the kids. So, a trade school may well suit some kids. If it keeps those kids in the education system, even if it is in a trade school, that seems to me not a bad thing. An alternative pathway for some people is very important.

However, I would sound a note of caution. Today in the press Terry Woolley, President of the Secondary Principals Association, announced his opposition to the proposal. He makes the point that it is the very opposite of what the industrial sector has been telling schools it needs from school leavers, and I think that is probably true. He says that specific trade schools should be left to the higher education sector. He states:

This is not about a lack of students able to be trained in the trades—this is about not enough employers taking on apprenticeships, because there are simply not enough jobs.

I think those words are very wise. However, I disagree with his saying that a trade school should not be established. There is a good reason for doing this: it is to provide alternative pathways for kids and, if it makes more kids stay in school, that is to the good. I would argue strongly (I am glad that the Minister for Education is in the Chamber, and I am very pleased that the member for Mawson has also joined us) that, if a trade school is to be established, it should be located in the south. That is for many good reasons, the demography in the south in particular. There are very many young families and young people and a real lack of jobs—

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**Mr HILL:** The member for Mawson says he supports it. There is a relatively high drop-out rate in the south, so there is obviously a need for vocational education and employment opportunities for young people in the south. From that point of view, we can clearly demonstrate that the school should be constructed in the south.

Secondly, there is an opportunity in the south which would not cost the Government an enormous amount of money. The western side of the Christies Beach High School is being vacated at the moment as the two campuses are being combined on the eastern campus, so that existing high school site could be used. In addition to the space aspect, it is close to the local TAFE and local industry at Lonsdale, where there is very good cooperation between business and training institutions, and it is also on the rail link at Noarlunga. So, there is an ideal opportunity, at a relatively low cost, to locate the school on the Christies Beach site. I know that the school, local people and the member for Mawson are in favour of the proposition. I am in favour of it and I am lobbying others in the community to help them come to the same conclusion. I will continue to lobby the Minister on the issue.

Another reason for locating the school at Christies Beach is that it would be close to an existing school. Some cooperation between the two would be possible, ensuring that some of the problems that may occur with an exclusive trade school, where children might miss out on the more general educational opportunities, can be avoided. I know that is one of the concerns that the President of the Principals Association expressed.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** I am pleased to be able to support a good news story that has been brought to my notice recently. In September last year the secondary schools in the Southern Vales cluster came together with local industry and business to develop a regional plan for the implementation and management of vocational education and work placements for students within its region.

Getting schools and industry to work together to provide students with an opportunity to learn work skills while still at school sounded like an impossible dream five years ago. However, as teaching staff within our schools have for some time been developing a stronger working relationship with

industry and business, I believe that both sides have seen the need to work together to ensure that our young people are work ready prior to leaving school and that our schools are ensuring our students have available training that meets the needs of business and industry.

At the outset, I would like to acknowledge the work of the Southern Enterprise High School at Morphett Vale, its Principal, Mr Doug Moyle, and his school council who managed to obtain funding under Ready Set Go which has enabled the school to utilise the skills of a teacher, Mr Andrew Russell, to obtain ASTF funding and establish a partnership with local industry, business and the TAFE sector that will enable our senior students to acquire workplace knowledge and experience before they finish school. One of the keys to this successful partnership is the effectiveness of the management committee, all of whom share equal representation. The committee meets regularly, negotiating all aspects of the program and jointly setting future directions.

While schools and industry may seem to have different cultures, objectives and ways of doing things, their goal in the end is the same, and the challenge for all is to work on the strengths of both the school and the work sector with the end result being the best outcome for our kids. At the inaugural meeting of the Southern Vales Cluster ASTF Committee, Mr Greg Fitzpatrick, Chairman of the management committee, highlighted the value to both industry and schools to be able to share the planning and implementation of the program his committee was about to undertake and he said:

Local industries and businesses in the south will have a real chance to ensure that vocational courses offered in the local secondary schools are linked to the employment skill needs of local companies.

His comments were supported by the Principal of Christies Beach High School, Mr Ken Cock, who spoke of the determination of the local schools, both State and private, to help all their students access future employment and training pathways during their transition from school to work.

The Australian Student Trainee Foundation (ASTF) has made it possible for students in our schools who are undertaking vocational courses to gain industry recognised qualifications while completing their SACE certificates at the same time. This creates a win:win situation. By linking and learning from local industry our schools are giving students extra opportunities to be successful in seeking employment and further training.

The Southern Vales Cluster is now seven months down the track, and the management committee has forged a partnership built on commitment, quality and sustainability. Its project is known as Partnership 2000—Linking schools to industry. The committee has developed its own marketing package outlining the benefits to prospective employers who may wish to participate. It outlines the role business plays, the role of the school and most importantly the aims of the program for students. The committee's major task is to obtain further funding through the ASTF to cement this partnership with industry and ensure that workplace opportunities are there for all our students.

Before I conclude, it is important to acknowledge local companies and organisations on the workplace side of the partnership: SA Retail ITAB, the Southern Development Board, Mitsubishi Motors, Alfon Industries, A Class Metal Finishers, Noarlunga Health Services, Sola Optical, Sealy International, Onkaparinga TAFE, SA Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Small Retailers Association,

members of State and local government, DETE Catholic Education Office, the Independent Schools Board, Southern Screen Scene and Mrs Julie Greig, who represents the Premier, who is also a keen supporter of this program.

Partnership 2000 has many challenges ahead of it. However, I am sure that, under the strong leadership of Mr Greg Fitzpatrick and the commitment of Mr Andrew Russell, this committee will succeed and provide many opportunities for industry to know that work-ready young people will be available and for young people there will be the training, the skill recognition and the confidence to believe that employment opportunities can and do exist.

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** State and Federal Government cuts to the health budget have forced Northern Domiciliary Care to cut services by 50 per cent, so that the number (150) of clients who were cared for has now been reduced to 50. This is rather a catastrophe for families and the elderly, especially as South Australia has the highest national percentage of people over the age of 65. I would like to know what efforts the Minister is making to address this major problem and looming crisis in home care assistance for our citizens. I will read part of a letter from the daughter of a person in need, who states:

I am appalled at the notice my mother has received from Northern Domiciliary Care in informing her that her two-hourly once a fortnight help has been reduced to only once a month.

She continues:

My mother is aged 94 years, and about 14 months ago she suffered five fractured ribs and was assured that help was available and she could remain in her own home. I now read in the *Advertiser* newspaper (Friday 13 March) that domiciliary care services are available not only Monday to Friday but also in the evenings and at weekends as a result of special home and community funding.

She goes on to state:

If this is not so, why are such services advertised and why has my mother's help been so drastically reduced?

I now have a 94-year-old constituent who has had her home assistance of one visit a fortnight reduced to one visit a month. This is in line with the Northern Domiciliary's 50 per cent cuts to services that the organisation provides to its clients. I know the service is very distressed about this.

I received in my letterbox the Liberal member for Makin's (Trish Draper) newsletter in which she trumpeted that Northern Domiciliary Care had received a budget allocation for 1997-98 of \$25 855 000, an increase of \$1 855 000 or 8.6 per cent. However, when I telephoned Northern Domiciliary Care, they informed my office that this budget allocation was for the whole of the State, whereas the member for Makin ascribed it to Northern Domiciliary Care. They said that that was quite wrong, that that sum was for the whole of the State and that overall Northern Domiciliary Care would get something like only \$100 000 out of the State increase most of which would be spent on equipment. The budget allocation will not redress the reduction in service, and the spokesman said that Domiciliary Care were just not able to cope with the demand for its services.

My constituent's daughter is quite properly extremely angry and very worried about how her mother will cope with just one visit per month, especially as she had this accident. At 94 it takes a bit of time to recover. My constituent is mobile and wishes to remain in her home rather than move to an aged persons' complex. If she cannot get the home care of at least one visit per fortnight, which is valuable to her, I fear she will lose her independence and may be forced to

move into a home for the aged. I do not think this is the way our Government should be treating our senior citizens, because it is a most appalling situation. I cite the case of this 94-year-old not just because she is the only one in my area but because there are many others. This reduction in services is causing great distress to people in the community, to the aged and to their families, particularly where an aged couple is living together, with each trying to support the other and doing so most ably but requiring some support from Domiciliary Care.

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

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** I want to speak about the water scheme program this Government put in place to assist the people west of Ceduna. I am interested in the recent comments of the member for Giles about this matter. I came into this place in 1970, and between 1970 and 1993 I led deputation after deputation, from the district council and from residents and groups wanting to see action. Nothing happened. My talking to Labor Ministers was a most futile exercise, because they mouthed, word perfect, exactly what the then Engineering and Water Supply Department told them. They did not want to extend one pipeline around South Australia; they did not want to do anything. The Government would not give them any money, and they inflated the cost. In 1985, at the height of the drought, the now Premier visited Penong and those areas. He made a commitment that, on coming to Government, the Liberal Party would commence construction in its first term of office. That promise was repeated by the then member for Finnis as Leader. I actually wrote the policy, and it was carefully worded, stating that a Liberal Government would commence construction of a pipeline in its first term of office.

**An honourable member:** Where?

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** It would commence construction from Ceduna West. Upon coming to Government, at that very time, ATSIC was looking to extend the pipeline from Ceduna to Koonibba. It had a private pipeline which was inadequate and which very few other people could access. The council thought that that was not a very productive enterprise, and it was of the view that the Government of South Australia should join with ATSIC and put in a pipeline to serve the total community. That is a course of action with which I entirely agree. Discussions were held with SA Water but they were not very productive. The then Premier was then brought into the matter, and he supported that concept. Private costings were obtained, and his project officers were most helpful. Had it not been for them, the project would not have gone ahead, because the Premier of the day, the member for Finnis, had been involved in private construction in his own electorate. He was aware that people had been using the figures in a rubbery fashion—and I am being very charitable here. The sum of \$8 or \$9 million was involved.

**Mr Foley:** It wasn't my fault.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** No, it was not your fault. So, agreement was reached with ATSIC and the District Council of Ceduna, and the work commenced. The first agreement involved \$1 million but it became clear that that was not sufficient. The State Government agreed to put in \$2 million, and everyone agreed that that would be the total amount of money to be provided. The construction scheme was organised by the Water West of Ceduna Committee and by the district council and, through the good efforts of the Chief Executive Officer, a well organised and efficient person, work proceeded, commencing with a connection at Denial

Bay, where there was no water but where there was a successful oyster industry which required fresh water if they could export. At this stage, the water scheme had gone well past Bugs Hill—

*Ms Breuer interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** That is dead right, and your colleagues did nothing for 23 years and had no intention of doing anything. If it had been left to the Labor Party nothing would have been done. Under this Government, it will be dealt with, with no thanks to the honourable member.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The member speaking should address his remarks through the Chair, instead of addressing an opposition member as 'You'.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I accept the point of order.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** To the honourable member I say that this Government did more than the last Labor Government ever intended to do. I repeat: if it had been left to the Labor Party nothing would have happened.

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

---

## MOSQUITO CONTROL

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services):** I seek leave to make a brief ministerial statement. Leave granted.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The member for Taylor, during the grievance debate, raised the issue of mosquitoes at Globe Derby Park, and she raised the same issue yesterday as well. I appreciate that the residents in the Globe Derby area, as well as the Salisbury area, have a significant mosquito problem. There is a specific committee under public environmental health called the Torrens Island and Environmental Mosquito Control Program Committee which has met earlier this year. I approved—and I think this is the first time it has been done—aerial spraying of the whole of the mangrove area and Globe Derby Park area where the larvae exist, designed specifically to hit what was a substantial increase in the numbers of larvae in the area. I understand that that exercise was at least partially effective. However, mosquito numbers have built up once again. In this case, they are adult mosquitoes rather than the larvae.

On Friday last week, I asked this committee to meet as soon as possible. It met on Tuesday this week and decided to carry out a limited trial of spot-fogging in the Globe Derby area, specifically to attack the adult mosquitoes. Before that fogging could be carried out, it had to be approved by the Environment Protection Authority, and that approval is expected this afternoon. If that is the case, the fogging is expected to go ahead as quickly as possible, as I said, on a trial basis. There is still no proof that the fogging will work, but certainly they will be attacking the Globe Derby Park area, where the mosquitoes are causing enormous problems to the householders and to those involved with horse training, and so on, such as trotters at Globe Derby. There are also mosquitoes in the Salisbury council area and apparently in the Le Fevre area. However, that is the responsibility of local councils and all local householders. Where there is a mosquito problem, I would urge local householders to get in and look at areas of free-standing water where mosquitoes have

been breeding and take some action on it—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** In relation to the mangrove swamps where the problem is, the Government has already taken appropriate action terms of the larvae. However, it is not possible to go out and spray the adult mosquitoes in large numbers, because you will kill fish and birds. It is a very important fish breeding ground. The honourable member would appreciate that we cannot just generally spray for mosquitoes from the air across the whole of the mangrove area. However, we can conduct fogging in selected areas around Globe Derby. In designated council areas it is up to the council to carry out the appropriate treatment. I suggest the honourable member approach the council. I urge the member for Taylor to approach the Salisbury council to take action where there is a mosquito problem in that council area.

### SMOKE ALARMS

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services):** I seek leave to make another brief ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Earlier this afternoon the member for Wright raised an issue in relation to financial assistance for older people or people with disabilities so that they can install smoke alarms in their homes, which is now required under law. I am able to report that the Office of the Ageing has put aside \$100 000 to assist aged people and those with disabilities to install smoke alarms in homes. People can talk to their local assistance program people, the local council or the Disability Resource Centre to access this amount of \$100 000. As I said, the cost in most cases would be about \$20 or, where the two alarms need to be fitted, \$40.

Discussions are also taking place with a number of private organisations and service clubs to see whether there is a possibility of obtaining discount on smoke alarms or possible free installation of those smoke alarms. In particular, we understand that a number of the service clubs may be willing to help install the alarms free of charge. Therefore, I would urge any member who has older people or people with specific disabilities who cannot afford the alarms to make that approach and to get some form of assistance as quickly as possible.

### EVIDENCE (USE OF AUDIO AND AUDIO VISUAL LINKS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises):** 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 inserts a new Part into the *Evidence Act 1929* to allow South Australian Courts to take evidence or submissions by audio visual or audio link from people interstate and to allow Courts interstate to take evidence or submissions using the same means from people within South Australia.

The Bill implements an agreement by the Standing Committee of Attorneys General to enact provisions enabling evidence to be taken and submissions received by video link or telephone within Australia. The Standing Committee developed a model bill and this Bill reflects the provisions of the model bill

The Bill gives the South Australian Courts the ability to take evidence and submissions by audio visual or audio link from people

who are residing in a State or Territory with reciprocal legislation. Equally, the Bill enables the State and Territory Courts, which have reciprocal legislation, to receive evidence and submissions by audio visual or audio link from persons residing in South Australia. Under the Bill, evidence or submissions can be taken using the audio or audio visual links where it would be more convenient for evidence to be taken by this method or where the witness is unable to attend the hearing. However, if a party can satisfy the court that taking evidence or submissions by these means will be unfair to that party, the court must not make a direction.

A South Australian court taking evidence from a person in another State or Territory that has reciprocal legislation can administer an oath or affirmation in the participating state. A precondition to using the audio visual link is that the parties in either location are able to see and hear each other and the precondition for use of an audio link is that they are able to hear each other. Also, due to the reciprocal legislation, a nominated Court interstate will be able to enforce South Australian court orders as if they were orders of that court, interstate participants in the proceedings will have the same privileges, protection, and immunities as if they were appearing before the nominated court in that State or Territory, an officer of the nominated court will be able attend and assist in the proceedings and the rules relating to contempt of court will be applied.

In turn, the Bill permits courts to exercise their powers within South Australia, enforce the court orders as if they were orders of the South Australian Supreme Court, confer on participants the privileges, protection and immunity of participants to proceedings in the South Australian Supreme Court, permit the court to administer an oath or affirmation, allow an officer of a South Australian court to attend and assist in proceedings and provides for contempt of court.

The provisions of the Bill will operate in addition to Part 6B of the *Evidence Act 1929* which already makes some provisions for the obtaining of evidence from outside a court's territorial jurisdiction. The amendments are intended to be an alternative method of obtaining evidence and are not proposed to be a code.

The Standing Committee of Attorneys General is now developing legislation to provide for the taking of evidence by audio visual and audio link in other countries.

#### Explanation of Clauses

*Clause 1: Short title*

*Clause 2: Commencement*

These clauses are formal.

*Clause 3: Insertion of new Part*

It is proposed to insert the following new Part after Part 6B of the principal Act.

#### PART 6C—USE OF AUDIO AND AUDIO VISUAL LINKS DIVISION 1—PRELIMINARY

*59IA. Interpretation*

New section 59IA contains definitions of words and phrases used in new Part 6C.

*59IB. Transitional*

New Part 6C extends to proceedings whether the proceedings were commenced, or the cause of action arose, before or after the commencement of new Part 6C.

*59IC. Application of Part*

New Part 6C is in addition to, and does not derogate from, other provisions of the principal Act or of any other law authorising the taking of evidence, or the conduct of proceedings, outside of South Australia.

#### DIVISION 2—USE OF INTERSTATE AUDIO OR AUDIO VISUAL LINK IN PROCEEDINGS BEFORE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COURTS

*59ID. Application of this Division*

New Division 2 applies to any proceeding (including a criminal proceeding) before a South Australian court.

*59IE. State courts may take evidence and submissions from outside State*

A South Australian court may on application direct that evidence be taken or submissions made by audio, or audio visual, link from a participating State (*see new section 59IA for definition of participating State*).

The South Australian court may exercise in the participating State (in connection with taking evidence or receiving submissions by audio, or audio visual, link) any of its powers that the court is permitted, under the law of the participating State, to exercise in the participating State.

*59IF. Expenses*

A South Australian court may make orders in relation to expenses incurred in connection with taking evidence or making

submissions by audio, or audio visual, link or for providing the link.

*59IG. Counsel entitled to practise*

A person entitled to practise as a legal practitioner in a participating State is entitled to practise as a barrister, solicitor or both—

- in relation to the examination-in-chief, cross-examination or re-examination of a witness in the participating State whose evidence is being given by audio, or audio visual, link in a proceeding before a South Australian court; and
- in relation to the making of submissions by audio, or audio visual, link from the participating State in a proceeding before a South Australian court.

*DIVISION 3—USE OF INTERSTATE AUDIO OR AUDIO VISUAL LINK IN PROCEEDINGS IN PARTICIPATING STATES*

*59IH. Application of Division*

New Division 3 applies to any proceeding (including a criminal proceeding) before a recognised court (*see new section 59IA for definition of recognised court*).

*59II. Recognised courts may take evidence or receive submissions from persons in South Australia*

A recognised court may, for the purposes of a proceeding before it, take evidence or receive submissions by audio, or audio visual, link from a person in South Australia.

*59IJ. Powers of recognised courts*

The recognised court may, for the purposes of any such proceeding, exercise in South Australia any of its powers, except its powers—

- to punish for contempt; and
- to enforce or execute its judgments or process.

The laws of the participating State (including rules of court) that apply to the proceeding in that State also apply, by force of new section 59IJ(2), to the practice and procedure of the recognised court in taking evidence or receiving submissions, by audio, or audio visual, link from a person in South Australia.

For the purposes of the recognised court exercising its powers, the place in South Australia where evidence is given or submissions are made is taken to be part of the court.

*59IK. Orders made by recognised court*

New section 59IK sets out orders that the recognised court may make in the course of such a proceeding. These are in addition to the powers of the court set out in new section 59IJ.

*59IL. Enforcement of order*

An order of a recognised court under new Division 3 must be complied with.

*59IM. Privileges, protection and immunity of participants in proceedings in courts of participating States*

The privileges, protections, immunities, etc., extended to judges, legal practitioners and witnesses in relation to proceedings before a recognised court are the same as those extended to persons in relation to proceedings before the Supreme Court.

*59IN. Recognised court may administer oath in South Australia*

A recognised court may, for the purpose of obtaining in the proceeding by audio, or audio visual, link the testimony of a person in South Australia, administer an oath or affirmation in accordance with the practice and procedure of the recognised court. Evidence given by a person on oath or affirmation so administered is, for the purposes of the law of South Australia, testimony given in a judicial proceeding.

*59IO. Assistance to recognised court*

An officer of a South Australian court may, at the request of a recognised court provide the court with assistance of particular kinds.

*59IP. Contempt of recognised courts*

A person must not, in relation to proceedings in South Australia for the purpose of taking of evidence or the receiving of submissions by a recognised court by audio, or audio visual, link, engage in conduct that would, if the proceeding were before the Supreme Court, constitute an offence or a contempt of the Supreme Court. The penalty for a contravention of new section 59IP(1) is—

- if the conduct would have constituted an offence—the same penalty as if the offence had been committed in relation to proceedings before the Supreme Court; or

- if the conduct would have constituted a contempt—imprisonment for 3 months.

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

**PETROLEUM PRODUCTS REGULATION  
(LICENCE FEES AND SUBSIDIES) AMENDMENT  
BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 17 March. Page 610.)

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** I will speak briefly on this matter. I understand that the member for Gordon has a contribution to make. Our understanding of this piece of legislation is that it primarily addresses issues relating to the High Court case at a national level in respect of the Ha and Lim case which regrettably saw the powers of the State to raise certain revenues taken away from us. The Commonwealth Government has been required to step in and make collection arrangements with respect to tobacco, alcohol and petroleum products. In doing so, the Commonwealth Government, in consultation with the States and various Treasury and taxation offices, put in place a collection regime at national level that was designed for the Commonwealth to take in approximately that amount of revenue that the States were collecting, and then redistribute it to the States.

In respect of petroleum products, there is within that a further set of complications where further rebating needs to occur. As we know in South Australia, unlike some other States, we have a zonal system which allows for a cheaper price at the bowser for consumers in the country. As members may be aware, we have three zones in South Australia: zone 1, which is the Adelaide metropolitan area; zone 2, which is a radius of 50 to 100 kilometres; and zone 3, which is that area outside the 100 kilometre radius of the City of Adelaide. The further one travels from Adelaide, the licence fee that had been charged by the State, which is now a surcharge by the Commonwealth, in some cases (and particularly with respect to unleaded petrol) was in excess of five cents a litre less than it was in metropolitan Adelaide.

Under this Bill, that fee will be reimbursed. Whilst the Commonwealth will be collecting at a uniform rate of 8.1 cents per litre, reimbursements will be made to the wholesalers, petrol companies and distributors involved, to ensure the discount is passed on to the consumer. The principle of the Commonwealth's stepping into this taxation arrangement was to ensure that, first, the revenue base was maintained and, secondly, that the consumer, wherever possible, would pay no more.

I am not sure when the differential price was introduced into South Australia. I should know because I suspect it was under a Labor Government. I know that many members who represent rural areas are forever pointing out what they perceive as unfair advantage when it comes to the cost of service delivery and the cost to the consumer of certain services in metropolitan Adelaide versus the imposts on country South Australia. This is another example of policy by Governments, both Liberal and Labor, to ensure that, given the large distances involved in our State, there are some cross-subsidies involved to ensure that users of petroleum products in country and regional South Australia have some of those costs defrayed through direct cross subsidy, as we see in electricity, water and many other Government services.

I simply make that point by way of illustration. I can understand the views of country people who think that

Government services are centred in Adelaide, which obviously they are in a geographical sense in this State, and therefore people living in the metropolitan area receive an advantage over country users. When you go through the various cross-subsidies and the ways that Governments of either persuasion address that issue, you find that in many cases Governments have been very mindful of the need to cross-subsidise service delivery in the country.

I remind the Independent members and the National Party member that, as we sell electricity and outsource water, the ability for Governments to cross-subsidise becomes even harder. I know that the member for Gordon is a staunch supporter of the public ownership of assets—his views on the forests in the South-East are well known, and I can only assume that he will have the same view on a stobie pole as he would on a tree as to whether that should be under private or public ownership. If for some reason these assets were ever sold, the ability for Governments to cross-subsidise becomes just that little bit harder.

I throw that one in simply because the member for Gordon is a member who, like the member for Chaffey and even the member for McKillop, is not intimidated. I may have to reconsider my views on the member for McKillop, because he is starting to show some extraordinary, fierce independence of this Government, and that is good to see. It is good for democracy and the State but, most importantly, it is good for the constituents within their electorates that they are taking such an independent stance on critical issues.

The major component of the Bill is to address this issue. The cross-subsidy or the subsidy involved will see approximately \$4 million returned to the fuel distributors and oil companies involved. I understand that the member for Gordon wishes to raise an issue concerning the bureaucracy and the way in which the rebate works, and I am happy to listen to those arguments, as no doubt will the Government. Bearing in mind there may be some issues there, we support the principle. The reality is we have no choice. If we wish to keep getting the money from Mr Costello, we will have to abide by this. It is worth noting that we are going through a moment of great angst in terms of Commonwealth-State financial relations. I am not going through much because I am not fortunate enough to be in Canberra. That is being handled by the Premier and Treasurer. We will see how poorly they perform over there in the next 48 hours.

At the end of the day, we do have a fundamental problem when it comes to the issue of the High Court knocking out the excise on cigarettes and knocking out the taxes, and the fact that we have some hundreds of millions of dollars that was our own source revenue now being collected by the Commonwealth. Whenever you are at the mercy of money coming back from the Commonwealth, whether you are a Labor or Liberal Treasurer, that would have to cause some concern.

I note with interest an article in the *Financial Review* in respect of a proposal to be tabled tomorrow by the New South Wales Treasurer (Hon. Michael Egan) on the issue of Commonwealth-State relations. I would urge members to read that article in the *Financial Review*, especially those members who have an interest in Commonwealth-State financial relations, because Michael Egan is flagging the issue of the States receiving a fixed share of Commonwealth revenue. The reality is that we will have to head down that path at some point. Effectively we are there now. I make the point again that, in whatever relationship is entered into, the relationship of the States becoming ever more dependent

upon the good grace of the Treasurer of the day in Canberra does not fill me with great comfort, I must say, because Canberra will always want to give us less rather than more.

I am transgressing. The other element is that the State Taxation Commissioner no longer has the role that he or she once had, and there are changes throughout the legislation to remove the *ad valorem* reference. For those who are not students of Latin, that means 'to value'. Many members are ignorant when it comes to Latin, and I am happy to display some of my talents. The *ad valorem* part of the Bill is being repealed. Effectively the powers of the State Taxation Commissioner are being taken out of the legislation. A role will be there, particularly at present when a rebate system is in place, but all in all it is a necessary piece of legislation. My conditional support is given, unless I hear an overwhelming, compelling case from my learned colleague the member for Gordon as to why we would want to further amend the Bill.

**Mr McEWEN (Gordon):** Compelling and overwhelming it will be, I assure the member for Hart. I also assure the House that I will not waffle on for the sake of it—it will not be my practice to run down the clock but to get on with the business of the day.

*Mr Meier interjecting:*

**Mr McEWEN:** I thank the Whip. I know that we have caused him some grief over previous weeks, but life will not get any easier for him. On the surface there may be a difficulty with the Bill. I am not sure whether we are collecting a licence fee, subsidy, levy or a rebate. That does not matter much—I understand the intent of the Bill. It is the point of collection of the revenue where some difficulties have been outlined to me. I am advised that in Victoria the revenue, whatever it is, will be collected by some four or five wholesalers. I am advised that in South Australia it has been pushed down the line one level to the distributors, of which there could be between 200 and 500 in this State.

This advice was provided to me at the eleventh hour by a distributor in South Australia. He tells me that, although between 200 and 500 distributors in South Australia will be the focus for collecting the moneys, a number of them do not even have the administrative systems in place to do that. They further advise me that the South Australian Tax Office is not prepared or resourced to manage an audit of the collection of the fee at that level. Not having any difficulty with the overall intent of the Bill, at this stage I simply allude to the fact that there may be problems in the mechanisms put in place in South Australia that are different from the mechanisms put in place in Victoria by which the revenue will be collected. In Committee I will explore that further.

I am not sure where in the Bill I explore that matter. The area of bulk end-user certificates may be the point at which I will need to seek further clarification. I will need to do it early on in Committee as we will not return to earlier amendments as we progress through the Bill. At this stage I foreshadow that I have been advised that there may be difficulties and, if those difficulties exist, I will be looking for a further explanation at the appropriate time.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training):** I thank the members for Hart and Gordon for their contributions. As the member for Hart has already indicated, the Bill arises as a result of a Commonwealth Government decision based on the High Court's decision in the Ha and Lim case that cast doubt on the validity of the State's legislation imposing an *ad valorem*

franchise fee on the three areas of liquor, tobacco and petroleum products. The Bill contains regulatory provisions which deal with such matters as the control and distribution of petroleum products and, in particular, safe storage, and it is appropriate that these provisions remain in force. The nominal licence fees relevant to those activities I am advised also will remain.

Under the replacement revenue arrangements following the Ha and Lim case, a Commonwealth excise surcharge of 8.1 cents per litre applies to all petroleum products produced in Australia or imported here. This involves all States and also Queensland, where previously a State petrol tax was not in force. As part of the safety net arrangements, which have been agreed with the Commonwealth, subsidies are payable on excess revenues raised under the surcharge relative to the State taxes that previously applied to ensure that the price of petrol at the pump to consumers does not increase over that previously enforced, so the subsidy will ensure that private motorists do not pay any more than they did previously. All States are having to abide by this situation to ensure that there is no increase in the pump price.

Subsidy payments have been made on an interim basis by agreement between the Government and the relevant oil companies, and we must formalise the subsidy scheme to ensure that those subsidies, particularly for country areas, are not exploited. The member for Gordon raised the issue of the situation in Victoria where the four oil companies are undertaking this collection rather than the distributors. I am advised that only 60 distributors in South Australia will be affected. In Victoria apparently the subsidy is approximately 1¢, very much smaller than in South Australia where, in zone three, the subsidy is 3¢. The Victorian Government, in going down the track that it has, is taking a risk, I am advised, in the petrol pump price rising as against here where, if we go through the system of distributors, we ensure that the 3¢ subsidy remains in place.

If we go down to the next level to the retail outlets to try to administer this subsidy, it then becomes far too complicated and too great an administrative burden, which is why it is done at the distributor level. If that does not adequately explain the situation, I am happy for the member for Gordon to raise questions in Committee. I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

**Mr McEWEN:** This is the point on which I may have a difficulty in terms of the definition of bulk end-user certificates. I am not clear where we deal with the definition of the point at which the revenue is collected. The Minister stated when concluding his second reading reply that there would be at least 60 distributors, which would be the point at which the revenue would be collected in South Australia. There may be more than that. We must remember that fuel is brought in across the border. Some of the distributors to whom I spoke purchase fuel out of Adelaide or Melbourne, depending on a number of factors, including spot price. This, in turn, poses a problem in terms of the distributor being the point at which the revenue will be collected. So, I need to clarify how many distributors there will be and how this will be differentiated?

I was not convinced by the Minister's previous explanation as to why we would want to move it down to the next level when there seems to be merit in collecting this revenue at the wholesale level rather than the distributor level. I

appreciate the Minister's comments that we will not collect it at the retail level, but why we are pushing it down to distributor level I am still far from convinced. I would also like to know what extra effort would be involved in the South Australian Tax Office having to administer the extra burden of seeing that this scheme is properly policed and audited at distributor level.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** First, I am advised that 60 is the definite number of distributors that will be affected in South Australia. Secondly, we are not collecting a tax: we are paying a subsidy to those distributors. If that fuel is purchased in South Australia or interstate, that subsidy will be paid. It does not matter from which distributor the fuel is purchased, the subsidy will be paid to the South Australian distributor.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 12 passed.

Clause 13.

**Mr McEWEN:** At this stage, I seek some reassurance that the distributor network is happy with this proposition. I understand that it would have been canvassed with them. I do not wish to identify at this stage a distributor who contacted me at lunchtime today indicating that they are most unhappy with the process. I need to be convinced that this is a one-off and that the distributor network at large is happy with the mechanisms that are being put in place and the rebates that will occur at that level.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** I am told that all distributors have been advised. It was basically a road show network which sought opinions on and advised distributors of how this system would work. There has been extensive consultation with distributors, and the feedback from those distributors has been acceptance of this form of administration.

**Mr McEWEN:** I thank the Minister for the way in which he has supported my questioning up to this point. I am satisfied with his explanation. I have no further difficulty with the Bill.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (14 to 28) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

#### INTERNATIONAL TRANSFER OF PRISONERS (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 February. Page 422.)

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** The Government asks us on humanitarian grounds to support the transfer to South Australian prisons of Australian citizens and permanent residents serving a prison sentence overseas. It also asks us to consider hosting in our prisons Rwandans and Yugoslavians convicted by international war crimes tribunals. The Bill is different from nearly every other Bill or administrative decision of the Attorney-General during his four-year stewardship because it exposes South Australia's Consolidated Revenue to the risk of substantially increased expenditure.

Commonsense tells us that Australian States shall be the soft touch in these international transfers, with many more Australians returning from overseas to serve sentences in South Australian prisons than guests of Her Majesty in our



State leaving for overseas prisons. That we shall be a soft touch is enshrined in part 6 of the Commonwealth Bill that we will adopt by passing this Bill. Under that part, the overseas sentence may be applied in Australia either by continued enforcement adapted as necessary to conform to Australian law or converted enforcement whereby a lighter sentence would be substituted. We can assume that converted enforcement would be the norm.

South Australia must pay for the accommodation of prisoners transferred to our prisons under this Bill. We must also pay for the cost of escort officers and air fares. Although there is provision in clause 51 of the Bill for the Commonwealth Attorney to try to recover on behalf of the State the expenses incurred in transferring a prisoner to an Australian gaol, we should not expect this to occur much, if at all.

I agree with the Government that the argument on the merits of the Bill is one between humanitarian sentiments on one side and, on the other, respect for the laws of other countries and their systems of punishment. I suppose the 1970s film, *Midnight Express*, has predisposed most people over 35 to the humanitarian side of the argument. Those of us who will be voting for the passage of this Bill should admit that it will be an incentive for Australian drug dealers to travel to Asia for the purpose of trading knowing that, if they are caught, they can serve most of their incarceration in their home State and be eligible for South Australia's comparatively generous parole and home detention arrangements. The risk of drug dealing in Asia will not now be quite what it was.

This scheme for international transfer of prisoners is an initiative of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General. The Commonwealth has facilitated the scheme by a 1997 Act of the Commonwealth Parliament, which this Bill adopts. It is to be expected that the Commonwealth would be keen to have the States commit to this law. The Commonwealth likes to be in the forefront of civilised nations doing the right thing in the new world order. Taking part in the international war crimes tribunal and offering to take one or more of those Rwandans or Yugoslavs convicted by the tribunal and sentenced to a term of imprisonment is something on which the Foreign Affairs Department would be focussed. Hosting Radovan Karadzic at Yatala, or perhaps, more realistically, a convicted Yugoslav with Australian relatives, is something that may seem absurd to South Australian voters but will earn valuable brownie votes for the Commonwealth in the international community.

The Minister says that the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs has 'strongly supported' the States' adopting the Bill. Well, it would, wouldn't it? The Commonwealth gets the international kudos and the States pay the bill. I should not give the impression that the State of South Australia is compelled to take any particular overseas prisoner. The Bill reserves to our State the right to refuse any prisoner. The Commonwealth law already provides that the prisoner must be an Australian citizen or an Australian permanent resident and that the prisoner must have ties with the State or Territory in which he is to be imprisoned. The ties can be with a spouse, *de facto* spouse, parent, grandparent, child, or someone with whom 'the prisoner has a close, continuing relationship'. The prisoner must consent to the transfer and the crime of which the prisoner has been convicted must be a crime in the jurisdiction in which he is to be imprisoned. International war crimes tribunal prisoners need not fulfil these requirements

except the first requirement, namely, the consent of the home State. I support the Bill and so, as it happens, does the Opposition.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises):** I thank the member for Spence for his support on behalf of the Opposition. I indicate that the Advisory Report on the International Transfer of Prisoners Bill 1996, House of Representatives Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, indicated on page 6:

The grounds for support in Australia include the humanitarian and rehabilitative reasons for the international transfer of prisoners—as the member for Spence acknowledged—

Reduced financial costs is also raised as a reason for Australia's participation. Biles has suggested that Australian participation in international prisoner transfers would be likely to result in financial savings for participating States or Territories as there is expected to be a net outflow of prisoners.

Bill read a second time.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises):** I move:

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

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** This is a Bill which I discussed in some detail on my favourite talkback radio program. I must say that it was my advice to listeners that there would be a cost to South Australia in signing up to this Bill. The House of Representatives Standing Committee, as quoted by the Minister, states that there will be a net outflow of prisoners. I have no idea how that could possibly be the case. The committee said it, and now the Minister has said it. I give him notice that I will be following up with questions in this House to see whether, indeed, this Bill does lead to a net outflow of prisoners. I doubt it very much.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises):** The member for Spence may well ask those questions. I suggest that the response will be equally illuminative for the Government, because all I have done is quote what was reported in the hope of shedding some light on the observation made by the member for Spence. I think that belittles the Bill. This is a Bill which obviously people would support on humanitarian grounds, and I applaud the Attorney-General for sponsoring it in the Parliament.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### **ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST (NATIVE TITLE) AMENDMENT BILL**

The Legislative Council agreed to the Bill without any amendment.

#### **CRIMINAL LAW (FORENSIC PROCEDURES) BILL**

The Legislative Council agreed to the Bill without any amendment.

#### **PUBLIC SECTOR MANAGEMENT (INCOMPATIBLE PUBLIC OFFICES) AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 February. Page 422.)

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** The Auditor-General in his 1996 report questions the practice of public servants holding incompatible public offices. Without any particular instance bringing the matter to public attention, the Auditor published a chapter on the matter. Quoting from an English case of 1832, the Auditor states the common law rule, as follows:

Where two offices are incompatible they cannot be held together. This is a rule founded on the plainest principle of public policy and which has obtained from very early time.

I suppose no-one told King Henry VIII of England about this principle when he declared himself Supreme Governor of the Church of England, but perhaps the doctrine does not apply to the sovereign, or perhaps the Tudor reign preceded 'very early time'.

The Auditor goes on to point out that a proved conflict of interest is not required before the doctrine is applied. Once incompatible public offices are established, the offender loses his first appointment automatically because he accepted the second appointment, this without an actual conflict of interest being proved. A textbook on public offices states the rule thus:

It is a well-settled rule of the common law that he who, while occupying one office accepts another incompatible with the first, *ipso facto*, absolutely vacates the first office and his title is thereby terminated without any other Act or proceeding.

The WA Inc. Royal Commission states the problem nicely, as follows:

It is wholly inappropriate that a public servant be appointed to the board of that body (i.e. independent statutory authority) while retaining his or her position in the Public Service in a department within any portfolio of the Minister responsible for that body.

My old law lecturer Paul Finn identifies two especially difficult situations where incompatible offices may do harm. One is where a public servant appointed to a statutory board is used as a conduit to convey information from the statutory board to the Minister in breach of the board's confidentiality and, secondly, where the public servant acts on behalf of the Minister to ensure that the board acts in accordance with the Minister's wishes, thereby undermining the independence of the board. Why is the rule prescribing automatic loss of the first position so tough? The Auditor quotes with approval this reason:

For the public has a right to know, in the case of attempted incompatible office holding, which office is held and which surrendered, and it should not be left to chance or the uncertain whim of the office holder to determine.

The Auditor says that he has identified 'a number of instances' of incompatible office holding in the SA Public Service and he argues there are potential consequences, not just for the integrity of public administration but also for the individuals concerned. At the end of the chapter the Auditor writes that when the Parliament establishes a statutory authority it ought to state its intention on the appointment of public servants from the Ministers' departments. The Auditor also suggested a detailed review of existing incompatibility. He says that remedial arrangements should be made so that public servants are not prejudiced. The Government has in its own time responded to this chapter in the 1996 report by introducing the Bill before us.

The Bill validates all incompatible offices. It also authorises the Governor in Council to issue directions on any conflict of interest arising from incompatible offices. By issuing such a direction, it would validate any incompatible office not already validated. I suspect that the clause about

the Governor in Council is merely to throw a blanket of validation across all existing and future incompatible offices alike. In addition to the Bill, the Government proposes what it calls a 'targeted review' of appointment to statutory boards.

The Opposition is not enthusiastic about the Bill, because we think the Government is validating incompatible offices across the board without answering the Auditor's identification of vices in the creation of incompatible offices. I would be surprised if the Government heeded the Auditor's message and used the so-called 'targeted review' to end existing incompatible offices and prevent new ones. On the contrary, clause 3(2) shows the Government's intention to go on linking incompatible offices in one person and validating them by order of the Governor in Council. The Opposition is mildly disappointed that the Government has not taken the relevant chapter of the Auditor's report seriously, but we shall support the Bill because it averts what may be unnecessary suffering by public servants who would otherwise lose their principal salaried job owing to their unlawful appointment to statutory boards—not that it is clear to the Opposition just who would initiate an incompatible offices lawsuit to divest these public servants of their jobs.

The Opposition thinks the correct response would be to protect individuals who may be prejudiced, have a thorough review of incompatible offices with a view to eliminating unnecessary second appointments and make provision in the parent Act to safeguard the independence of statutory boards from the old ministerial ploy of appointing a compliant public servant to a board to do the Minister's will. If a public servant from a Minister's department must be appointed to a statutory board, Parliament should ensure that the public servant cannot be given directions by the Minister or the Government.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises):** I thank the Opposition for its basic support of the Bill. However, I do not agree that the Government has not taken the Auditor-General's issues seriously; indeed, we have done so with the introduction of the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

**Mr ATKINSON:** Does new section 70A(1) validate all existing incompatible offices in the Public Service? Would some public servants still hold incompatible offices under the common law doctrine, even after new section 70A(1) comes into effect?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** The Bill does not validate actual instances of incompatibility by reason of conflict of duty and duty. The Bill simply provides that the doctrine does not operate because of potential for conflict.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I take it that the Minister is saying that incompatible offices still exist which may be affected by the doctrine but which are not being validated by the Bill before us. Could the Minister give instances—even if they are hypothetical—of such positions?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** No; incompatibility would exist only if there was the potential for incompatibility and it was not handled appropriately in the first instance; and, I am also advised, if there were inherently incompatible positions, for example, if a member of the Health Commission were also at the same time the Auditor-General. However, the general answer to the question is 'No'.

Clause passed.  
Title passed.  
Bill read a third time and passed.

### LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (QUALIFICATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 19 February. Page 426.)

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** Life used to be comparatively easy for the Supreme Court Board of Examiners when it considered applications from people to be admitted as barristers and solicitors in South Australia. We had only one Law Faculty, at the University of Adelaide. Although there were a few applications from graduates of interstate or overseas law schools, such as my own at the Australian National University, the vast majority of applications were from the local law school, whose curriculum and standards conformed to the requirements of the Supreme Court.

The board comprised the Master and practitioners and it advised the Supreme Court on applications. With the new Flinders University Law School and proliferation of law schools interstate, the job of the board is harder. The board cannot be expected to investigate the curriculum and standards of law schools throughout the world and reach a conclusion on whether it should credential their graduates. As the Minister pointed out in his speech introducing the Bill, every other Australian jurisdiction has delegated the task to a body outside the Supreme Court.

**The Hon. R.B. Such:** There are too many lawyers.

**Mr ATKINSON:** The member for Fisher says there are too many lawyers. I would not recommend to any young man or woman commencing study at university that they take a law degree, because I think there will be an oversupply of law graduates very soon, if there is not already.

**The Hon. R.B. Such:** They don't all have to practise.

**Mr ATKINSON:** No, they do not all have to practise, but unemployed scorned lawyers are a very great danger to civil society. Historically they have been the most blood thirsty revolutionaries, along with unemployed doctors, I should add. The Government proposes a Legal Practitioners Education and Admission Council, which will include judges, lawyers, representatives of the Attorney-General and the local law schools and a non-voting law student. The council will have a secretariat, to be called coincidentally the Board of Examiners, that will do the delving in respect of law schools and applicants. The council will set the standards for admission as a barrister and solicitor. It may require an applicant to do post-admission studies and then review the applicant when he applies for the next year's practising certificate.

The council's rules will be subordinate legislation and thus will be placed before Parliament. These changes will not alter the Supreme Court's traditional authority of letting one into practice for the first time amid ceremony and striking one off the roll for indiscipline with rather less ceremony but greater press coverage. What may be transferred from the Supreme Court is the issue and renewal of annual practising certificates. The administrative work with practising certificates has been done by the Law Society. Now the Supreme Court may vest authority for this formally with the Law Society. Although the Opposition wonders what the Government would do if a registered trade union sought to credential applications for the calling it covers, with that wistful thought

we support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 12 passed.

Clause 13.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I move:

Page 9—

After line 14—Insert:

- (aa) by striking out from subsection (1) 'The Treasurer' and substituting 'Subject to subsection (1aa), the Treasurer';

After line 18—Insert:

- (ab) by inserting after subsection (1) of the following subsection:

- (1aa) If the society collects practising certificate fees pursuant to an assignment of functions by the Supreme Court, the society may retain a proportion of those fees approved by the Attorney-General for the purposes specified in subsection (1).

This amendment will allow the Law Society to retain money it receives from practising certificate fees and apply it for the purposes set out in section 95(1). The Law Society presently issues practising certificates on behalf of the Supreme Court and this is expected to continue. Now the Law Society receives the practising certificate fees and pays them to the Treasurer. The Treasurer then reimburses the society for its costs in issuing practising certificates and pays the society an amount towards the cost of the society's law library and an amount for the society to pay into the guarantee fund. The amendment will eliminate this round robin of cheques.

**Mr ATKINSON:** My question is to you, Sir. Would you care to explain to the Committee the procedure whereby a clause comes down in a Bill from another place in battered type and we amend it without its appearing in type before us?

**The CHAIRMAN:** The clause in erased type is not in the Bill. It has been taken out and the Minister is inserting a new clause, the form of which is up to the Minister, as distributed.

**Mr ATKINSON:** Notionally, clause 13 does not exist in the Bill and the Minister is inserting a new clause 13, a version of which appealed to him more than the old one.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I believe that is what has happened.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 14 passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS DUTY (DUTIABLE RECEIPTS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the Bill without any amendment.

### STATUTES AMENDMENT (CONSUMER AFFAIRS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 February. Page 429.)

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** The Opposition has studied this omnibus Bill most carefully. We have written to the Law Society, the Consumers Association and the Labor Lawyers about the Bill and I presume that, like us, they find no fault in it because they have not responded to this Bill, although they have two other Bills currently before the House. Running through the Bill is an amendment to many Acts

changing the method of deciding whether lay assessors should sit with judges in hearing cases in each jurisdiction. Members in the previous Parliament may recall that the Attorney-General, full of zeal in his role as the lawyers' lawyer, tried to rid South Australian courts of their lay assessors or non-lawyer experts sitting with judges on trials of fact.

The Attorney-General was stopped in the other place by agreement between the Parliamentary Labor Party and the Australian Democrats. The Hon. Anne Levy, a former Minister of Consumer Affairs, was keenest of all about retaining assessors. The purpose of assessors was to bring to the bench expertise in the subject matter of the case, whether it was building, conveyancing, real estate, land valuing or electrical work. Those of us who support assessors believe this expertise will help justice be done, because a judge's knowledge of the law may not be enough if the workings of the trade are so arcane as to confuse the judge in his understanding of the facts.

We believe assessors can help by knowing the ins and outs of the trade and by making more sense of the technical evidence. The stock amendment to each of the Acts removes from the judicial officer who is hearing the case sole authority to decide whether he has to sit with assessors. The amendment arranges for this authority to be shared with any judge of the court, such as the judge who does the administrative work of the court, such as allocating judges to cases. The Opposition hopes that this is not a backdoor method of removing or minimising the role of assessors, and we shall be asking the Minister about this in Committee.

The schedule of the Bill continues the Government's misguided policy of converting divisional penalties to maximum terms of imprisonment or cash sums. Labor will return to divisional penalties when we form a Government.

I turn now to the detail of the Bill. The Travel Agents Act, Builders Licensing Act and the Commercial and Private Agents Act are amended to prevent a disqualified person working in the trade in some other capacity. This type of provision is also in the Second-Hand Vehicle Dealers Act, and one of its purposes is to forestall an attempt by a person whose licence has been disqualified from staying with the business and using another licensed person as his agent to front the business.

The Security and Investigation Agents Act is amended to make it an offence for an employer to hire an unlicensed person to work as an agent. The onus is now on the employer to check the licences of his employees.

The Retirement Villages Act is amended from an abundance of caution to ensure that the residents' priority charge over the village's title is not defeated by anything in the Real Property Act.

The Residential Tenancies Act is changed to validate enforcement orders of the tribunal that may exceed in value the jurisdiction of the Magistrates Court. Such orders may now be registered in the District Court, which has a higher value threshold.

Clause 25 makes provision in the principal Act for the long-awaited code of conduct for rooming houses. Brompton and Ridleyton, suburbs in the State district which I have the honour to represent, have several rooming houses that are sorely in need of an attempt at regulation. Perhaps rooming houses are not a favourable object for law and order, but I think we should give it a try. The principal owner of rooming houses in my electorate has died waiting for the code of conduct, but his widow struggles on with their management as best she can. I do not know what the men who live in our

rooming houses would have done but for her late husband's enterprises.

I notice that some of the provisions in the code will attract criminal penalties for breach, or at least I think that is what the clause notes say. This will have to be so, because life in a rooming house is not trouble free and police attendance is required from time to time, often in response to violent episodes of mental illness. Clause 26 allows the exemption of some rooming houses from the code.

The Business Names Act is changed to allow more information on the register, such as the post office box of a bush business.

The Conveyancers Act and the Land Agents Act are amended to allow the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs to amend the qualifications required for practice in these vocations. A person refused registration for their vocation may appeal to the District Court.

An Act with which the last Parliament dealt at length, the Second-Hand Vehicle Dealers Act, is amended to ensure that every second-hand vehicle sold by a dealer to the public is roadworthy. The Office of Business and Consumer Affairs felt that second-hand motor vehicles more than 15 years old and sold for more than \$3 001 fell between the requirements of roadworthiness in the Act without the Parliament's intending that result.

I am pleased to see the Government move to stop a scheme for avoiding the requirement of warranty insurance in the building industry. This requirement comes in at the threshold of \$5 000 where renovations and alterations are being done. Some builders were dividing jobs in the range \$5 000 to \$9 000 into two—one for the materials and one for the labour—to avoid the need for insurance to fulfil their warranty should their business fail.

One proposed change that the Law Society has been monitoring is the application by the South Australian so-called 'template' of the Consumer Credit Code to consumer leases outside the code in other States and Territories. The Government says that these leases are in the jurisdiction of two other State Acts, and the parent Act should be changed to a true template. With those remarks, the Opposition supports the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5.

**Mr ATKINSON:** As I said in my second reading contribution, the parliamentary Labor Party is keen on the role of assessors in these jurisdictions. Why has the Government been opposed to the role of assessors in these jurisdictions? What proportion of cases are heard with assessors, and has that proportion declined since his Party came to power? Why is this amendment necessary?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I need to clarify for the member for Spence the fact that the Government is not against the use of assessors. The change is necessary at the request of the court, because I am informed that the issue of assessors is decided at a preliminary hearing where the judicial officer may not be the one who ultimately will preside at the trial. This measure is designed not to reduce the use of assessors but rather to make sure that their use is as streamlined as possible.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I take it that the Minister is saying that there is an administrative meeting where presumably the Chief Judge or another judge looks at the facts of the case as

they appear in the pleadings and decides whether an assessor is necessary, and the Government seeks Parliament's permission to regularise that procedure rather than to have the trial judge, whomever that may be, decide whether or not he is to sit with assessors.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** The advice I am getting is that there are obviously preliminary hearings in all matters. A judgment is made about the use of assessors. One assessor is a lay assessor and one is from the industry. I reiterate that it is to streamline the use of assessors, not to sideline assessors.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I note that clause 5 provides that a judge of the court will decide whether the court is to sit with assessors, whereas clause 6 provides that a judicial officer of the court will do so. Why is there different wording in the two clauses?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I believe that the member for Spence has identified a drafting error because we are unable to identify the rationale for the altered form in clause 6 as opposed to clause 5. Clause 5 is consistent with the alterations that are to be made in other clauses of the Bill and we believe that it may be a drafting error. However, factually, I do not believe that it alters the decision-making process. In addition, there is the possibility that clause 6 and clause 8 may be so worded because they refer to actions in the Magistrates Court whereas the others refer to actions in the District Court.

Clause passed.

Clause 6.

**Mr ATKINSON:** Will the Minister advise the Committee whether the use of assessors has varied in the courts since the Government's attempt to rid us of them in the last Parliament?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I understand that initially assessors were not being utilised but now they are, and their use is being encouraged.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 24 passed.

Clause 25.

**Mr ATKINSON:** This makes an amendment to the Residential Tenancies Act and provides:

The regulations may prescribe provisions that will be taken to be terms of all rooming house agreements.

I presume that this is the long-awaited code of conduct for rooming houses which has been many years in the drafting. Do I read it correctly in the clause notes that there will be criminal penalties for some breaches of the code of conduct for rooming houses or is it that there are not to be criminal penalties, as I detected from the second reading explanation? There seems to be some conflict between the clause notes and the second reading explanation. What is the truth of the matter?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** A code of conduct for proprietors and residents is already provided in the Residential Tenancies Act, under section 7. However, the maximum penalty for a rooming house proprietor not complying with the relevant code of conduct is \$1 000, and for a rooming house resident not complying with the relevant code of conduct it is \$200. For some of the lesser offences, it is felt that that potentially is a little heavy handed and, accordingly, this clause is being inserted in the Bill.

**Mr ATKINSON:** So is the Minister correcting my second reading contribution regarding the Residential Tenancies Act? Is the Minister saying that there is a code of conduct?

*The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:*

**Mr ATKINSON:** The Minister interjects that there is provision for a code of conduct but in fact a code of conduct has not been inaugurated under the provisions.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** There is provision for a code of conduct for both proprietors and residents, as I indicated, under section 7 of the Residential Tenancies Act. The code of conduct is at the moment being drafted.

**Mr ATKINSON:** Will the Minister advise the Committee how many years it has been in the drafting?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I am informed that the first mention of a code of conduct for rooming houses was in 1995. However, as I indicated previously, it was felt that the provision in respect of a code of conduct may well have been deficient. As I indicated, it imposed quite severe penalties for some potentially minor offences. Accordingly this is an attempt to bring a degree of balance into the arrangements whereby some matters can be settled by agreement rather than attracting criminal offence penalties.

**Mr ATKINSON:** Are there still criminal penalties in the code of conduct?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** That is in the Residential Tenancies Act. A code of conduct is provided for with a maximum penalty of \$1 000 for a rooming house proprietor and \$200 for a rooming house resident.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** Correct. But for argument's sake, if a rooming house resident were found not to have kept his or her room tidy, is it appropriate to exact a criminal penalty? The answer to that is 'No'.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** As the Minister responsible in this place, I say 'No'. Accordingly, the opportunity for a more balanced approach is afforded by this legislation.

Clause passed.

Clause 26.

**Mr ATKINSON:** When relating clause 25 to clause 26, could the Minister explain what the Government is doing in these clauses that will change the way the code of conduct is enforced? We had provision in the Residential Tenancies Act for a code of conduct, so the hole is there in the Act for it to be fitted to or the hook is there for it to be hung on to. In fact, we do not yet have a code of conduct. Criminal penalties are to be retained for some offences, but not for others that will be handled by civil proceedings. What is it that has changed, given that we do not yet have the code of conduct? Surely one method of fixing this up is to redraft the code of conduct to get it to say what you want it to say, given that there was already a hook in the Residential Tenancies Act on which to hang the code of conduct. Why the need for change? What method is being used?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** Under the Residential Tenancies Act the tribunal already has jurisdiction over a rooming house agreement and again this part of this legislation is an attempt to allow a balance to be brought in whereby the tribunal will be able to make a decision on a particular offence, for example, if somebody should be kicked out for keeping an untidy room. It is an attempt to bring balance, but I emphasise that the tribunal, under the Residential Tenancies Act, already has jurisdiction over rooming house agreements.

**Mr ATKINSON:** What is changed by this Bill from what applied before?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** The effect of clause 26 is to broaden the Act, first, but what has primarily changed in both clauses 25 and 26 is the opportunity for the tribunal to exact less than criminal penalties for less than criminal

offences.

**Mr Atkinson:** At its discretion?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** Correct.

**Mr ATKINSON:** Why grant exemption from the code to some rooming houses?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** Under the Residential Tenancies Act, the tribunal can indeed exempt a tenancy agreement or premises from the provisions of the Act. This is, if you like, a clause to indicate a completeness across the Act. But it is at the discretion of the tribunal: it would obviously have to make any exemption on proper evidence, reasonable assessment and so on.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (27 to 38) passed.

Schedule.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I am astonished by the foolishness of the Attorney-General and the Government in ridding our statute law of divisional penalties. I am horrified by the Attorney-General's going through all our legislation as it falls for consideration before the Parliament and tearing out of it divisional penalties and substituting fixed penalties. I do not know if the Government believes its own rhetoric about economic management and believes that, somehow, because the Liberal Party is in power in Canberra and in Adelaide, the consumer price index will not be more than 2 per cent indefinitely and therefore these fixed monetary amounts will persist for decades. The truth is that inflation can come back at any time, and the divisional penalty system is a very useful system of grading the seriousness of offences.

If one turns to the Acts Interpretation Act, one finds that the penalties range from division 1, where imprisonment is for a term not exceeding 15 years and a division 1 fine, a fine not exceeding \$60 000. That ranges down to a division 12 fine, a fine not exceeding \$50; a division 12 fee, an expiation fee of \$25. In the middle, there is division 6 imprisonment, a term of imprisonment not exceeding one year; division 6 fine, a fine not exceeding \$4 000; and division 6 fee, an expiation fee of \$300. So, there you have 12 grades whereby the Parliament can grade the seriousness of a particular offence against the law and, as inflation goes up, that can be adjusted accordingly. But with divisional penalties you know roughly what the seriousness of the offence is and what you will get and you do not have to rush back to the statute book and bring in statutes amendment bills here changing dozens, or hundreds of fines.

So, we are going back in time to a very primitive method of fixing fines at certain monetary amounts, and then persisting for years with those amounts, even though they might be wholly inappropriate. To give you an example, we dealt with one last night under the Highways Act, where the penalty for having an unlawful access to the highway from one's property was £50, converted at decimalisation to \$100. And the Government, after finding it entirely unsatisfactory for the purpose of regulating the seriousness of offence—because some of these access roads cause tremendous damage

in the Far North, as the member for Stuart would know—put up the fine from £50 to, I believe, \$1 250 and \$2 500 for a second or subsequent offence.

If the divisional penalty system had applied, we would not have had to go through that process, because the Government can adjust division 1 through to division 12 in accordance with the consumer price index by amending just one section of the Acts Interpretation Act—section 21A, headed 'Standard scales for penalties and expiation fees'. I am at a loss to understand what the Attorney-General is trying to do by abolishing divisional penalties, except to make the job of legislating more difficult and arduous than I have already made it this afternoon.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** The member for Spence speaks from the heart, as he does on most occasions. I understand where he is coming from, but I think the nub of his concern was stated when he said the Government could alter the penalties by altering one single section. According to my recollection and understanding, that has not happened. The situation is—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** A series of Governments have not chosen to do that. Factually, that means that, almost like bracket creep, a number of penalties have got out of kilter with the relative seriousness or otherwise of that offence. In making a one-off adjustment, given that a series of Governments have not done so—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I can assure the honourable member that we looked at that option. However, it was decided that to make a one-off adjustment at this stage would have meant that just as some penalties are too low, if we had done as the member for Spence legitimately suggests, others would have been dramatically too high. That option was looked at and found to be inappropriate. Accordingly, laboriously, we will undertake the task of doing so. I daresay that at some stage in the future—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** That is a long way in the future. I think it will be well and truly before that. Once the penalties are put back into kilter—and I hope that will be sooner rather than later—it may well be that an opportunity to revisit the sort of system which the member for Spence identifies may or may not be taken. This is an attempt to ensure that the penalties most appropriately reflect the actual thing for which they are exacted. However, I understand the point that the member for Spence makes.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## ADJOURNMENT

At 5.20 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 24 March at 2 p.m.

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

**Tuesday 17 March 1998**

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**SCHOOL PROPERTY SALES**

14. **Ms WHITE:** Which property sales are included in the 1997-98 estimate of \$13.5 million in capital receipts from the sale of land and buildings?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** The following are the properties included in the 1997-98 estimate of \$13.5 million receipts from sale of surplus land and buildings:

- Surplus land and property for sale 1997-98:
- Adelaide Girls High School
- Belair Junior Primary School
- Conyngham Street, (blocks)
- Edwardstown Primary School (part)
- Findon Primary School
- Marden High School
- Marion High School
- Marion Primary School ( part)
- Millswood (Wiltja)
- Mount Barker High School (part)

- Nailsworth High School—Land & Buildings (balance)
- Osmond Terrace—Buildings (balance)
- Plympton High School ( part )
- Tonsley Park Primary School Parcel 2
- West Lakes High School (balance)

The value of each property is not provided because it is considered that public knowledge of the details could have a detrimental effect on the level of returns from sale.

**PREMIER'S MEDIA UNIT**

18. **Mr CLARKE:** What are the names of all media advisers employed in the Premier's Media Unit and in relation to each:

- (a) what is the rate of remuneration as per the contract expressed as either per hour or as an annual salary;
- (b) what is the term of each contract;
- (c) what are the details of other benefits including all allowances for telephone, car parking, travel, recreation leave and superannuation; and
- (d) what are the details of any payments due at expiry of the contract or in the event of termination by either party?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Responses to parts (a), (b) and (c) are as at the 3rd December 1997 and are attached in table form. In regard to termination arrangements (d), if any Media Adviser were to resign, he/she would receive any outstanding recreation leave and long service leave entitlements. If terminated by the Premier with less than three months notice, the Media Adviser is entitled to a payment of sixteen weeks salary plus any outstanding recreation leave and long service leave. Any payout would be subject to pro rata repayment if the person were to be re-employed within any 'office of profit under the Crown' during the period encompassed by the payout.

Media Advisers in the Premier's Media Unit

Name	Position Title	Expected Finish Date	Salary \$
Vicki Thomson	Principal media adviser Car park, reasonable personal use of mobile telephone, home phone rental plus two-thirds of calls, home	Minister's term	80 000
Peter Green	Media adviser Car park, reasonable personal use of mobile telephone, home computer/fax line and calls	Minister's term	63869
Sascha Meldrum	Media adviser Car park, reasonable personal use of mobile telephone, home computer/fax line and calls	Minister's term	63 869
Leanne Weir	Car park, reasonable personal use of mobile telephone, home computer/fax line and calls	Minister's term	63 869
Mark Williams	Media adviser Car park, reasonable personal use of mobile telephone, home computer/fax line and calls	Minister's term	63 869

**KENNEDY, Ms A.**

19. **Mr CLARKE:**

1. What are the details of Ms Alex Kennedy's current employment contract as an adviser to the Premier and in particular:

- (a) what is the rate of remuneration as per the contract expressed as either per hour or as an annual salary;
- (b) what is the term of the contract;
- (c) what are the details of other benefits including all allowances for telephone, car parking, travel, recreation leave and superannuation; and
- (d) what are the details of any payments due at expiry of the contract in the event of termination by either party?

2. Is this the same employment contract that existed between Ms Kennedy and the Premier prior to the election on 11 October 1997 and if not, what were the details of that contract?

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

- 1. (a) Ms Kennedy was not employed on an employment contract. The 'Write Connection', of which Ms Kennedy is a principal consultant, was engaged on a consultancy basis. The agreed rate of payment was \$10 000 per month.
- (b) 1 July 1997 until 14 January 1998.
- (c) With the exception of carpark facility, no benefits, including allowances for telephone, recreation leave and

superannuation were payable to Ms Kennedy as she was not employed on an employment contract. When required to accompany the Premier on official duties, the cost for Ms Kennedy's travel was met by the Department.

'The Write Connection' provided all equipment during the period of this consultancy, but Departmental computer equipment was made available for Ms Kennedy's use so it was compatible with the whole of government mandated system.

- (d) As Ms Kennedy is not an employee, no payments are due at the expiry of the contract.

2. Prior to 1 July 1997 'The Write Connection' was retained to provide speechwriting services to the Premier. As a principal in that firm, Ms Kennedy was paid at a fortnightly rate of \$2 115.38.

**BILDSTEIN, Mr C.**

20. **Mr CLARKE:**

1. What are the details of employment contract with Mr Craig Bildstein as an adviser to the Premier and in particular:

- (a) what is the rate of remuneration as per the contract expressed as either per hour or as an annual salary;
- (b) what is the term of the contract;
- (c) what are the details of other benefits, including all allowances, for telephone, carparking, travel, recreation leave and super-

annuation; and  
(d) what are the details of any payments due at expiry of the contract in the event of termination by either party?

2. Is Mr Bildstein on secondment from the Victorian Government and does he have any ongoing employment arrangements with the Victorian Government?

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

1. (a) The annual salary is \$105 000 per annum.
- (b) The contract is for the life of the Government or for the duration of the Premier's term.
- (c) Other benefits provided to Mr Bildstein include a private-plated motor vehicle and carpark, reasonable personal use of a mobile phone, home delivered newspapers, home telephone and fax lines rental and calls, reasonable removal expenses, Public Service recreation leave entitlements and 6 per cent superannuation guarantee levy.

(d) At the expiry of the contract Mr Bildstein is entitled to a payout of sixteen weeks salary. In the event of termination by the Premier with less than three months notice, Mr Bildstein is entitled to sixteen weeks salary, together with any amount payable on account of accrued recreation leave.

2. Mr Bildstein has resigned from employment with the Victorian Government.

#### PREMIER'S STAFF

21. **Mr CLARKE:** Which members of the Premier's staff have access to credit cards and for what purposes are these cards used and how much has been spent on each card from January 1, 1997 to December 3, 1997?

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

Cardholder	Purpose of Issue	Expense \$
Bildstein Craig	Official Government Purposes	\$1,689.32
Blieschke Liz	Official Government Purposes	\$1,403.98
Chapman John	Official Government Purposes	\$503.60
Duff Ann	Official Government Purposes	\$89.55
Hanke Gudrun	Official Government Purposes	\$137.75
Hickey Benadict	Official Government Purposes	\$1,416.20
Keane Denise	Official Government Purposes	\$1,427.75
Kennedy Alex	Official Government Purposes	\$2,179.60
Lockett Peter	Official Government Purposes	\$1,080.60
Pearce Kenn	Official Government Purposes	\$548.50
Thomson Vicki	Official Government Purposes	\$9,624.99
Young Joan	Official Government Purposes	\$399.63

#### MINISTERIAL STAFF

22. **Mr CLARKE:** How many ministerial and public service staff are employed in the office of each Minister and in particular:

(a) What is the name and job title of each staff member;

(b) What is the salary of each staff member; and

(c) What, if any, additional benefits apply to each staff member such as carparking, superannuation, bonuses, travel, mobile phones, telephone allowances and credit cards?

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

#### Office of the Hon. R.I. Lucas, Treasurer

Name of Staff Member	Job title	Annual Salary	Additional Benefits
Ministerial Staff			
Richard Duddy	Ministerial Adviser	\$56 759	- Carpark - Mobile Phone
Ann Lambert	Personal Assistant*	\$39 726	- Mobile Phone
Public Service Staff			
Ron Rechner	Chief Admin Officer	\$50 862	
Jacque Guthrie	Admin Officer	\$34 722	
Sally Greenhalgh	Secretary	\$30 363	
Christine Sanchez	Correspondence Clerk	\$28 252	
Dianne Peacock	Receptionist	\$29 308	

\*Staff member has the use of a Government Credit card for official purposes only

#### Office of the Hon. D.C. Kotz Minister for Environment & Heritage, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs

Name of Staff Member	Job Title	Annual Salary	Additional Benefits
Ministerial Staff			
Bob Jackson	Acting Chief of Staff	\$78 614	- Carpark - Mobile Phone - Telephone Allowance
Public Service Staff			
Ken Neely	Senior Admin Officer*	\$51 879	- Mobile Phone
Tony Steele	Research Officer (Acting)	\$42 211	
Rosemary Schultz	Personal Assistant*	\$39 211	
Cathy Radtke	Senior Clerk*	\$34 946	



Margaret Sparrow	Personal Asst to COS	\$30 328
Kathryn Bell	Correspondence Clerk*	\$23 408
Deidre Armour	Receptionist	\$26 060
Rebecca Fensom-Wenzel	Trainee	\$3 000

## Departmental Staff

Denise Kean	DEHAA Liaison Officer	ASO-5 Funded by Agency	- Mobile Phone
Liz Moncrieff	Parliamentary Clerk	ASO-2 Funded by Agency	

\*Staff member has the use of a Government Credit card for official purposes only

## Office of the Hon. Malcolm Buckby, Minister for Education, Children's Services &amp; Training

Name of Staff Member	Job Title	Annual Salary	Additional Benefits
Ministerial Staff			
John Halsey	Chief of Staff*	\$84 584	- Carpark - Mobile Phone
John Behenna	Ministerial Adviser	\$52 459	- Carpark - Mobile Phone
Chris Bodinar	Personal Assistant	\$39 726	
Antonietta Fantasia	Personal Assistant	\$39 726	

## Public Service Staff

Lee Bitzios	Parliamentary Officer*	\$28 395	
Diane Chadwick	Senior Admin Officer*	\$51 064	
Ann Duff	Administrative Officer	\$35 406	
Lee Gordon	Receptionist*	\$29 564	
Alison Hunter	Administrative Officer	\$33 069	
Sheree Simmons	Administrative Officer	\$33 069	
Tania Tassotti	Admin Support Officer	\$28 395	
Jennifer Verner	Administrative Officer	\$35 406	

\*Staff member has the use of a Government Credit card for official purposes only

## Office of the Hon Graham Ingerson, Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Trade &amp; Tourism

Name of Staff Member	Job Title	Annual Salary	Additional Benefits
Ministerial Staff			
Carolyn Cranwell	Acting Chief of Staff*	\$84 584	- Carpark - Mobile Phone
Stewart Leggett	Snr Political Adviser	\$63 000	- Carpark - Mobile Phone
Marilyn Crighton	Personal Assistant	\$39 726	

## Public Service Staff

Steven Ward	Snr Policy Adviser	\$77 448 Funded by DIT	- Mobile Phone
Gary Stratford	A/Snr Admin Officer	\$43 417	
Jacqui Merchant	Personal Asst to COS	\$34 757	
Nikki Farquhar	Parliamentary Clerk	\$33 752	
Merilyn Beyer	Admin Assistant	\$36 402	
Ashleigh Ridley	Asst to Ministerial Advisers	\$31 199	
Nicki Hordyk	Correspondence Clerk	\$30 012	
Glenis Stephenson	Receptionist	\$26 809	
Steven Fila	Trainee	\$11 633	

\*Staff member has the use of a Government Credit card for official purposes only

## Office of the Hon Rob Kerin, Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development

Name of Staff Member	Job Title	Annual Salary	Additional Benefits
Ministerial Staff			
Barry Featherston	Acting Chief of Staff*	\$84 183	- Mobile Phone - Pager
Mike Metcalfe	Ministerial Adviser	\$67 574	
Trudy Huczko	Ministerial Adviser*	\$60 500	- Mobile Phone

Sandy Hancock	Personal Assistant*	\$39 762
Public Service Staff		
Kim Gardner	Chief Admin Officer*	\$46 698
Carolyn Synch (Temp)	Admin Officer	\$33 386
Chris McArdle	Ministerial Assistant*	\$31 812
Grant Hickman	Correspondence Clerk	\$29 701
Tina Ferguson	Correspondence Clerk	\$29 701
Fiona Gilchrist (temp)	Receptionist	\$29.701

\*Staff member has the use of a Government Credit card for official purposes only

Office of the Hon Trevor Griffin, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Consumer Affairs

Name of Staff Member	Job Title	Annual Salary	Additional Benefits
Ministerial Staff			
Lynne Stapylton	Chief of Staff*	\$80 174	- Mobile Phone
Pam Huntley	Executive Assistant	\$39 726	- Carpark
Public Service Staff			
Denis Carey	Manager, Admin Services	\$45 338	
Jane Pelham	Acting Snr Admin Officer	\$39 393	
Judy Bennett	Parliamentary Liaison Officer	\$32 936	
Wendy Pfoertsch	Sec to Chief of Staff	\$27 811	
Simone Hennessey	Receptionist	\$27 811	
Stephanie Clarke	Correspondence Officer	\$26 786	
Julie Winn	Correspondence Officer	\$30 011	
Tracey Carley	Receptionist	\$18 140	
Sonia Spandrio	Clerical Officer	\$25 043	
Jane Lanigan-O'Keefe	Clerical Officer	\$22 122	
Kara Lee	Clerical Officer (Trainee)	\$15 928	
Sarah Day	Clerical Office (Trainee)	\$17 998	

\*Staff member has the use of a Government Credit card for official purposes only

Office of the Hon. Dean Brown, Minister for Human Services

Name of Staff Member	Job Title	Annual Salary	Additional Benefits
Ministerial Staff			
Pam Attwood	Acting Chief of Staff	\$75 000	- Carpark - Mobile Phone
Lyn Byrne	Exec Assistant (0.8 FTE)	\$31 781	
Kathryn Errey	Ministerial Adviser	\$55 000	- Mobile Phone
Dawn Story	Appointment Secretary	\$39 726	
Public Service Staff			
Terry Anderson	Policy Adviser, Health	\$55 171	- Mobile Phone
Karen Courtney	A/Correspondence Clerk	\$23 408	
Helen Dunham	Asst to Ministerial Advisers	\$39 726	
Helen Kay	Liaison Officer, FACS	\$50 828	
Tine Lloyd	Liaison Officer, SAHT	\$55 306	
Lisa Lockwood	A/Snr Admin Officer	\$41 363	
Maxine Menadue	Snr Health Adviser	\$77 024	- Carpark - Mobile Phone
Amy O'Reilly	A/Receptionist	\$23 394	
Debra Read	C'wealth/State Agreements	\$61 000	- Mobile Phone
Cathrine Seal	Correspondence Clerk	\$29 682	
Dawn Thomas	Admin Officer (0.4 FTE)	\$15 426	

No staff member has the use of a Government Credit card.

## Office of the Hon Dr Michael Armitage, Minister for Government Enterprises

Name of Staff Member	Job Title	Annual Salary	Additional Benefits
Ministerial Staff			
Stephen Wade	A/Chief of Staff*	\$84 584	- Carpark - Mobile Phone
Helen Goerecke	Personal Assistant	\$39 726	- Mobile Phone
Jane Cooper	Project Officer (Short-term contract)	\$60 000 pro rata	
Hugh Higgins	Project Officer (Short-term contract)	\$30 000	
Public Service Staff			
Carolyn Lee	Snr Admin Officer	\$48 059	
Ann Vine	Admin Officer	\$34 913	
Michelle Pryse	Parliamentary Officer	\$32 740	
April Davenport	Correspondence Officer	\$22 016	
Sonia Kowalski	Correspondence Officer	\$24 047	

\*Staff member has the use of a Government Credit card for official purposes only

Office of the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, Minister for Transport & Urban Planning, Minister for the Arts,  
Minister for the Status of Women

Name of Staff Member	Job Title	Annual Salary	Additional Benefits
Heather Webster	Chief of Staff*	\$90 000	- Carpark - Mobile Phone
Cynthia Richardson	Personal Assistant	\$39 726	- Carpark
Paula Victor	Ministerial Officer	\$45 000	- Carpark - Mobile Phone
Public Service Staff			
Deanne Cullingford	Media/Admin Support Officer	\$30 295	
Andrej Knez	Admin Support Officer	\$31 356	
Rachel Miers	Arts Officer	\$30 295	
Debbie Pieper	Parliamentary Officer	\$35 600	
Marlene Schiell	Receptionist/Admin Support	\$29 235	
Michelle Tait	Manager-Admin/Projects	\$42 444	

## Departmental Staff

Helen Dyer	Planning Liaison Officer	Funded by Planning SA	
Lyndall Rodella	Correspondence Officer	Funded by Transport SA	
Janet Worth	Arts Research/Policy Adviser	Funded by Arts SA	

\*Staff member has the use of a Government Credit card for official purposes only

## Office of the Hon. John Olsen, Premier, Minister for Multicultural Affairs

Name of Staff Member	Job Title	Annual Salary	Additional Benefits
Ministerial Staff			
Craig Bildstein	Chief of Staff*	\$105 000	Private Plated MV, mobile telephone, home delivered newspapers, carpark, home phone & fax lines rental and calls, reasonable removal expenses.
John Chapman	Chief Policy Adviser*	\$105 000	Mobile phone, carpark, home computer/fax line rental & calls.
Vicki Thomson	Principal Media Adviser*	\$80 000	Carpark, mobile phone, home phone rental plus two thirds of calls, home computer/fax line and calls.
Kenn Pearce	Communications Manager, Media Monitoring Unit*	\$65 000	Carpark, home fax & computer line and calls, home phone plus two thirds of calls, mobile phone.
Peter Green	Media Adviser*	\$63 869	Carpark, mobile phone, home computer/fax line rental and calls.
Leanne Weir	Media Adviser*	\$63 869	Carpark, mobile phone, home computer/fax line and calls.

Mark Williams	Media Adviser*	\$63 869	Carpark, mobile phone, home computer/fax line rental and calls.
Julie Gregory	Program Manager, Media Unit*	\$56 000	Carpark, mobile phone.
Joan Young	Community Liaison Officer*	\$54 860	
Gudrun Hanke	Personal Asst to Premier*	\$45 620	Carpark
Janette Peucker	Personal Asst to COS	\$40 000	Carpark
Cilla Williams	PA to Chief Policy Adviser & Chief Political Adviser	\$40 000	
Lorraine Damm	Administrative Asst	\$34 000	
Toni-Lee Thomas	Administrative Asst	\$34 000	
Nicole Brackenridge	Ministerial Assistant	\$33 500	
Christine Burford	Media Monitoring Asst	\$33 500	
Sara Dunstan	Media Monitoring Asst	\$33 500	
Jelena Jokic	Asst to PA to Premier	\$33 500	
Gina Perrotta	Media Monitoring Asst	\$33 500	
Michelle Prak	Media Monitoring Asst	\$33 500	

\*Staff member has the use of a Government Credit card for official purposes only

Public Service Staff			
David Abbott	Director, Administration	\$62 623	Home telephone rental
Desi Stergiou	A/Administrative Officer	\$39 947	
Sue Nash	Receptionist	\$31 239	
Annette Reinli	Correspondence Clerk	\$19 542	
		\$406.90 p.a. First Aid Allowance	
Mandy Sibonis	Correspondence Clerk	\$21 925	

#### UNITED WATER CONTRACT

	Balaklava	1995	86
		1996	69
		1997	196
	Mannum	1995	132
		1996	134
		1997	370
	Tailem Bend	1995	990
		1996	972
		1997	2 256

#### 26. Ms HURLEY:

1. Did United Water comply with the requirement under Schedule G of the Water Contract and complete by 30 June 1997 Detailed Asset Management Plans for the water and wastewater systems in order to identify performance standards and programs for maintenance and remedial work ?

2. Will the Minister table a copy of the Detailed Asset Management Plans for the water and wastewater systems in order to identify performance standards and programs for maintenance and remedial work?

#### The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:

1 & 2. United Water complied with the requirements under Schedule G of the Adelaide Outsourcing Contract and submitted initial Detailed Asset Management Plans to SA Water by 30 June 1997.

These plans are subject to ongoing review and upgrading, as detailed in the contract requirements, in order that the plans remain relevant in the light of changes to the operating requirements, asset performance and improved data collection and analysis techniques.

I do not propose to release the plans as they are commercial-in-confidence. Release of this information in the public arena is likely to adversely affect the business affairs of SA Water by revealing financial estimates in relation to certain asset management works. Access to this information by contractors wishing to bid for these works would reveal SA Water's cost estimates thereby reducing competition between contractors and compromising SA Water's opportunity to negotiate contracts that represent best value for money

#### ON-THE-SPOT FINES

39. **The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** How many on-the-spot fines were issued at Burra and surrounding districts between 1 August and 30 November in each of the years 1995 to 1997?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I shall provide a response to this question in two parts.

1. On-the-spot fines issued in the Burra district for the period 1 August to 30 November and in each of the years 1995 to 1997 are as follows:

1 August 1995 to 30 November 1995	36
1 August 1996 to 30 November 1996	54
1 August 1997 to 30 November 1997	206

2. I am only able to provide information for the fiscal year with regard to on the spot fines issued in surrounding districts for each of the years 1995 to 1997:

#### CROYDON PRIMARY SCHOOL

46. **Mr ATKINSON:** Will the Government meet the cost of hiring a mini-bus or van to take Croydon Primary School pupils displaced by the closure of their school to other State Schools in the area?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** As you are aware, after department review, and consultation with schools and school communities, a decision was made to close Croydon Primary School at the end of 1997. Families and students residing in Croydon and the adjacent suburbs are served by several nearby Government primary schools at Challa Gardens, Allenby Gardens, Kilkenny and Brompton.

I am advised by officers of the Department of Education, Training and Employment (DETE) that approximately 170 former Croydon Primary School students have smoothly transferred enrolment to local primary schools. Most families enrolled their children at the closest school to home and some exercised a choice and enrolled their children at a more distant school.

The Government provides transport assistance to students disadvantaged by distance, viz reside five kilometres or more from their nearest appropriate Government school. This bus service (where justified) and/or travel allowance is provided by the department in accordance with the School Transport Policy. Consequently, the assistance largely applies to students who attend schools in country areas throughout the State, and to a small number of students attending schools on the outer fringe of the metropolitan area of Adelaide.

Government assistance by way of subsidised student tickets and public passenger transport services is available to the majority of students who attend schools located throughout the metropolitan area of Adelaide. Currently, a student multi-trip (10) ticket costs \$5.50 and local public transport services are provided by TransAdelaide, SERCO or Hills Transit.

I am advised by officers of the department that all former

Croydon Primary School students reside less than five kilometres from a local Government primary school and therefore are not eligible for the school transport policy assistance. However, these students and thousands of other students in metropolitan Adelaide may purchase subsidised tickets at a fair price to access public buses or use whatever transport (private car, walking, bicycling) their families deem appropriate to get to and from school.

Ultimately, all families who reside less than five kilometres from their nearest Government primary or secondary school are responsible for getting their children to and from school. Accordingly, the Government cannot agree to meet the cost of hiring a mini bus or van to take Croydon Primary School students displaced by the closure to other State schools in the area.

#### TUNA FARM

45. **Mr ATKINSON:** Has the government granted permission for a tuna farm, near Kangaroo Head, Kangaroo Island and, if so, does the Government fear the farm's environmental effect and the consequential effects on tourism at Penneshaw and American River?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** The Government has not granted permission for a tuna farm, near Kangaroo Head, Kangaroo Island.

Application has been received by the Development Assessment Commission proposing to establish two aquaculture sites in the coastal waters of Kangaroo Island, adjacent Kangaroo Head. These applications are to conduct research and development into the holding and cultivation of Southern bluefin tuna.

The applications are currently being processed by planning officers within the Primary Industries and Resources Aquaculture Group. The Development Assessment Commission's Aquaculture Committee will make a decision on the applications—during their assessment they will consider environmental and social effects of the proposals.

#### FISHING, NET

50. **Mr ATKINSON:**

1. For what reasons does the ban on recreational netting in marine waters continue?

2. How many licensed recreational netters have there been in each of the years from 1994 to 1997?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:**

1. Many of the main inshore scalefish species targeted by fishers are showing signs of overfishing or are fully exploited. Recently concerns have been raised over the long term sustainability of the snapper fishery, and King George whiting spawning potential is estimated at approximately 4-5 per cent of maximum spawning potential. Additionally, fishing pressure on other species such as squid, mulloway, Australian salmon and Tommy ruff is increasing as more fishers target these each year. These species need to be protected from a level of over-exploitation.

The conservation of our valuable fish stocks has been given the highest priority by those responsible for management of our marine resources, with access by various interest groups regarded as a secondary objective. Recreational gill netting contributes to the overall fishing effort and exploitation of our fish resources, and tends to be non-selective in terms of both the number of fish and species that are taken. The mortality of unwanted, undersized or fish in excess of bag limits is very high once the fish has been meshed in a gill net.

The regulations applying to recreational gill netting prior to the banning of this activity in marine waters were inequitable, as they prevented access to the use of this particular type of gear for the majority of recreational anglers. This situation clearly did not comply with a basic principle for fisheries management in democratic societies; that if access to the use of a particular item of gear is allowed, it should be accessible to all.

The government continues to adopt this responsible and very necessary position in order to protect and conserve the valuable inshore fish stocks of South Australia, and to provide equity in fishing opportunities for all residents of South Australia.

2. Figures for the total number of registered recreational net licence holders in the years from 1994 to 1997 are not held, except where official correspondence addresses them. The available figures are

As at 8 August 1995           6 020

As at 23 February 1998       3 707

The figures published in the annual reports of PIRSA Fisheries relate to the number of recreational net registrations that have been

renewed in that financial year. Holders of these licences are required to renew their registrations every three years.

#### SCHOOL BUSES

52. **Mr LEWIS:**

1. In which suburbs, or neighbouring areas, within five kilometres of the greater metropolitan area of Adelaide are there Education Department school bus services operating?

2. Which of these services operate in whole or part within five kilometres of a public transport route which is serviced by buses contracted to and/or licensed and/or owned by either the Minister for Transport or Minister for Education?

3. Which schools located in the greater metropolitan area have school bus services?

4. Which schools, located within five kilometres of the greater metropolitan area, are attended by students from within the metropolitan area who travel to the school on school buses?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:**

1. Suburb
  - Cudlee Creek
  - Kersbrook
  - Humbug Scrub
  - Cockatoo Valley/Williamstown
  - Sandy Creek
  - Roseworthy
  - Lewiston
  - Angle Vale
  - Two Wells
  - Virginia
  - Bridgewater
  - Kuitpo/Meadows
  - Echunga
  - Sellicks Beach
  - Carey Gully
  - Hahndorf
  - Basket Range/Lenswood

2. All of the previously mentioned school bus services have other public transport bus routes operating within five kilometres, however, the public transport routes generally operate to or from different destinations, and at times that would not suit normal school starting and finishing times.

3. The following schools located in the greater metropolitan area of Adelaide are served by Department of Education, Training and Employment (DETE) operated or contracted school bus services. Furthermore, these long established school bus services are dedicated to the transport of eligible students in terms of the school transport policy and are free of charge to parents.

- Aberfoyle Park High School
- Aldinga Primary School
- Craigburn Primary School
- Evanston Park Primary School
- Gawler High School
- Gawler Primary School
- Heathfield High School
- Heathfield Primary School
- Elizabeth City High School
- Smithfield Plains High School
- McLaren Flat Primary School
- McLaren Vale Primary School
- Norwood-Morialta High School
- One Tree Hill Primary School
- Seaview High School
- Stradbroke Primary School
- Willunga High School
- Willunga Primary School

4. A survey has been carried out by officers from DETE of schools located within five kilometres of the greater metropolitan area. The results of the survey have revealed there are no schools where students travel from within the greater metropolitan area on department owned or contracted school bus services.

#### KULU PTY LTD

54. **Mr HILL:** What are the details of the contract with Kulu Pty Ltd engaged to provide assistance with the preparation of the State Marine Strategy and in particular:

(a) on how many occasions has Kulu Pty Ltd conducted public meetings on behalf of the Government;

- (b) when and at what locations were these meetings held; and  
 (c) how much has Kulu Pty Ltd been paid to date and what is the full cost of the contract?

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:**

- (a) Kulu Pty Ltd was engaged by the Marine and Estuarine Strategy steering committee following approaches made to 3 facilitators recommended by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources as suitable for the task. The approach was in writing followed by written agreement on terms of reference, time frame and cost. Kulu Pty Ltd has been engaged once by the steering committee to facilitate a series of 8 workshops and provide a report on the outcomes from each, followed by an overall summary.
- (b) The eight workshops were held at Millicent, Meningie, Glenelg, Kadina, Port Lincoln, Ceduna, Whyalla and Kingscote in mid to late August 1997.
- (c) Kulu Pty Ltd has been paid the full amount as agreed—\$8 000.

### SCHOOL CLOSURES

58. **Ms WHITE:** Has the Minister fulfilled his undertaking that closure of any school would result in the proceeds being returned to local schools and that additional funds and resources would be allocated to schools taking children from Croydon Primary School in relation to Allenby Gardens Primary School, which has gained 56 students from Croydon Primary School?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** As a result of the closures of Croydon and Croydon Park Primary Schools in 1997, a substantial amount of resources has been allocated to local schools. This has included \$1.7 million for the redevelopment of Croydon High School, \$374 500 for the upgrade of Kilkenny Primary School and \$512 400 for the upgrade of Challa Gardens Primary School. In addition, Back to School grants totalling \$226 570 have been allocated to these three schools.

The total valuation of the two closing school sites was \$ 1.94 million. The total money allocated to the redevelopment/upgrade of local schools, including Allenby Gardens Primary School, currently stands at \$2 842 710.

During the transition process in 1997, parents from Croydon Primary School were requested to indicate where their children would be enrolling in 1998. It was anticipated that most of the children would attend Kilkenny, Challa Gardens or Brompton Primary Schools, however, many parents held the decision to enrol their children at Allenby Gardens Primary School until January 1998.

Prior to receipt of final enrolments, the Principal of Allenby Gardens Primary School informed the District Superintendent that the school would be able to cope with what he anticipated to be approximately 20 enrolments from Croydon. However, 56 students had chosen to enrol at Allenby Gardens Primary School in 1998.

The amount of funds remaining in the Croydon Primary School consolidated account is still being determined as outstanding accounts are still being received from various companies. Once officers from Financial Services, Department of Education, Training and Employment (DETE), have an accurate balance, schools who have enrolled students from Croydon Primary School will receive a per capita share of any remaining funds.

A high priority has been placed on upgrading facilities at Allenby Gardens Primary School, with the school receiving a Back to School Grant of \$25 140. In addition, Allenby Gardens Primary School has received \$4 000 for furniture for new classes and can apply for additional funds when enrolments allow a tenth class to begin. A quantity of furniture was also supplied from the Croydon Primary School site.

Consideration is being given to reimbursing the school from the Minor Works Budget for approximately \$6 000 spent from school funds during the January vacation on upgrading another room (sainting, carpet, blackboard).

A transportable building will need upgrading to accommodate a new class later in the year and this project is currently being costed by officers from Services SA.

Allenby Gardens Primary School has successfully accommodated all new students and staffing has increased as per the staffing formula and specific needs of the school. This has resulted in Allenby Gardens Primary School being eligible for, and receiving, an additional 0.2 teacher library time an additional 0.5 administration time (deputy principal) 13.5 school support officer hours per week a total of 10 TRT days for Allenby Gardens and Kilkenny Primary Schools to support the transition of Aboriginal students during terms 1 and 2, 1998.

### ELECTRICITY, PRIVATISATION

67. **Mr ATKINSON:** How will the Government ensure that a privatised ETSA continues research into renewable energy through projects such as the wind farm at Cape Jervis, the Wilpena solar installation and the New Haven Energy roof?

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** It is anticipated that market mechanisms will continue to drive such projects particularly in view of the Prime Minister's commitment of 20 November, 1997 'to work with the States and Territories to source an additional two per cent of their electricity from renewable energy sources by 2010.'