

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 23 July 1998

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

**OMBUDSMAN (PRIVATE OR CORPORATISED
COMMUNITY SERVICE PROVIDERS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 4 June. Page 1112.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I move:

To amend the second reading motion as follows—Leave out all words after ‘be’ and insert ‘withdrawn and referred to the Legislative Review Committee for its report and recommendation’ in lieu thereof.

The Bill seeks to give the Ombudsman the jurisdiction to investigate complaints against the existing range of service providers if and when these services are privatised, outsourced or corporatised. The member for Kaurua in introducing this Bill has indicated that it does not extend the Ombudsman’s power to any new areas but seeks to ensure that people have access to the Ombudsman when there is a complaint about a Public Service provider, regardless of whether the public service is privatised, outsourced or corporatised.

If we consider aspects of the Ombudsman Act in its current form we note that it applies to administrative Acts of agencies, Public Service administrative units, other Government authorities and local government councils. The Bill seeks to extend the definition of ‘agency’, to which this Act applies, so that it includes a private community service provider and a corporatised community service provider. ‘Community service provider’ is defined as a company that provides certain services or, under a contract with the Crown, an agency or instrumentality of the Crown or a Government authority, manages the provision of such services. Members would note that the services to be covered are electricity, in the sense of retail, distribution and transmission, water and sewerage, public transport, prisons, hospitals, schools and services that may at some future time be prescribed by regulation.

The service provider may be either private or corporatised. The community service provider would be private if the company is not owned or controlled by or on behalf of the Crown and it would be corporatised if the company is owned or controlled by or on behalf of the Crown. We note that the Bill does not seek to cover the operation of hospitals or educational institutions unless a contract is in place with the Crown to provide such services. The Bill also allows private community service providers to be excluded from the application of the Act by regulation. The principle said to underpin the Bill is that the legal rights of individuals to seek redress in relation to Government funded services should not be diminished by contracting out.

It is of interest that in his twenty-second annual report the Ombudsman quoted a passage from a letter he sent to the then Premier as follows:

Assuming that there be commercialisation, corporatisation or privatisation of an agency or instrumentality of the Crown or part thereof, it would not be undesirable that in situations for which there

may no longer otherwise exist an avenue for independent external review of public complaints but for the reason shown in the report of the State-Owned Enterprises (Ombudsman and Officials Information Act) Committee (New Zealand), the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman be retained. The Ombudsman Act (New Zealand) and the New Zealand freedom of information legislation have been considered by a select committee to provide a desirable measure of accountability to members of the public.

The South Australian Ombudsman has expressed his support for the Bill in a letter to the member for Kaurua, which the honourable member read into *Hansard* during his second reading speech. In that letter the Ombudsman asserts that the proposal is in keeping with similar legislative movements interstate and overseas.

Amendment to the Ombudsman Act to allow the Ombudsman to deal with complaints against privatised or corporatised agencies or instrumentalities of the Crown was considered, according to the information given to me by Cabinet, back in 1995. At that time it was recognised that the matter was not clear-cut. Although it is essential that some accountability is maintained it may not be appropriate to treat commercialisation, corporatisation and privatisation in the same way. While it may be appropriate for a public corporation undertaking commercial activities to be covered, it may be undesirable for a privatised agency to be subject to scrutiny additional to that applicable to other like businesses. On balance, therefore, it was decided that the *status quo* should be maintained, that the Ombudsman should continue to have jurisdiction only over agencies of Government.

I believe that similar arguments are still relevant today. There is also concern that the Bill may go further than its stated aim. For example, in relation to electricity reform it would appear that any company that is involved in the retail, transmission or distribution of electricity would fall within the terms of the Ombudsman’s jurisdiction, even though it has no relationship with ETSA or Optima Energy. The Bill would pick up any electricity providers. Therefore, the Bill deals not with privatised service providers but with the privatisation of services. It would also result in the provision of electricity being treated differently from the provision of gas on the historical basis that a Government agency was originally involved in the provision of electricity.

In the package announced by the Premier on 30 June this year for the reform of the electricity sector the establishment of an Electricity Ombudsman and an industry economic regulator were announced. The Ombudsman is proposed to be electricity sector managed but linking in with the licensing by the regulator. The Ombudsman would have power to make orders up to \$10 000 or, by agreement between the parties, up to \$50 000. So, certainly the proposed system could be described as a robust system. I think it should also be recognised that other consumer protections in place under the State Fair Trading Act and the Federal Trade Practices Act continue to be available.

So, in light of what I have just said and in light of the fact that we have now flagged that an ombudsman or equivalent position will be needed in the privatisation of electricity (assuming that does pass in another place; we still have another Bill to pass through here but assuming it will pass the Parliament) we believe that this proposal that the member for Kaurua has put forward needs further consideration but that the Bill that is before us is not necessarily one that will meet the objects in all cases. Therefore, we believe that the best place to consider this further is in the committee that has the right to look at Bills before they come into the Parliament and

certainly Bills that need further investigation, namely, the Legislative Review Committee.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I intended to support the original motion moved by my colleague the member for Kaurna, but I am also happy to support the amendment moved by the member for Goyder. I am pleased to see that the Government is acknowledging the importance of the issue and is prepared to consider it further. I believe that indeed accountability, transparency and the rights of citizens to make complaints and have grievances properly attended to is a fundamental plank of our society. In relation to my own Bill before this House I have spent some time looking at the role of the Ombudsman in various jurisdictions, and I was given a paper by Ms Roberta Jamieson, the Ombudsman of Ontario. She gave a paper in September last year in relation to the matter of privatisation and the role of the Ombudsman. I found that paper very interesting reading. She canvassed many of the points that were covered by the member for Kaurna's Bill and certainly many of the issues that I had been considering.

In my belief a fundamental plank of a democratic society is the right of individuals who believe that they have been treated unfairly in the provision of public services—or indeed any services—to have access to an effective complaints mechanism, with an independent mechanism of last resort for unresolved complaints. We must all acknowledge that it is a basic tenet of a democratic society that people can seek redress from an independent authority. As we all know, the delivery of services by Government has changed greatly over the years and today, right across the world, particularly in developed countries, privatisation is occurring at a greater rate. We know that privatisation by various governments and instrumentalities seems to be occurring because of three main beliefs that people hold: first of all the belief or assumption the private sector can do it better, more effectively and more efficiently; secondly, the assumption that when the private sector does something it will do it more cheaply and there will be a saving to Government in public expenditure overall; and, thirdly, the assumption that smaller government and less provision of government services is a better way to go.

I take umbrage with those three points. In some cases perhaps some of those beliefs are correct but I certainly take umbrage with them as a general way to go. However, that is not the issue with this Bill. The issue is that when this occurs—and the fact is that it is occurring to a greater extent—we need to ensure that citizens have a right to have their complaints heard. In the paper I mentioned previously by Roberta Jamieson she states:

Today, Government is maintaining jurisdiction, maintaining control, but placing the administration of services in the hands of the private sector. This has the effect of keeping direct control at hand, but placing accountability at arm's length—out of reach of both the public and the legislature. The problem is that the private sector is not subject to provisions regarding conflict of interest, access to information, privacy restrictions, provincial auditors, etc.

That is the point: when public services are contracted out to the private sector, the private sector is not accustomed to behaving in the way that we expect of public services, with the checks and balances that ensure that citizens' rights are protected. This is why a Bill such as this—a change such as this—is important to allow all citizens to have their complaints heard and resolved, no matter who delivers the Public Service, whether it is the Government, the private sector or a corporatised body.

I will briefly mention an example which has just come to light in my electorate office over the past couple of days and which illustrates this to some degree. A constituent contacted my office to say that he had purchased a home and then had received a bill from SA Water addressed to the previous owner of the house, who had since died. My constituent rang SA Water and explained that the bill that had been sent was not his and that the previous owner had died. Some time later, a second bill arrived, but it was addressed to the late Mr So and So. It is very interesting that the bill was addressed in that way, but that is what happened. My constituent again contacted SA Water staff, who told him that they did not care who paid the bill—those were the words—as long as the bill was paid and that, as far as they were concerned, he, as the next owner of the property, was liable to pay the bill.

My constituent was surprised and annoyed at this and told SA Water that he would go to his local MP. He was told, 'Well, don't bother, because she will not be able to do anything because it is in the legislation.' We are still trying to get SA Water to tell us exactly where it is in the legislation, but it has not been able to do so. It illustrates the point that we are making: when things like that happen, what is a person to do? Obviously that is not right. How can somebody be liable for a bill that does not belong to them and how can a company get away with that sort of approach and attitude to a consumer in receipt of this sort of service?

It is interesting that that example should arise just as we are debating this Bill. We definitely need to have mechanisms in place so that private operators such as SA Water are accountable and are expected to behave in a fair and reasonable way with South Australian consumers.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: Perhaps. I reiterate that these days there is a marked decrease in the level of trust that the public has for Governments, politicians and for the services that Governments provide. It is very important for us to remember that nothing increases the trust of the public in the Government more than if people feel that if they have a grievance they know that it will be listened to thoroughly and that it will be properly and seriously resolved. Whether or not they win the day is of lesser importance. The fact is that people need to feel confident that, if something goes wrong, if they have a grievance, it will be taken seriously and it will be dealt with.

We need to examine this issue, as it is being examined in other countries because, as I said before, the privatisation issue is not being experienced just in Australia; it is happening in many other countries. We need to remember that accountability, transparency and the balancing of the rights of the individual against the rights of the service provider are very important issues, and I believe that what the member for Kaurna has suggested is of benefit to our community. I look forward to the deliberations of the Legislative Review Committee, and I hope that those deliberations occur in a timely fashion.

Mr HILL (Kaurna): I appreciate the opportunity to speak again in this debate, and I will conclude my remarks by addressing at least one or two of the issues raised by the member opposite in his comments earlier today. I also thank members on this side of the House who spoke in favour of the proposal. I am disappointed that it is to be sent to a committee to be examined, but I would rather that happened than it drop off the Notice Paper altogether. I hope that, when the committee looks through this legislation, it does so with

sympathy and on its merits and does not see it as an attempt to score political points.

In his remarks earlier today, the Government Whip made the point that there would be an anomaly if this were passed, that one privatised instrumentality, that is, ETSA or the electricity generating companies, would be looked over by the Ombudsman whereas the gas company and other energy generators would not. That is true, because all my legislation attempts to do is ensure that those services of the State which are currently supervised by the Ombudsman will continue to be so supervised regardless of whether they are privatised, outsourced, commercialised or whatever. That is all that my legislation attempts to do. It is not an attempt to re-describe the boundaries of the Ombudsman's power.

If members opposite are worried about those sorts of inconsistencies, I would have no objection to an amendment which allowed the Ombudsman to have authority over a range of energy providers. If the Government wants to have the gas company or Boral supervised by the Ombudsman, I have no objection to that, but that would be more adventurous than I am attempting with my legislation. My Bill attempts to ensure that what is currently covered by the Ombudsman continues to be covered by the Ombudsman, no more and no less. It is a simple matter.

The arguments for having the Ombudsman maintain that authority are quite simple. People are used to dealing with the Ombudsman when it comes to instrumentalities such as ETSA but also public hospitals, public schools, and so on. The confidence that they have in those instrumentalities is in part grounded in the fact that they have proper accountability systems, including the Ombudsman. All this legislation seeks to do is to maintain confidence in those instrumentalities. There needs to be some sort of process of deciding how the public's rights are protected when an instrumentality is privatised. The simple way of doing so is to make sure that the Ombudsman continues to have the power to supervise those authorities.

With those concluding remarks, I support the motion to refer the Bill to the Legislative Review Committee. I hope that the committee looks at it sensibly and does not sit on it for ever and a day and ignore it completely. I know that with certain members that will not happen, and I look forward to the opportunity to give evidence to the committee.

Amendment carried; motion as amended 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 DECS*Tech* 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 March. Page 811.)

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): In speaking in support of this motion, I return to some points I made in my speech relating to the budget. I said then—and it still applies—that the three major concerns of people in my electorate of Elizabeth are: first, getting a job; secondly, making ends meet; and, thirdly, having access to services. I will use those three points in relation to this motion and the importance of having a mechanism in place to retain and monitor public education services in our State.

I refer, first, to the issue of getting a job. No-one could possibly argue against the notion that having a sound education—that is, completing secondary school and then completing a further period of training at TAFE, another vocational training institution or a university—is absolutely critical in getting a job. No-one could argue against that. I make the point that we in South Australia are facing a very serious situation in relation to the retention rates of our young people in our secondary schools.

We need to think very carefully about this very serious situation because what we are finding is that we have a terrible decrease in the retention rate, which means that people are not even getting to the end of first base, that is, their secondary education, let alone successfully completing further education and training. At the beginning of this year ABS statistics revealed that the number of children completing year 12 in South Australia's government schools fell again in 1997 to only 66.9 per cent. According to the ABS, the retention rate in 1993 was 86.3 per cent; in 1994, it fell to 81.7 per cent; in 1995, it collapsed to 71.4 per cent; in 1996, it fell again to 68.4 per cent; and in 1997, as I have just said, it fell to 66.9 per cent. In other words, one third of our students chose to leave school before they completed year 12 and their SACE certificate.

The Government in responding to those sorts of figures always makes two points: first, that the high number of part-time students that were not included in the ABS figures made a difference to the statistics; and, secondly, that students were leaving school to go to jobs. Both of these arguments have been proven to be false. This was certainly backed up by the Olsen Government when it released Education Department figures showing that, even when part-time students were included in retention rates, the number of students completing year 12 declined dramatically from 99.1 per cent in 1992 to 71.2 per cent in 1996. Of course, we all know that the seriously high youth unemployment rate in this State obviously indicates that the second point—that is, that students are leaving school to go to jobs—is simply not true.

Even more concerning is the fact that these retention rates are average retention rates across the State. Therefore, if we say that we have an average retention rate of 67 per cent (or near enough) across the State of South Australia, it means that the retention rate for some schools in some areas is way below 67 per cent. It would not be very hard for people to guess where those retention rates will be the lowest. When we look at that issue we find the usual result; that is, the schools with the lowest retention rates are those in country areas and in the poorer areas of the metropolitan area. This is probably one of the most serious situations confronting us. What is happening in our schools? What is happening to our young people, one third of whom do not even stay to finish their education? If that does not require some serious consideration, some serious listening and some serious changes for the future, I do not know what else does.

In reference to vocational education, I noticed in the budget this year that the State Government has signalled

significant cuts to TAFE colleges across our State. Budget documents and departmental documents obtained by the Opposition indicate that there are to be significant funding decreases to TAFE institutes: \$3.2 million this year; \$7.9 million next year; and \$9.5 million the year after. If that does not have an effect on vocational education, vocational education that is delivered post secondary and also during the senior secondary years, I do not know what will. More than ever, we need to be aware that this is happening, and we need to monitor closely the effect on the community, young people and their prospects in our community over these times.

The second point is the issue of making ends meet, which is a big issue for people in my electorate. One thing that I mentioned in my budget speech and which made quite an impression on me was the statistics provided by SACOSS reporting the fact that in South Australia in excess of 40 per cent of families now receive less than 60 per cent of average male weekly earnings. In other words, nearly half the families in South Australia are doing it really tough—not just ordinary tough but really tough. So, making ends meet and stretching the dollar is a huge issue for a significant proportion of our community. What we are seeing in our schools is a withdrawal of funds and a shifting of responsibility for funding from the State Government to parents. For instance, in the first four years of this current Government it has cut education spending by \$133 million—and it is not stopping there. This most recent budget has shown more cuts.

The capping of school support grants will produce a saving of \$6.4 million for the Government. What it means is that, for schools to be able to provide their basic curriculum and the sort of education we require for the smart State and the clever country, the people picking up this cost will be the parents. We have already seen large increases in fees across schools, and again it is the kids living in communities where there is not a lot of money who will miss out because they will not be able to pay the fees. In finishing, I have touched on only two points in speaking on a huge issue. The point is that at all times education is supremely important. We need to ensure that we keep an eye and an ear on what is happening. This Government is renowned for its secrecy: we need a select committee to do what I have said.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I oppose this motion as I believe the specific areas nominated for investigation have been adequately addressed in a number of initiatives put in place by this Government that were previously ignored by the former Labor Government. I also believe that a select committee in another place looked into these issues and never brought down a report. I understand the committee was in place for four years, the terms of reference were similar and there was ample time for an interim report to be tabled. It would be a waste of time and money to set up another select committee to go over similar ground again.

In addition, I have found that the Minister has an open door, and specific issues can be discussed with him at any time. I know this, because I regularly take the opportunity to discuss with him the problems in my electorate, and the Minister has met with delegations from my electorate as well as visiting it, only recently over three days.

Excellent progress has been made in providing information technology to all schools in the State as a result of the EDSAS and DECStech 2001 technology programs. There are more than 70 education institutions in the electorate of Flinders and these programs have enabled the primary and secondary schools sector to increase considerably the number

of computers available to students. Many of these schools are well on the way to achieving the target of one computer to every five students by 2001. Some schools have already reached this level and some are already looking to upgrade their older computers, many of which were provided by school parent groups and other community groups in country towns who actively fund raised in order to buy computers to ensure that their children were able to keep up with modern technology during an era of Labor neglect.

As a direct result of these Liberal Government initiatives, computer skills are being taught to students from reception through to year 12. Children as young as seven and eight are able competently to manipulate word processing, spreadsheets, publishing and animating packages. They are creating their own home page on the Internet with graphics and text, and displaying their school to the entire global village. Many students are talking via the Internet to students in other parts of Australia and indeed the world.

Children are familiar with CD-ROM and can have a story read to them while the words are highlighted, thereby helping them to identify the words as they are uttered. They can access and download information from intranet systems for school projects and choose from a wealth of information and graphics contained on disc.

Country students continue to face many challenges in gaining an education which their city counterparts do not. However, the funding provided by this Government which has allowed increased access to technology has alleviated some of the difficulties of isolation and inability to access information that country students have traditionally faced.

I commend this Government's introduction of incentives to teachers to undertake country service. Eyre Peninsula faces constant difficulties in attracting and retaining professional people to the region. I applaud the introduction of inducements which encourage teachers to come to the country and make it attractive for them to stay. Once we can get teachers to come it is usually not difficult to keep many of them as they find that the lifestyle is congenial and the country people very welcoming.

Increased funding has allowed all the schools in my region to attend to urgently needed repairs and maintenance. When this funding was introduced most of the schools were in a very degraded and unattractive state. I believe this situation made it difficult for teachers and students to feel pride in their school environment and morale was low. Many classrooms had not been painted in decades, carpets were threadbare and furniture, fixtures and fittings were in need of repair. These are now being attended to and there is an increased pride in the schools. Children are thrilled with their new look classrooms and are very proud to show their parents and visitors around. Airconditioning that is gradually being placed in libraries, resource centres, computer, science and other classrooms as funds are made available is greatly improving the learning environment, particularly in summer, in central Eyre Peninsula where the heat is not alleviated by a cool sea breeze in the evening.

Having attended to urgent repairs and maintenance, many schools are now undertaking outside projects, planting gardens and erecting much needed shade for eating and play areas. The Education Department emphasises duty of care towards their charges and I applaud these sun safe projects as a very necessary precaution against the increase in skin cancers in Australia. Several years ago country communities were ravaged by the combined effects of drought and high interest rates. There was a marked population drift towards

metropolitan areas as farmers were forced to leave their properties and businesses closed as they were unable to meet extremely high interest payments. Despite a significant drift from Eyre Peninsula, the region has been relatively unaffected by school closures; in fact, I believe the last school closure occurred when the former Government was in office. Strategies have been put in place where possible to allow schools to remain open. Small schools have been annexed to larger ones in order to allow the small school to remain open, providing better educational outcomes and greater consumer choice into the bargain.

My electorate covers an area of 55 000 square kilometres. Many of the schools are extremely isolated and those schools which have been affected by falling enrolments and a subsequent loss of teachers are often reliant on the open access system to provide instruction in subjects for which a face to face teacher cannot be provided. I believe that this system, while not perfect, operates quite effectively and that some schools have year 12 students for the first time while others have increasing numbers, owing in part to the large range of subject options now available.

Vocation education training provides a means for the Government to focus on improving choices for our young people. Prior to leaving school they get some experience in their nominated field of work before gaining an apprenticeship or traineeship. This allows them to make an informed decision about their future employment and often has the result that students decide not to pursue a particular avenue.

My observation of the schools in my electorate indicates that the many new initiatives have been very well handled and are providing excellent education outcomes for students. I reiterate that I oppose the motion as I believe an investigation by a select committee is unnecessary and both funds and time could be put to better use.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I join with my colleague the member for Flinders in opposing this motion. It is simply a mischief motion which is designed to try to stir up something to which this Government has been attending ever since we got into government about 4½ years ago. I am absolutely staggered to see before us today this motion which seeks to set up a select committee to look into the matters to which we have been attending in a very positive way for the past 4½ years. What happened in the previous 11 years? Virtually nothing! The amount spent on computers in schools prior to the Liberal Government's coming into office was virtually zero. That is how much thought—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder has the call.

Mr MEIER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. That is how much consideration the Labor Party had for students in schools with regard to the provision of computers. The former Labor Government did not want to know about providing computers. What has this Government done? In the immediate past year 1997-98, spending under the DECStech 2001 project has amounted to \$5.2 million, representing \$4 million on the computer subsidy scheme and \$1.2 million in placing computers in preschools. We are spending millions of dollars putting computers in schools so that, at long last, students are able to have access to computers, no matter where they are getting their education. Before that it was very limited and depended entirely on the local volunteer parent group whether schools were able to raise money to get computers.

Since Labor left office the Government has taken really positive action: \$2 million was distributed to schools in training and development grants and a further \$300 000 was spent on the provision of other training programs; \$7.5 million was allocated to software, as well as salaries for district support officers who provide technical support for schools, cash grants to schools and general project costs. Funds of \$28 million have been committed for networks in schools, including file servers over the five years of the project.

I therefore urge all members of the House to oppose the motion. It is time that members opposite recognised that their shadow Minister for Education is simply trying to make mischief in the Parliament. Members opposite should see through that and not support her motion. There is absolutely no point in seeking to support the motion, and I believe that deep down the member for Taylor recognises that this is a nothing motion.

Why should we set up a committee to consider matters which were not acted on under the previous Labor Government but which are now really being acted on? I will tell the House why: it results from sheer, pure jealousy. They cannot wear the fact that they did nothing and that we are doing something. What do they want to do? They want to interfere and say, 'Let's see whether we can throw a spanner in the works of what the Government is doing. We recognise that it is receiving accolades for all its work.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Thank you, members.

Mr MEIER: All they want to do is to have a select committee so that they can say, 'We were able to get additional funds in some other area, too.'

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Why don't you start taking a responsible and a positive attitude towards schooling in this State and support the programs that this Government has undertaken? Members need to be made aware that these programs have been implemented at the worst time in this State's financial history. I do not have to remind members that we had the State Bank disaster and many other financial disasters which have left us with the worst debt this State has ever had. Yet our Government is spending more on education and millions more in the computer area than has ever been spent before. It is an absolute disgrace that a motion such as this should have come before the House. I would hope that the shadow Minister in future will not seek to bring similar motions before the House. The honourable member should have listened to her Leader during the last election campaign when he indicated—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MEIER:—your Leader—that he would seek to have a bipartisan working relationship with the Government. We have seen absolutely nothing of that bipartisanship. This is a classic example where you are seeking to knock the positive achievements of this Government. It is absolutely outrageous.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth will come to order.

Mr MEIER: Thank you very much your protection, Mr Speaker. The sooner this motion is dispensed with, the better off we will be, and I urge all members, on both sides of the House, to vote against it.

Members interjecting:

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I am glad that people realise I am standing. I oppose the motion to establish a committee but not because I oppose improvements in education. Members on both sides would know of my commitment to education. I would support this motion if it were retrospective—if it applied before 1993.

Members interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: Yes, you can carry on talking. The Opposition is committed not to education but to committees. Anybody would think that, since 1993, education has been neglected and somehow we have gone back to the Dark Ages. However, in reality members opposite would know that we have not gone—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elder will come to order.

Mr SCALZI: —back to the Dark Ages: the Goths and Vandals have not attacked Rome. Since 1993, there has been a refreshing change in education. There has been an honesty. We accept there have been problems. We are having a renaissance in education. When does a renaissance take place? It takes place when there is new technology and a new sense of direction. That is what this Government has done. It is setting the base for education in the twenty-first century by supporting computer technology, by making sure that every student will have access to computers and by ensuring proper staffing development for teachers to enable that technology to be used to the best advantage for our students.

Members opposite would have us believe that somehow there has been doom and gloom, that we have closed schools and that somehow we have gone backwards. The reality is that school closures and amalgamations took place well before 1993. As members opposite would know, as a teacher I taught in a Labor heartland. I could see how in the past those needy students were neglected by the very people who claim to have a social conscience.

Members interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: They were neglected. Tell me what happened to the Ingle Farm schools of this world and what happened to the northern suburbs. I did most of my teaching in those areas, and the member for Elizabeth would know that. Those areas were neglected, because they were in safe Labor seats. That is where they did not support the things that needed to be supported. I enjoyed teaching in those areas, and I had a commitment to the students. I am pleased to note that this Government has a commitment to education, although it is not perfect. We would have liked to be in a position where we could give more to education.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: I am glad that the member for Elizabeth acknowledges that. I know that she genuinely supports education, otherwise she would not have spent most of her working life in education. The reality is that we were strapped for cash. Nevertheless, education has been a priority of this Government and it will continue to be a priority of this Government. With regard to school closures, nothing has changed. We are sticking to the same principles that I believe are correct, that is, taking into account the wishes of the community in those areas, addressing properly the concerns and making sure there are adequate subject choices for students. At the end of the day, what makes a school is not the building but the students.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth will have to learn to contain herself.

Mr SCALZI: If that means that we have to move a school up the road for the wellbeing of the students, so be it. I went through it when Ingle Farm, Valley View and Para Vista schools amalgamated. In the end, it was the best thing that happened for that area. Let us not be territorial. Education should not be about our being territorial, establishing committees and point scoring. The education of our students means more than that. I am pleased to say that this Government, with the limited resources it has, has shown it has a real commitment to education, and it will continue to have such a commitment. We still have a better staff to student ratio than has the rest of Australia. It does not mean that we should not improve it.

Let us acknowledge where we are before we say where we want to be, and let us acknowledge where we have been in order to understand where we are today. The reality is that this State has been in a financial mess—and I am not blaming just members opposite. Let us acknowledge that the 1980s was the decade of greed and of making unsound economic decisions. Perhaps if we had been in power, we might have made some of those decisions as well. Let us acknowledge that the reality is that we were in deep financial troubles, and you cannot deliver to the ideal if you do not have the resources to do so. Our establishing a committee will not all of a sudden give us all the resources we want and give us utopia. It will not happen.

Let us be realistic: this is just trying to score political points on education. I will not stand by and be silent about this, because I have seen it: I have seen what has happened in the past 10 or 15 years. It is not, as I said, since 1993. When there is constructive criticism, I accept and acknowledge it. We must have education as a top priority, and I will fight within the Government to ensure that education is given top priority. When discussions about budgets come along, members opposite and my fellow teachers can be assured that they have a voice within Government to make sure that education is given a top priority.

Ms Stevens: You are nowhere near them.

Mr SCALZI: We are nowhere near them? I know the benefits that have occurred in my electorate alone. Three or four weeks after I was elected in Hartley I was invited by the Principal of East Marden Primary School to go and look at the state of the school. I should have taken a video recording of the neglect in maintenance over the years of the facilities at that school. If they go there now, members will see the changes. They will see what this Government has put into maintenance and into bringing those schools up to scratch.

In fact, members opposite can look at what happened to this building alone, in terms of maintenance. Where was this building before 1993? It is true that this Government has spent money: it is the same with schools, hospitals and so on, even with limited resources. Ask the members opposite and the members on this side who had two or three people sharing their rooms. You cannot have those standards, and I am pleased to note that members opposite have acknowledged that this Government has improved maintenance in this place—as it should have, because this is a great building and should be our pride.

Ms Stevens: What does this have to do with the select committee?

Mr SCALZI: The select committee means that, with the resources that we have available, this Government has put education first and will continue to do so. The capital works and maintenance programs that I have seen carried out at East Marden, Newton, Hectorville and at Norwood/Morialta are

just a small example of what has happened statewide as a result of this Government's commitment to education. We have placed the schools on the Internet, basically, to make sure that they are up to date with modern technology so that they can be part of the twenty-first century in education.

Mr WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

BANKS, COUNTRY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Venning:

That this House condemns the major banks for the closure of many branches in country regions with no consideration for the impact on local communities.

(Continued from 9 July. Page 1418.)

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): I move the following amendment to the motion:

Line 2—After 'country regions', insert 'and the State and Federal Liberal Governments for their neglect of rural and regional areas of South Australia, in particular their employment policies, which have seen many public sector jobs, both State and Federal, lost to regional South Australia.'

Whilst it is all very well for the member for Schubert to rise to his feet, as he did the last time we debated this matter, and condemn banks for the loss of jobs in regional areas (not only in South Australia but elsewhere), with which I agree with him, it is also important, as the member for Gordon pointed out in his contribution to the debate on this motion, that many jobs have been lost in rural and regional South Australia as a result of Government decisions in cutting back its own work force in regional South Australia.

I can cite a few simple examples of what the State Government has failed to do, which inaction has cost a number of jobs in regional areas. If we look at the outsourcing and contracting of much of the work in the State Department of Transport, we find one small example in the town of Hawker. Previously, seven persons were employed directly by the Department of Road Transport on road maintenance. They lived in Hawker and spent their wages in Hawker, their families grew up in Hawker and went to the local schools in Hawker. That work was privatised and now outside workers come to do the work that previously was done by those persons who lived in Hawker. Those families in the main have had to leave Hawker to find alternative employment. That means less money being spent in that local community, and this has a further detrimental impact on employment opportunities in that town in the private sector.

There is the Government's contract with respect to EDS and the supply of computer equipment and the like to Government agencies in those rural areas. Last year, when I was in Port Augusta I found that the local supplier who used to go to towns such as Hawker to fix computers at the Hawker Hospital, for example, no longer has that the work. The computer must be sent, if it is to be fixed at all, to Adelaide.

Mr MEIER: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I have only just had the wording on the amended motion given to me. In my opinion, the amended motion is completely different from the original motion which related to the closure of banks. This amended motion has no reference to banks at all, and I seek your ruling, Sir, as to whether the House can accept this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is of the view that, whilst it broadens the motion, it does not actually negate it, and the Chair is happy to accept the form of words before it.

Mr CLARKE: Thank you, Sir. Another example relates to SA Water.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The proposition we have before us is to add certain words, although by inference I take it that the member for Ross Smith in his amendment intended to cause the deletion of the words 'with no consideration for the impact on local communities'. Although those words do not appear, the honourable member did not move that they be deleted, so I presume that they still stand as part of the question.

The SPEAKER: I understand that they do. The member for Ross Smith can confirm that in his contribution.

Mr CLARKE: Yes, you are exactly right, Sir. In response to the member for Hammond, I do not seek to delete those words. However, given that my time is fast running out, members should look at the accounting department of SA Water. Nearly 16 clerical jobs were lost between Berri, Port Lincoln, Crystal Brook and Mount Gambier because the Government of the day decided to centralise the accounting functions in Adelaide and took three or four paid positions from each of those rural areas. There was no reason, in my view, if there was to be a centralisation of accounting functions, why that could not have happened in one of those major rural centres, but it did not happen.

As a result of the privatisation of Australian National, a decision of the Federal Government, nearly 800 additional jobs have been lost over the past 12 months as a direct result of that privatisation, particularly on Eyre Peninsula and at Port Augusta. The former Federal Minister for Regional Development, Mr Sharp—of all things a member of the National Party, who is now retiring from Federal Parliament—stated only about two years ago that there was no constitutional or any other reason why the Commonwealth Government should be involved in regional development. Also, the Federal Liberal Government cut the funding to the REDO organisations which were established under the Keating Government to assist rural and regional areas throughout Australia to develop alternative sources of employment.

So, there has been a constant erosion of jobs in the rural areas. In Port Pirie, the Community and Public Sector Union last year undertook a survey of its members. It issued them with plastic money, and they went about their normal business of shopping at the various stores, supermarkets, petrol stations and the like to determine the amount of money that would be spent by members in a one month period in that local community. If the figures were extrapolated, members of the CPSU in the City of Port Pirie itself would spend between \$1.5 million and \$2 million of their wages.

Many of those jobs in the past 12 months have disappeared because of the direct actions of the Federal Liberal Government in abolishing jobs, such as in the former Commonwealth Employment Service. Members of the CPSU in full-time career positions in Port Pirie spent between \$1.5 million and \$2 million. That has largely been sucked out of that local community and it further impacts on private sector jobs in those areas.

It is all very well for the member for Schubert to condemn banks—and I join him in that. However, the Federal and State Governments must give the lead in regional development and, in particular, provide the sheet anchor of employment in those local communities by having direct public sector jobs in those

areas, not only to provide a much needed service to regional and rural areas of the State but also to provide the sheet anchor of employment in those areas in order to attract and retain private sector jobs in those very regions.

I will be very interested to see what the member for Gordon will do in relation to my amendment because, if he is to follow what he said on the last occasion on this matter, he should join the Opposition and support that amendment. Of course, as we found yesterday, the member for Gordon is looking for a spine to shiver up from time to time. This will be an important issue for him as a member representing a country region in this State also to the lay the blame where it properly applies, that is, among the State and Federal Liberal Governments which have wreaked havoc on regional centres throughout Australia, and South Australia in particular, because of their blind ideology of contracting out public sector jobs which have been lost for all time in those areas.

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

Mr SCALZI secured adjournment of the debate.

MOUNT LOFTY CATCHMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.C. Wotton:

That this House calls on the Government to give urgent consideration to the need for incentives to be provided which will encourage the retention of land for primary production in the Mount Lofty catchment recognising the importance and the fragility of the catchment in providing an essential source of water for metropolitan Adelaide and in particular calls on the Government to introduce as policy the waiving of costs associated with the amalgamation of titles within the catchment as one such important incentive.

(Continued from 4 June. Page 1122.)

Mr HILL (Kaurna): I rise to speak briefly on this motion which was moved by the member for Heysen. The proposal before the House is that incentives be provided to assist landowners in the Adelaide Hills and Mount Lofty catchment area who have multiple titles effectively being used for rural or agricultural purposes. The honourable member's motion would attempt to encourage the Government to provide incentives to have those titles collapsed into one title—in other words, to make it easier for landowners who have multiple titles to end up with one title. That seems to me to be a sensible proposition because, if we can encourage landowners in the Hills to reduce the risk of development there, that must be a good thing for the general environment of the Hills and also for issues associated with the management of water.

As I understand it, individuals who have multiple titles, all of which are being used for rural or primary production purposes, do get a rebate on their rates. They do not have to pay the appropriate rate for separate titles: they pay a rural rebate. So, there is an incentive for them under the current rules to keep multiple titles, and that promotes the possibility of development down the track and the breaking up of those land holdings.

So, what the honourable member is suggesting in this motion is very sensible. If we encourage people with multiple titles to collapse them into one title, and thereby reduce the chances of development in the Hills, it is a good thing which should be supported.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW secured the adjournment of the debate.

ABC DIGITAL TRANSMISSION

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.B. Such:

That this House calls on the Federal Government to provide the necessary resources to enable the ABC to adequately prepare for and introduce digital transmission of services to both city and country areas.

(Continued from 4 June. Page 1123.)

Mr De LAINE (Price): As we all know, the ABC plays a very important and significant part in the communication of information in Australia, and it is a very worthwhile organisation to keep going in a democracy such as ours. Therefore, it is very important that the Federal Government provides the necessary resources for the ABC to quickly move to digital technology. The member for Fisher is quite right: the \$30 million recently allocated in the Federal budget is totally inadequate for this transition, and the necessary funds should be made available by the Federal Government to enable the ABC to quickly change to this new technology. I strongly support the motion moved by the member for Fisher.

Motion carried.

CHILD CARE

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms White:

That this House—

(a) condemns the Federal Government for cutting nearly \$1 billion from child care after three budgets;

(b) notes that this has forced an increase in fees for child care, closure of 14 South Australian child-care centres, the loss of an estimated 200 child-care workers and has threatened the viability of many other child-care services;

(c) expresses concern that as a result of the cuts, child care is no longer affordable for many families, that working parents have been disadvantaged and in some cases have to forgo employment and study; and

(d) calls on the Federal Government to reinstate adequate funding to child care in South Australia.

(Continued from 2 July. Page 1265.)

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I am very pleased to be able to speak on this matter today, when it has been given a good airing, for a change, in our local press. I have not noticed over the years that the *Advertiser* is particularly persuaded to talk about socialist feminist issues, so I think the fact that today it is commenting on the way in which the Federal Liberal Government policies are forcing women out of the work force and affecting the quality of care that children get indicates that the closures of child-care centres can no longer be seen as some sort of fringe issue. They affect ordinary women, ordinary children and ordinary families—people who are working as caterers, bar attendants, students and people who are working in a range of professions. Child care is often talked about as a middle class issue. This is simply not true. The people who are most affected by the provision of child-care services are those who are earning below average incomes.

One group that I feel particularly strongly about in relation to the impact of child care cuts is supporting parents, who often realise that their only chance of providing a decent life for themselves and their children is by going to TAFE or university and developing some workplace skills. There are many reports now of women, in particular, in these situations having to drop out of their study and abandon their hopes for their future and for their family because they can no longer

afford the extra \$10 or \$12 a week additional child care costs. People who deal in share returns of \$600 000 a year probably find it difficult to see how their policies of requiring parents to pay an extra \$10 or \$12 a week can have such a drastic effect on their lives.

This is one of the difficulties that we face in our community today. It has almost become populist to say that politicians do not understand the lives of ordinary people. But when policy makers can make such cruel decisions as to force people to abandon their plans for study or work because they simply cannot afford the additional \$10 or \$12 a week in child care costs (and that is the bottom end of the range) there is something very wrong in Australia. I am standing here to say that I do understand it, and I know that many of my colleagues on this side understand it absolutely. We understand it both because of our personal decisions and because we take the time to read information provided to us by those who are representing women in this situation.

I would like to spend some of my time talking about the submission by the Working Women's Centre to the Senate inquiry into child care. This provides some vivid illustrations of what happens to families when they can no longer provide access to child care that is preferred. Many of those parents are now dropping out of the work force, and the *Advertiser* indicates that the ABS reports that, in South Australia, 22 100 women in both full-time and part-time work left work in the past 14 months. While the ABS figures cannot indicate conclusively that this was because of child care cuts, the *Advertiser* article further indicates that the ABS has become so interested in this matter that it is now monitoring it to try to see whether there is a causal link there. The anecdotal evidence says that there is a very strong link there.

Parents now have to find alternative sources of child care (where they are not dropping out of work or study) and, according to the Working Women's Centre study, which gained information from 461 parents, 124 of them now have to juggle a variety of three or more combinations of care. Imagine the executive management skills that are required to manage that situation! Also, think for a minute about the impact on children when they do not have any consistency in the sorts of limits that are defined for them and the rules that are set for them. They have no routine about the food that they eat, when they sleep, when they play, about how or when they are changed and what sort of educational stimulation they get for their important small minds.

Another major issue is what happens to parents who require extended hours care. The capping on the hours that are supported in child-care centres is making it very difficult for centres to provide long day care, and especially care in the early morning and the late evening, when fewer people require the service. Fewer people require the service, but for those people who work some distance from where they live, the amount of travel that is involved can be one or more hours.

Where parents are fearful of losing their jobs, we know that many are working vast amounts of unpaid overtime. This makes it very difficult for them, particularly for people in my electorate and farther out in the electorates of Kaurana and Mawson who work in town, to get back to the child-care centre before 6 o'clock, which is the standard time when centres close. It means that children have to be cared for alternatively for more than 11 hours a day, for more than 50 hours a week. These parents, particularly those who are working as waiting staff, musicians (who work very late hours), all sorts of shift workers, particularly nurses, those in

many of our manufacturing industries, where Federal and State Government policies are encouraging enterprise agreements that require people to work a shift covering 24 hours a day, often without additional recompense, find it very difficult when the child care costs increase, because of the decreased hours subsidy in a week. For those who use occasional care, the cap on that is also causing difficulties.

Being at home with a young child, particularly two or three young children, is a very demanding and stressful occupation. Many parents today find that, as they do not have their mothers and grandmothers around to relieve them of that burden at times, they need to use some respite care. The hours for this have now been cut back. Those parents also are facing great difficulties. Unfortunately, I need to move the following amendment to paragraph (b) of the motion:

Delete '14' and insert '15'.

I do so because today the *Advertiser* reports the closure of yet another child-care centre. I conclude by using the words of some of the parents who were interviewed by the Working Women's Centre about what they are doing to overcome both the loss of access to child care and the quality problems now that parents have to provide meals and nappy services instead of those being provided by the centre. Often, these are not of the same quality as provided by the centre; but the parents are saying:

I will consider not having another child. Two children in child care will be too expensive.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

GRAND JUNCTION ROAD

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr De Laine:

That this House—

- (a) opposes the Government's proposal to establish a 12 hour per day clearway on Grand Junction Road between South and Port Roads;
- (b) opposes the Government's decision to allow A-double road trains to operate on Grand Junction Road between South and Port Roads;
- (c) calls on the Government to put a freeze on both proposals until a thorough assessment is made of the whole situation; and
- (d) calls on the Government to investigate other options for sea cargo to be transported to both the Port River in line with its 1997 election promise.

(Continued from 26 March. Page 818.)

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I can understand exactly the member for Price's motives for moving this motion but I want to move an amendment to it. I hope the honourable member can understand my motives for doing this. I move:

Delete all the words after 'That this House' and insert the following:

- (a) notes the proposal by Transport SA to establish a 12 hour per day clearway on Grand Junction Road between South and Port Roads has been referred to the Corporations of Charles Sturt and Port Adelaide Enfield for consideration and public consultation.
- (b) notes the proposal is based on Australian standard 1742—1989, Part II which provides that, where one way traffic volumes exceed 800 vehicles per hour, the installation of the clearway is recommended to achieve two clear travelling lanes.
- (c) Notes the proposal is unrelated to the decision to allow A-double road trains to operate on Grand Junction Road between South and Port Roads.
- (d) recognises that A-double road train access to the Northern Adelaide metropolitan area from 1 March 1998 has been

restricted to operators accredited under the TruckSafe or similar alternative compliance scheme.

- (e) acknowledges that the A-double road train access initiative will generate transport savings of more than \$4 million a year to the South Australian community and enable producers of farm and manufactured goods to be more competitive, and exports to be transported more efficiently.

Allowing specially accredited companies to operate A-double road trains on a small number of roads in the northern suburbs, particularly Grand Junction Road, has helped reduce the number of trucks travelling along that road. As the honourable member would understand, X amount of tonnes has to be transported to Port Adelaide in some way. I am quite happy to listen to any alternative plan at this stage but, if we break up these A-double road trains into smaller trucks, there will be more prime movers on the road—

Mr De Laine: More jobs.

Mr VENNING: Arguably. But I believe the honourable member's motive in moving this motion relates more to the safety and amenity of people living in that area, namely, his constituents. I would argue that by breaking up these trucks into smaller units and by having more prime movers, it would be worse. Obviously, if you split up these trucks and put each trailer on separate prime movers, it doubles the number of trucks on the road; in fact, the number of trucks could be tripled. It has been shown here and in other States that A-double road trains have a successful record of safe operation. Only accredited operators are allowed to travel on these selected roads, and they are not allowed to travel on any other roads.

As I said, we must look at the cost savings in terms of this whole matter. It is estimated that it will save the South Australian community \$4 million a year. That is a very substantial saving, particularly when you consider that the Government moved to allow A-double road trains to travel beyond Port Augusta, initially to Lochiel, then to Gepps Cross and now to Port Adelaide. We cannot break the chain at the last point. Any break of the chain affects that vital link. Of course, by not allowing the trucks to go the last few kilometres to Port Adelaide would make the whole system uneconomical, and it would be rather farcical.

Ms Key interjecting:

Mr VENNING: The honourable member refers to trains. Yes, I heard the whistle. It is obvious that there will be a saving when there is half the number of prime movers. There is a saving and a job cost; I heard what the honourable member said about that. I have studied what is taking place in relation to this. At the moment, most of these trucks travel along the new South Road extension (which is a marvellous piece of road for which I congratulate the Minister and Government), down Grand Junction Road and then turn right on to Eastern Parade. I notice that traffic lights have been installed there. So, the trucks do not need to go through Rosewater or into those areas via Commercial Road. Most of the trucks turn onto Eastern Parade, because that is the shortest route to the port.

I note the announcement the other day of a new river crossing over the Port River. Hopefully, that will be incorporated in a new design plan for a completely new access road from the South Road extension to the port via a completely new corridor, which should traverse the wetlands there. That would mean a completely new road corridor that would not traverse any built up areas.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: After the third crossing, yes; or in conjunction with it. I offer the honourable member my full cooperation in the matter, because I understand his anxiety. This will save industry, business and the people of the State. As the honourable member for Hanson said, the problem is that we do not have a total railway network across the State of South Australia to carry the freight to the port. The major port on this side of the State is Port Adelaide. There is no rail infrastructure from here to the West Coast or Yorke Peninsula and there is not much to the Mallee. The only way to combat that is to have marshalling points outside the city.

Many companies are already doing that. In particular, South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling, our grain marketer and handler, is building marshalling areas at Bowmans and Roseworthy in the north and at Tailem Bend in the south so that trucks can unload their goods via fast train loaders onto trains for transport to Port Adelaide. That is the way to go; that is commonsense. But these things do not happen overnight. There are huge costs, and you must sell this idea to the users, that is, the farmers. At this time, we need big road transports to move the produce. Farmers are more efficient in their operations and are producing more grain. We see record grain deliveries to the ports around the State. Every year we seem to create another record. At this time, only individual trucks can provide the required flexibility.

A-double road trains are the most technically advanced road transport vehicles in Australia. They are equipped with modern, computerised driving aids. They are quieter and use less fuel and, as a result, are more environmentally friendly. Their drivers have special accreditation and the prime movers have special ratings. This mode of transport is bringing a higher standard to the industry in South Australia through the extensive training of operators and the use of high-tech equipment. As I said, I have concerns similar to those expressed by the honourable member in relation to the clearway, particularly relating to those people living on that road. I have lived on a main road all my life. I know the hassles as we progress through modern society—

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: No. I have lived on the Princes Highway—

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Let me finish. New roadworks always limit access because, in this case, it is a major highway. As we progress, people who happen to live on main access roads are further inconvenienced. I understand the situation, but there is no option: one must accept it. It is inconvenient to residents, and I can certainly understand the concerns expressed by the member for Price. The matter is open to comment but we must ensure that we have safe roads on which to drive. We must have the open lane situation. I am concerned that the clearway upsets people but we cannot afford the luxury of using the side of our major roads as parking bays.

People can use side streets and councils need to design and provide parking bays at regular intervals. Businesses need to be encouraged to provide for their own clients' parking. Planners also have a responsibility, first, to design a new alternative route to Port Adelaide; and, secondly, to design alternatives to main road parking. I can understand the honourable member's desire in moving his motion but I also hope that he understands my desire in moving my amendment.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I support the motion as amended by the member for Schubert. The first concern of the member for Price related to the 12 hour per day clearway on Grand Junction Road. If we are to have vehicles travelling through busy suburban areas, from experience, I can say that a clearway is the safest way of ensuring the smooth flow and interaction of large trucks and passenger vehicles. However, the decision to operate a clearway has nothing to do with road trains and is based upon the fact that the traffic volume of the road in question exceeds 800 vehicles per hour, and the installation of a clearway is recommended under the Australian standards which aim to achieve two clear travelling lanes.

The decision to allow A-double trains on Grand Junction Road between South and Port Roads is completely unrelated to the establishment of the clearway. In Port Lincoln we have, of necessity, allowed large trucks or road trains—that are roughly the same length as double road trains but actually have three sections—through the main street. This occurs with a minimal amount of interruption of main street traffic. The A-doubles and the A-B hybrids even manage to negotiate two double-lane roundabouts. The job would be made much simpler if we were able to enforce clearway zones for at least some of the day but, being a commercial shopping precinct and one that has fewer than 800 vehicles, this is unlikely.

Trucks are shipping goods across the State and, indeed, Australia. Without them the times taken to ship freight from one side of this State to another would be enormous. Why should we ban these vehicles from the outer Adelaide suburbs, which rely on the goods and services that these trucks deliver as much as my electorate does? The aesthetics of having large trucks in your area may be hard to swallow but the alternative would be even harder to take. No large trucks would mean, first, less competitive businesses. It would mean, as the member for Price interjected earlier, that driving jobs would be retained, but I believe that, overall, in the long term it would be detrimental and result in the loss of jobs in country regions and in Adelaide.

Secondly, it will mean greater increased costs to consumers of freight which must be double handled. The uncoupling of trailers and taking of freight in and out individually, on the surface, may look safer, but it actually doubles, or even triples, the number of times trucks must travel along the roads. This proportionally must increase the potential for accidents to occur and therefore is not as safe as the road train. The closing of the rest and exchange point at Lochiel means that trucks can bring their loads through the outer suburbs of Adelaide with the extra trailer.

The cost savings in not having to make continuous trips to Lochiel will be considerable. It will decrease freighting times, which brings down prices for consumers. Efficiency will make operators more viable. Consideration must also be given to the fact that there will be reduced wear and tear on the roads and therefore reduced road maintenance costs. Why is it that every time the Government tries to do something that will benefit the State the Opposition tries to block it? Trucks with single trailers have always entered Adelaide. The trucks have proven to be safe and the drivers are required to keep a number of safety registers and documents regarding their loads, travel times and rest stops.

The checks have recently been made even more stringent with the Truck Safe program. This program prevents anyone without special accreditation, or who has contravened the requirements, from driving into Adelaide. The Truck Safe scheme has been embraced by the trucking community as a

means of rewarding companies and drivers with good records. Truck Safe accredited drivers are allowed to travel past Lochiel with the double trailers into the outskirts of Adelaide. This was part of the promise made to companies and drivers who became involved with the scheme. The self-regulation of the trucking industry that this State has introduced can only benefit responsible operators, other road users and the general public.

These drivers skilfully negotiate roundabouts, sharp corners and some less than considerate Adelaide drivers. As already indicated, the State relies on these trucks. As the honourable member said in his amended motion, the A-double road train access initiative will generate transport savings of more than \$4 million a year to the South Australian community and enable producers of farm and manufactured goods to be more competitive and exports to be transported more efficiently. Repeatedly we are slammed as a Government that is doing nothing to assist small business people, primary producers and a range of other enterprises that rely on road-shipped goods, yet here is a proposal that could save \$4 million in transport costs, which could be passed on to consumers and producers in South Australia, not to mention the approved safety aspects on our roads.

As for putting a freeze on the proposals, these plans have been in the pipeline for some time now and to stall them any further will bring unnecessary hardship to transport companies within the State that have complied with various changes and promises regarding access to Adelaide. Many truckies within the Flinders electorate have been more than patient in waiting to hear the final decision about road trains travelling into Adelaide. Detailed and numerous submissions have been made regarding the road train traffic. They have been reviewed, and appropriate industry groups have had a chance to check over the details of these plans. The majority believe that the solution put forward by the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning is the best option open to them.

On a separate matter, the member for Price has asked what we intend to do about getting sea trade back into the Port. Coming from an area that boasts the second largest natural deep sea port in the State, I am only too aware of the benefits that sea trade can bring to a community. The cost of shipping between the States is far more expensive than road transport. The cost of shipping between internal ports is even higher. Why would we try at this stage to implement something that would be less efficient and more expensive to the people of South Australia?

The Minister's decision will hopefully decide these issues once and for all, and will give the operators in the transport industry some solid ground on which to plan. It is sometimes said, 'I went to Adelaide but it was closed.' Let us not have this kind of mentality when it comes to the nature of freight movements in and out of the State's capital. Road trains will actually reduce the number of truck movements on the roads, increase safety and efficiency and reduce costs to South Australians. I oppose the motion moved by the member for Price and fully support the amendment moved by the member for Schubert.

Ms KEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

EUROPEAN WASPS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.C. Wotton:

That this House commends the Government on its decision to maintain funding to assist in the control of European wasps and also its commitment to further research issues relating to their eradication and urges the Government not to support the imposition on property owners of a removal fee for wasp nests as this could discourage people from reporting the presence of wasps and would therefore be to the detriment of the program,

which the Hon. M.K. Brindal had moved to amend by deleting all words after and including the words 'and urges the Government'.

(Continued from 2 July. Page 1269.)

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I would like to make a few comments on this motion and the amendment proposed by the Minister. For some time, European wasps have been a serious problem in our community. Articles in the *Advertiser* of 23 February and 6 March this year clearly demonstrate the danger to public health. The frightening picture of the young man from Happy Valley who suffered about 50 wasp stings and who took an incredible amount of time to recover from his ordeal shows that the Government needs to be proactive in finding and supporting a proper solution to this problem.

The State Government said that it would continue funding for this year with a \$70 000 contribution to assist local government to rid the community of the wasp menace, but it has not indicated whether that will be ongoing. I must say that I think \$70 000 is pretty miserly and inadequate. So, I support the member for Hanson's call to have this funding continue and hopefully increased. Local government needs to be informed of the Government's proposals. This amendment to offload the burden onto ratepayers does not suit the local councils in my area, and I do not think it will be successful.

The Tea Tree Gully council has spent about \$100 000 and the Port Adelaide Enfield council has outlaid considerable amounts of money to keep down the wasp population and to assist residents to do so. The Port Adelaide Enfield council destroyed 187 nests in January 1988 compared with 118 in the same period last year, and the Tea Tree Gully council destroyed 162 nests this year compared with 121 in the previous year. If nothing is done and if the onus is placed on councils and individual householders, it will not be long before someone is stung to death.

Our climate is conducive to a rapid increase in wasp population. As our lifestyle revolves around a great deal of outdoor activities, such as sport and dining outside, I am concerned that this problem will seriously affect our hospitality and recreation industries. A person from overseas to whom I spoke said that Europeans enjoy eating outdoors, that that is one of their great pastimes. This person likened the problem with wasps to being attacked by spitfires. Concern was expressed that if we did not take a real proactive stance immediately, and continue with it, we would suffer the same fate and that, because we have long summers and short winters compared with northern Europe, we would face a major crisis in the future.

So, I support the member for Hanson's position. Throwing the burden back onto the householder in the manner in which the Minister suggests in his amendment is simplistic. It places a further burden on ratepayers and householders who are already bearing the brunt of the additional taxes, charges and levies which the Government is ever increasing. So, this amendment concerns me. If the Minister seriously wishes to deal with this problem, he will not continue with the idea of charging householders but contribute more money in the best interests of the whole community.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): There is no doubt that the European wasp has become an enormous problem for the metropolitan area, and it is reaching some country areas. To the best of my knowledge, there are no wasps in the electorate of Goyder—and I hope there never are. However, I will stand corrected if one of my constituents reports to me that they have sighted these wasps. I have had some experience with wasps in the metropolitan area, and I wonder how we can continue to enjoy barbecues and outdoor relaxation if we do not take some drastic action.

I recall that, when these wasps were first identified in this State some years ago by members of this Parliament, it was hoped that they could be eradicated, but that did not eventuate. Last summer, I was gutting and filleting some fish and one wasp after another became very attracted to the smell. It reached the stage where I could not keep on filleting these fish, so I got a spade and started to hit the wasps, eventually using a couple of boards, on which I had been filleting the fish, to hit them. Between about 5.30 p.m. and 7 or 8 p.m. I killed 52 wasps by this method.

Ms Ciccarello interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I say to the member for Norwood that it is a pity that I did not get all 1 000 052 wasps. It was a clean, quick way to kill them. If I had used insecticide they would not have died instantly. At the beginning, I thought there were only four or five wasps, but although I kept killing them that number did not reduce—there were always four or five wasps. They literally had established an endless route to where the fish were being filleted.

I realised then that this was an enormous problem, so I had a discussion with the people on the neighbouring property which had a lot of thick bushes. I pointed out to them that the nests were probably on their property, but they said it was more likely that they were coming from another property. I saw immediately that it would be difficult to establish, in the first instance, where the wasps were coming from. Contact was made with the local council and a council representative came out to see what could be done. The council was quite happy to eradicate any wasp nests that could be clearly identified. Obviously, the identification of nests is part of the problem. It is all very well to obtain a brochure from the council to see what a nest supposedly looks like, but I have not yet been able to discover a nest and I am not sure that I would know what one looked like if I came across it.

We need to further educate the public. As I come from a rural background, I know that farmers are aware of the measures they can take against pests. Why not develop a program to educate people who live in the suburbs in how to use appropriate eradication measures against wasps? I must admit that when I first undertook to start killing some of those wasps with a spade, I was a little worried that they may turn on me. But it was not even close to happening on any of the occasions. I did not feel in any danger, but whilst I would not advocate other people doing it because a mistake could be made, at the same time I believe that we perhaps can use the people in the community more than we are currently considering.

I certainly congratulate the Government on making additional funds available to combat this problem, but additional money will not work in itself. We have to liaise with councils and certainly the home owners will have to seek to do what they can. I am concerned if we are going to sheet the cost back to the home owners, because people who do not want to spend any money will say, 'Blow it, it is not in my yard' or, 'I do not believe it is, so I will not report it.' We

have to make every effort to make sure that people report it willingly and seek to assist wherever possible so that, in theory, we should be able to get rid of them.

I say that with respect to the metropolitan area because I do not believe it is like the rural area where you can have hundreds of square kilometres of land where no-one virtually lives. But in the metropolitan area, to the best of my knowledge and understanding, where people have their own little block of land, it should not be difficult to identify wasp nests if we are given the appropriate information and have the appropriate publicity and certainly the appropriate help from councils and the Government.

I fully recognise why the member for Heysen is bringing this motion before the House. It is something that we as a Parliament cannot ignore. We have to seek to do everything we can, otherwise the good old Aussie barbie in South Australia may well become a thing of the past.

Mr SCALZI secured the adjournment of the debate.

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 2 July. Page 1269.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I wish to move the following amendment:

Delete all words after 'That' and replace them with the following: this House:

- (a) recognises the need for waterfront reform in Australia;
- (b) urges all the parties involved in waterfront reform to work to ensure its success; and
- (c) commends all those involved in the reform that has been achieved, thus far, at the Port of Adelaide.

Mr CLARKE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the way I heard the amendment, it would seem to totally negate the resolution and therefore is incapable of being pursued as an amendment.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will resume his seat while the Chair considers this amendment. The Chair has considered the amendment and believes that on balance the honourable member is probably okay to proceed.

Mr MEIER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Waterfront reform, as raised in the original motion and then in the subsequent amendment by the member for Ross Smith and now in my further amendment to that, has been an issue for quite sometime. There is no doubt there has been a lot of argument about waterfront reform in Australia. I would simply very clearly say that I compliment the Federal Government for taking a very strong approach to waterfront reform and saying it has to be fixed up, and it is time that something was done. I was very surprised that the Labor Party did not come out and agree with the Federal Liberal Government on implementing such reform. I was surprised because of the Labor

Party's attitude back in 1989 when the pilots struck, and I quote from remarks made by Bob Hawke, the then Prime Minister:

My message to them [the pilots] is that they will cop every instrument of punishment and retribution and reaction that the operators can bring against them.

Further:

It is a different game this time, boys. It's war. They are exceptionally greedy.

That was the attitude of the then Labor Prime Minister Bob Hawke and his Party to the pilots whom he felt were exceptionally greedy. How do you define the word 'greed'? What would you describe as being exceptionally greedy? I would like members to consider a few of the employment conditions that the waterside workers had been operating under and see what members think of this. As to employment conditions, the 4 500 MUA members working as waterside workers were paid between \$74 000 and \$110 000 per year for an actual 30 hour working week. I can say that we as members of Parliament probably would very much like to get into the waterside workers union. I am sure there are many people who are working 40, 50, or 60 hours a week who are earning far, far less than between \$74 000 and \$110 000 per year for a 30 hour working week. It is a huge—

Mrs Geraghty: You would not last two minutes!

Mr MEIER: The honourable member interjects and says that I would not last two minutes. It is interesting that, when the alternative work force was on site, it included several women. I remember hearing one of the women interviewed on television near the end of the strike and she said she was undertaking the work of four men. I do not know whether the honourable member is directing a sexist remark at me as a male or whether she is not actually alluding to that at all. I would say to the honourable member that I do not believe that her interjection is at all relevant, that I believe each one of us would last very well on the waterfront and that we could do the unloadings without any problems at all.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will contain herself.

Mr MEIER: I worked as an unofficial brickie's labourer for some time when I first got into this game and had to do building alterations to my house at Maitland. Because I had some spare time, I was the brickie's labourer. It was confusing to my two young sons at that stage because the brickie was always saying to me, 'Come on, labourer' and my son said, 'Dad, how can you be a labourer when you're a member of the Liberal Party?'

I will make comparisons in relation to other workers. The shift workers' base pay for police officers is \$47 000, for nurses \$43 000 and for construction workers \$35 000. These people work darn hard and work long hours, yet their pay does not come anywhere near what many of these union people have been paid in the past. The waterside workers have a 35 hour a week base award condition, but meal and smoko breaks are included and paid for in the 35 hours. Waterside workers are frequently paid to stay home—called idle time. It has been put to me that in Adelaide work is available only 50 per cent of the time and employees are paid to stay home for the balance of the time.

Mr Clarke: Are you talking about the Legislative Councillors?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ross Smith.

Mr MEIER: They also have a \$1 600 per year allowance for telephones, laundry, etc. Gyms, pool tables, televisions, radios, showers, lockers and so on are provided on site. Even our Parliament House will lose its gym. We cannot afford to run the gym here, but the waterside workers are able to have their gym. The key point we have to remember is that waterfront reform was essential on the Australian waterfront. Progress has been made. To what extent it has been made time will tell, but I compliment the Federal Government on what it has done in this respect.

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): I speak in opposition to the amendment and in favour of the motion. Whenever industrial relations is discussed we get the old hat material; the Government wheels out the old information from 50 years ago, which neglects industrial harmony and goes down the old traditional line. The amendment talks of commending all those involved in the reform achieved thus far at the Port of Adelaide. How could members be serious about that when we have seen an example of a Federal Liberal Government and the National Farmers Federation, along with Patrick Stevedoring, with the behaviour it has undertaken through this episode?

It is an absolute disgrace to industrial relations in this country and for the Government Whip to get up and move an amendment of this nature does him no credit whatsoever. I suggest that he go back to his farming community. Some of those farmers, whom I know very well, as he well knows, would not even go down this line that he is suggesting here today. It is an absolute disgrace and many farmers have acknowledged and recognised both publicly and privately the poor representation they have received from the National Farmers Federation with the behaviour it has shown through this episode.

It was a Federal Labor Government that commenced waterfront reform in this country. Let us make no mistake about that. Waterfront reform has been going on for many years in this country. Many reforms have been undertaken. This exercise is not about progressing waterfront reform but about union bashing and trying to turn upside down the industrial relations in this country. We must have Governments that are committed first and foremost to the well-being of the people, to all the people. We must have Governments that respect the need for a true balance of all interests. That is what industrial relations is about. That is what sensible industrial relations is about, so you have a compromise and bring parties together, negotiate, discuss and work your way through problems.

We have not had an example of that through this tardy exercise that has been generated by a right-wing conservative Government that is trying to take this nation not into the twenty-first century but back to the nineteenth century. Here we have an example of a Prime Minister and Federal Minister of Industrial Relations who have scabbed on the country, scabbed on the work force, have shown no leadership and have no credibility in industrial relations whatsoever. We must not seek to build societies based on the principle of all against all: social cohesion and unity of purpose can be achieved only if people are able to manage their working relationships within a legal framework, which respects the rights of the citizens and their public associations.

That has not been done in this exercise. That was never the aim of this exercise. To bring forward an amendment which reads the way the honourable member's amendment does is an absolute joke and does him no credit, no service and

certainly provides no representation to his community. I am very disappointed that he would bring an amendment of that nature before us today. Through this exercise we have had a grubby piece of legislation. We have had a very grubby exercise that has been led from day one out of the office of the Federal Minister for Industrial Relations, Peter Reith. Make no mistake about that.

Mr Meier: Good Minister.

Mr WRIGHT: The member opposite interjects that he is a good Minister. May we remind you that he is now no longer a contender for the office of Prime Minister. May we remind you of that. Peter Reith has shot his own foot and is no longer a contender. It is now a two horse race. We now have John Howard, who could not lead Australia out of anything, and the Federal Treasurer who is the heir apparent to become the Prime Minister of Australia. It is similar to the situation in this House where we have a Leader who has shot himself in the foot and we are waiting for the heir apparent to take over. Why is it that Liberal Leaders cannot lead when they get into this position? It is because they are very narrow, inward thinking and want to go back rather than go forward.

That is what this Prime Minister and this Federal Minister has been all about in this dispute. They have not been interested in waterfront reform. They have been interested in trying to union bash, trying to turn upside down the system of industrial relations that has existed successfully in this country for over 100 years. There have been times when there have been hiccups, of course. The way to overcome those hiccups is to bring the players together and work out a sensible, pragmatic way of solving the problems. That is how you handle industrial relations in this country.

We have a Secretary of the National Farmers Federation, Donald McGauchie, who has made the most inflammatory comments about workers in this industry that any leader has ever made in Australia's history. I say that quite deliberately. There has been no leader of any organisation, whether it be the National Farmers Federation or any other right-wing think tank group, that has been so inflammatory in the comments made about workers of this industry than has Donald McGauchie. He is a discredit to the National Farmers Federation. He has not represented his members. He is an absolute disgrace and should be sacked immediately. He is even worse than McLachlan—if that is possible. He has gone a long way down the track. If we look at one of the other major players in this exercise, Chris Corrigan, what do we see that he has done? He has done a Graham Ingerson: he has lied to the people of the nation. He has got up and lied to the people of the nation.

Mr MEIER: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The word 'lie' is unparliamentary and I would ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order in that the honourable member is referring to an individual outside the House.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The honourable member clearly said, 'Like Mr Ingerson'.

The SPEAKER: Order! We will deal with these one at a time. The Chair did hear an oblique reference to Minister Ingerson. If there was a reference there that drew a parallel, the honourable member is clearly out of order. I would encourage the honourable member not to imply that members in this House are liars, because they will be strictly out of order if they do.

Mr CONLON: I rise on a point of order, Sir. In a debate here yesterday I was asked to withdraw the word 'liar', which

I did unconditionally, but I also went on to say that on the facts before us and according to the dictionary definition the Minister had come into this place and told a lie.

The SPEAKER: Order! First of all the honourable member is out of order raising a matter in relation to a ruling yesterday. However, yesterday the honourable member used the distinct word 'liar'. In this case the honourable member has referred to a person outside the House. Another honourable member has picked up a point of order that there was an oblique reference to Minister Ingerson and I have dealt with that.

Mr WRIGHT: I was talking about Chris Corrigan. Fancy associating yourself in any way with people of the ilk of Chris Corrigan, Donald McCauchie, John Howard and Peter Reith! How is that for a quadrella? Even the member for Hart would not back a quadrella like that, despite the fact that he is the shadow Minister for Racing. What an absolute disgrace that an amendment of that nature would be proposed in this Chamber! I will finish by reminding all members of what one of the scabs from PCS—the front for the National Farmers Federation—said after his job was wound up. I remind the member for Schubert that he said, 'I recommend that everyone join the union.'

Mr CONLON (Elder): I have heard some odd things in here today, so I think I had better make a contribution, because I know something about the waterfront. I have worked there and I can tell members that when I first started on the waterfront it was way back in 1976. I was not a wharfie but I worked on the waterfront.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CONLON: Yes, we did work there. We have never been the beneficiary of agrarian socialism like your mob have. We do not run to the Government every time we have a problem. You believe that the Government should fix it up every time the wheat does not grow or it grows too much, it costs too much, it costs too little, it rains too much, or it rains too little. We did not do that down there, mate. We lived at Port Adelaide and we looked after ourselves: we did not get the Government to do it for us. I hope I will not hear anything more from you on that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address his remarks through the Chair.

Mr CONLON: I worked on the waterfront in about 1976 as one of the first jobs I ever had—because I am a young man. In those days the wharves were open. There were mooring gang employees and people who swept the sheds. On estimate, about 10 times as many people were employed on the wharf as there are now, after many years of reform in the waterfront industry which the waterfront industry voluntarily went through itself. It reduced its work force; I do not have the figures in front of me but I would be surprised if there is now more than about 10 per cent of the work force that existed in 1983. If we took that number of people off the farms, they would be whingeing. If we took that number of people's livelihoods out of the farms, they would be whingeing—the agrarian socialists over there. But down on the wharves they did that voluntarily.

What did we get after that, with the election of John Howard, the worst little Prime Minister since Federation? They did not want reform that way; that is not the way they wanted reform. He sat around with his mate Reithie. They got on their Rambo gear, buckled a few belts around them, picked up their big guns and said, 'Let's get hairy chested. That's not the way we want to reform; let's do it quicker, because we're

tougher than the other mob was. Look at me; I'm nearly 5 foot tall; I'm tough.' The small man complex came out in dealing with the waterfront. He said, 'I'm going to get these blokes. I know: we'll train people in Arabia, we'll give them some guns and dogs and sticks and then we'll pick a fight, and we'll win it. We'd better get a loyal sidekick. Who will we get? Who would be up to this? There's this bloke Corrigan; he's been named in a report of this committee in the early 1980s as a person who's prepared to tell lies for his own benefit, so he's an ideal sidekick, and he's a bit hairy chested too.'

His brother does not think much of him. Obviously, his brother is the beneficiary of that thing known to biologists as 'ultimate inheritance', where the intellect and moral character skip one of the brothers and reside in the other. So, he is the bloke that got the good looks, brains and character in the family. But, let us face it: good looks, brains and character would not have been suited to the purposes of the 5 foot 2 Rambo in Canberra. So, he said, 'Here's how we'll reform it: we'll pick a fight and then we'll win it.'

They sat down and made plans to go off to Dubai, but then someone pointed out to them that they were being just a bit silly. So, what is the view of the Prime Minister? 'We never had anything to do with that in the first place.' They picked their fight and they sent in their dogs and men. But this is the face of John Howard's industrial relations reform: thugs with balaclavas ashamed to show their faces, with dogs on chains, barricades around the waterfront and workers locked out.

There is Rambo, and what happened? They were dusted up. The 5 foot 2 Rambo sent his loyal honcho, 'Slim' Reith (or whatever he is called), down there, and he was dusted up. He received a black eye, and then another black eye, and he went crawling back to Parliament and said, 'John, it didn't work. They not only dusted us up but there are these judges who have said that we did it wrong; we broke the law. Did we do that?'

What do we hear now? It was not their idea at all. It was not John Howard's idea or Peter Reith's idea: it was that mongrel Corrigan. At least he has the decency to tell a lie for his mates. He put up his hand and said, 'It had nothing to do with them: it was my idea in the first place.' The member for Schubert and that Colonel at the back—this is their idea of waterfront reform. People jumping out of planes and going down with their machine guns blazing are supposed to do that in the magazines, not in real life. If you do it in real life it fails, and it has failed.

I support the original motion moved by the member for Ross Smith. Anyone in this House who thinks Australia benefited as a result of this disgraceful performance on the waterfront is greatly misled. It is consistent with the performance of this the worst Federal Government since Federation that it has blown this. It has blown the race debate and it has knocked off the railway line. It is over there talking to the people in Melbourne about building the One Nation Express to go through every regional seat they have, so South Australia is forgotten. Its great plans for Telstra have fallen apart in its hands. It has blown everything it has touched. It got in with a huge majority and looks like breaking the record for losing it—and the waterfront was just one part of that. When you think about this issue, think about that. I support the member for Ross Smith. I urge members opposite to stop reading magazines and get into the real world.

Debate adjourned.

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

SUSTAINABLE ENERGY BILL

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

ELECTRICITY (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL (NO.2)

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

PRIMARY INDUSTRY FUNDING SCHEMES BILL

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

QUESTION TIME

TAXATION REFORM

Mr FOLEY (Hart): What action is the Premier taking to protect South Australia's financial base under the Howard Government's proposed tax package? Will the Premier follow the lead of the Western Australian Premier and oppose the tax reform package if it does not provide South Australia with growth taxes? On 15 July the Premier of Western Australia (Mr Richard Court) announced that the State Liberal Party in Western Australia had agreed to reject the tax reform package and campaign against it if it did not allow the State to raise the revenue it needs. Premier Court said:

There will be uproar if the Federal Government does not listen to us and provide the State with its fair share of the national pie.

The Western Australian Premier went on to say:

To date we have not had any involvement in the development of the package. We are the troops on the ground and, if you leave us out, you are doomed to failure.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: At last we have a serious question from the Opposition, and it is an important question about Australia's future and South Australia's future. I commend the member for Hart for lifting the debate in this House onto serious issues, because this is a serious issue and it is an important issue for South Australia. Fundamental taxation reform, as I have indicated to this House previously, is the most important issue nationally in the next decade.

I had a meeting with the Prime Minister last Friday and I canvassed a number of issues with him. First, in relation to the Adelaide-Darwin rail link, I sought and obtained an unequivocal commitment from the Prime Minister that he would ensure that there was Commonwealth legislation should negotiations with the land councils break down. That commitment was given. Secondly, I raised the question of taxation reform with the Prime Minister. It is clear that vertical fiscal imbalance or the disparity between collection and expenditure between the Commonwealth and State levels must be addressed, and the Prime Minister acknowledged that in discussions with me.

He also gave a commitment that horizontal fiscal equalisation will be maintained. Members will recall that when I visited Melbourne recently I had discussions with Jeff Kennett to secure the support of Victoria in any discussions between the State and the Commonwealth on taxation reform so that we did not see the abolition of horizontal fiscal equalisation. That will ensure that the standard of provision of health services, education services and other social services in a small economy are not disadvantaged compared with a large economy such as New South Wales and Victoria. New South Wales and Victoria have been subsidising the smaller States. Premier Kennett supports HFE and the Prime Minister has underpinned that, saying that he supports the continuation of horizontal fiscal equalisation, therefore building in protection for South Australia.

On those two key points the Prime Minister has given me a clear indication that South Australia's interests will be protected, but the most important benefit for South Australia amongst the other States, and certainly ahead of Western Australia, will be the abolition of wholesale sales tax. As a manufacturing State, like Victoria, exporting our goods and services manufactured in the international marketplace, we currently have in excess of a \$1 billion disadvantage in the marketplace through wholesale sales tax. As part of this tax reform package, as the Prime Minister indicated at a luncheon he addressed recently, South Australia would be one of the big beneficiaries of taxation reform. That would have to be in the context of the abolition of wholesale sales tax.

So our manufacturing base will get a boost and reduced input costs and it will have a greater advantage to be able to sell those goods in the international marketplace. That positions us better than Western Australia, because wholesale sales tax impacts against the manufacturing States like South Australia and Victoria. Currently there is no wholesale sales tax on mining, financial services, or tourism services, so Queensland, New South Wales and Western Australia are not sharing in the tax burden, as South Australia has in the past. If taxation reform eliminates wholesale sales tax, that will be a big and significant plus for South Australia.

The Prime Minister gave further indications that he will undertake discussions with the State Premiers prior to the public release of the taxation package. I have indicated to the House before that this is a keen policy issue and we are waiting for the call to have those discussions. The Prime Minister gave me an assurance that those discussions will take place prior to the public announcement by the Commonwealth of the tax package.

There is one other area that is particularly important in respect of taxation reform, and that is tax as it relates to the wine industry in this State and this country. In going to a broad-based, indirect tax, there will be a top up so that the revenues from the industry will be neutral, that is, they will stay the same.

Western Australia is proposing that there ought to be a volumetric tax on wine, not an *ad valorem* tax on wine. That would be a significant disadvantage to South Australia in the following respect. Regarding cask wine and the contribution made by the Riverland and other wine growing areas of this State, you would start to price it out of the market and shift the bulk wine product and manufacturing offshore: that is the possibility. I also raised that matter with the Prime Minister on Friday last.

In response to the member for Hart's question, first, taxation reform is vital and important, and I thank him for the serious question. Secondly, I am sure that South Australia

will be a beneficiary of this because of the abolition of wholesale sales tax. Thirdly, and importantly, those other areas such as wine tax and horizontal fiscal equalisation will all be taken into account to this State's interest.

KISTLER AEROSPACE

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Will the Premier advise the House about the developments of the world's first fully operational commercial spaceport in the State's Far North which was announced at Woomera earlier today?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am delighted to inform the House of this very significant announcement for South Australia and Australia. Together with Federal Ministers Ian McLachlan and John Moore, Mr Robert Wang, the Chairman of Kistler Aerospace from the United States, and the honourable member, we had the opportunity to turn the first sod at Woomera for this advanced reusable rocket launching facility. This is a \$45 million investment. During the press conference, the Chairman of Kistler Aerospace clearly indicated to those who were somewhat cynically saying, 'Is this just simply a starting point until the authorisations are there for you to put a launching facility in the Nevada desert and then you will shift back to the Nevada desert?' that the \$US45 million investment in South Australia is a long-term investment and any Nevada operation will be complementary because, obviously, the Nevada operation is in the northern hemisphere and the Woomera operation is in the southern hemisphere.

Given that the telecommunications market is growing substantially—and Mr Wang indicated to the audience that the fastest growing market segment for telecommunications is the Asia-Pacific marketplace—this will breathe new life into Woomera and it will also assist the towns and cities in the Spencer Gulf region: 180 direct jobs will be created. The construction will be completed by the end of this year and they will then have the capacity to launch a rocket every week—100 on an annual basis. We would hope to see one a week being launched at Woomera. Together with representatives of the Australian Submarine Corporation—who were there and who were looking for opportunities regarding other defence and electronics associated industries through the Industrial Supplies Office—we have put in place, between the Whyalla Economic Development Board, the Industrial Supplies Office and Leighton Contractors, which will do the prefabrication and the infrastructure for the site, not only that the expenditure is on site—the creation of 180 jobs—but also that there are spin off benefits to the cities and the towns within the region.

In addition to that, in the negotiation of this contract, we have put in place with the Aboriginal communities, in securing their agreement for this to go ahead and for their land to be used, educational training programs so that local Aboriginal members of that community can participate in the development at Woomera and develop a skill base that might assist them elsewhere in gaining employment. So, it is a win-win position from their perspective.

Certainly, this will enable South Australia and its defence and electronics industry to be showcased nationally and internationally. It will take us into the international marketplace and clearly demonstrate that South Australia is a sophisticated technology base—and manufacturing base at that. It has been some 18 months to two years in the negotiation and the securing of this facility. I put on the record the cooperation of the Commonwealth Departments of Industry,

Defence and Environment, which, at our request, assisted us in obtaining the licences required at an international level as well as a national level for such a project to go ahead. This is good news. The proposed closure of Nurrungar in the year 2000 meant that the prospects were not good. What we now have is a major new investment, jobs being created, opportunities flowing into the region and a good regional economic development initiative that will showcase the very best of South Australia.

TAXATION REFORM

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Premier. Given the Prime Minister's commitment last Friday to consult the Premier before releasing the Liberal Party's tax package and the speculation that the package may be released as early as next week, has the Premier sought a zero rating for any GST to apply to the cost of essential services run by the State Government such as water, electricity, bus and train fares?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: We have to look at the package in its totality. I understand that the Federal ministry and Cabinet is meeting today and further meetings will be held next week and, until the package is complete and can be presented to us to present a particular case, we could put forward a whole range of hypotheticals. But the simple point that I make is this: we have championed the cause of the key industry sectors which are important to South Australia and which deserve and require protection in the tax package.

ELECTRICITY, PRIVATISATION

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Will the Premier enlighten the House about the latest deliberate misinformation from the Democrats on the sale of ETSA and how that misinformation has been received interstate?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am happy to respond to the honourable member's question. The Hon. Sandra Kanck called a media conference on Sunday, no doubt to get a number of reporters who had not been closely following the ETSA story. At that media conference she very deliberately misrepresented the data of the Electricity Supply Association of Australia, which has not only written to her demanding a public apology but has sent the Government a copy of the letter the association has written to the *Advertiser* following Ms Kanck's public statement. I would like to read to the House for the benefit of members opposite the Electricity Supply Association's view. The letter states:

In her efforts to denigrate electricity business privatisation in South Australia by issuing a press release to the Adelaide media on 19 July 1998, Democrat MLC Sandra Kanck has resorted to using Electricity Supply Association of Australia (ESAA) data—but, without understanding the information, she has got it wrong.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: How about that. The association goes on to say:

Using ESAA annual statistics. . . Mrs Kanck has claimed in the Adelaide media on 19 and 20 July 1998 that reliability of supply has suffered in Victoria, where all distribution businesses are privatised, and that the service is much worse than in South Australia.

In fact, data for the past six years (going back before privatisation in Victoria) shows that the South Australian supply has been consistently more reliable than in Victoria—and this relates to different system designs, distribution of electricity at different voltages and different geography.

Reports published by the Victorian Office of the Regulator-General—the independent watchdog for utility services—show that

the privatised Victorian distribution businesses have reduced significantly the amount of time Victorian customers are without power compared to the situation six years ago. Then the average time without supply per Victorian customer was 438 minutes a year—now it has been reduced to little more than 200 minutes a year. In 1997 Victorian customers were without power for an average of 218 minutes a year compared to 118 minutes in South Australia, an outage level that has been almost the same in South Australia for the past four years.

Mrs Kanck is entitled to her view against privatisation—a position ESAA believes is misguided—but she should beware quoting statistics in ignorance of their context. She could easily have checked with ESAA before she put out her statement—she has done so in the past—but chose not to do so.

Finally, in her media statement she makes a claim about the bad effects of privatisation of electricity supply internationally which is also not borne out by examination of the record.

In Britain, for example, the Chairman of the electricity consumers' committees for the 14 British electricity regions is on the recent record as praising a 'significant improvement' in standards of service since privatisation, citing a halving in customer complaints since 1991, a 30 per cent reduction in power bills for residential customers (inflation-adjusted) and a reduction in failures by private distribution companies against their licence standards from 12 321 per 100 000 customers in 1992-93 to 2 251 in 1996-97.

It goes on to say:

Mrs Kanck knew about this statement of support for privatisation by the Leader of the British consumers' committees before putting out her media statement because I wrote to her in late June to provide the information.

Yours faithfully
Keith Orchison
Managing Director

Electricity Supply Association of Australia Ltd.

That clearly puts to rest the distorted figures and the claims of Ms Kanck.

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Employment. Given the promise made in the budget to use some of the direct proceeds of the sale of ETSA and Optima for future employment programs, by how much will these programs now be cut following the Premier's announcement yesterday that all proceeds from the sale would go to debt reduction?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Ross Smith!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: In relation to the electricity industry, I am the Minister who is handling this matter before the House, and the Deputy Leader totally misrepresents the position that has been put before the House. I appeal to the Deputy Leader to get some better researchers; they really do set her up with these questions constantly. In relation to the legislation that was introduced yesterday in the House, we have done a number of things. In legislation we have given absolute protection to country and regional areas. There will be no greater than 1.7 per cent variation in power prices. In addition to that, we have put in place a special deposit account in Treasury in which \$10 million will be placed to ensure that good faith is followed through with that policy commitment.

As I have said constantly, the structure that is put in place in that respect has now been signed off by the ACCC, and the Deputy Leader was in the House last night when I advised the House of that. That is factored into the sale process. If we get between \$4 billion and \$6 billion for the sale of this asset, it would enable us to retire debt of that sort of magnitude. In retiring debt, you reduce the daily \$2 million interest bill we have every single day in this State. In reducing that, we can then put some money into a whole range of social programs: education, health, environment and job creation. We want to

be able to retire debt so that the funds that are released in interest can then be channelled into the provision of education, health and environmental services, and job creation.

To demonstrate the *bona fides* of this Government, members should have a look at the budget that is presently before this Parliament. In it is a \$100 million job creation and support package. It looks after youth employment in this State and mature aged unemployment in country and regional areas. For example, in Whyalla, we gave additional funding to DOME to assist it in the process of linking unemployed people, skilled jobs and job opportunities in the region. The Deputy Leader cannot come in here claiming that we are doing something when we are not. The track record clearly indicates that we are pursuing the sale of privatisation, first, to get rid of risk; secondly, to give certainty to country and regional areas of South Australia in terms of cost of power post 1 January 2003; and, thirdly, to retire debt, and when we retire the debt, the savings on a daily basis in interest can be put into jobs, education, health and environmental clean up programs.

SUICIDE PREVENTION ADVISORY GROUP

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): Will the Minister for Human Services provide information regarding the establishment of a suicide prevention advisory group?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Members of the House might have heard a most unfortunate report which came through nationally earlier this week and which indicated that suicide, particularly youth suicide, is dramatically on the increase and has been throughout Australia over the past 10 years. I appreciate the member for Fisher raising this issue. I know he has a particular interest, certainly in youth groups and the high and very unfortunate level of youth suicide in this State but particularly across Australia. The report that came out on Monday highlighted the high level of youth suicide, particularly in rural and regional parts of Australia. It talked about how, in some country towns, youth suicide rates have increased by as much as 12 fold, which is very disturbing indeed.

My predecessor the member for Adelaide set up a task force last year. As a result of that and as a result of the mental health summit, it was decided to establish a suicide prevention advisory group. I am now able to announce the membership of that advisory group. It will be chaired by Prof. Graham Martin, Executive Director of Southern Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services and also a professor at Flinders University. Included in the group will be various clinicians, including Prof. Bob Goldney, Professor of Psychiatry at the University of Adelaide, and Associate Prof. James Harrison from the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, National Injury Surveillance Unit at Flinders University, which is a national unit based in Adelaide. There are two young representatives on the advisory group: one is Camilla Benson and another is Lynessa Garland. It will also include Kym Davey, the Executive Director of the Youth Affairs Council; Dorian Marsland, from the Shopfront Youth Centre at Salisbury; Michael Collin from the Adelaide Central Mission; Pastor Rod Denton, who has had experience in terms of dealing with people who are suicidal, particularly young people; and Mike Turner, from the Community Health Centre at Port Augusta.

That highlights a broad cross-section, and it is a strong representation from younger people or people who are dealing on a daily basis with younger people within the

community. I stress the importance of this group in terms of tackling a social problem within our community, understanding some of the reasons why youth suicide is occurring, and coming to grips with how we can have early intervention so that we are able to give those young people the help they need at an early stage. The one lesson everyone learned as a result of the mental health summit is that, for goodness sake, make sure you have early intervention and effective 24 hour crisis care so that, when young people are in need, people who are suitably qualified and trained are able to intervene immediately rather than allow that suicide to occur.

ELECTRICITY, PRIVATISATION

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Given the Premier's response to my previous question, can he explain why his 1998-99 budget employment statement states that, after the two year funding period for programs announced in the budget:

... the moneys from the sale of the State's power companies will become available. As we have already stated publicly, while most of this money will be used to retire debt, a portion will be used to further finance targeted needs—such as whatever employment programs are required.

The Premier yesterday released a media statement indicating that all proceeds would be used for the sole purpose of State debt reduction.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I do not know how many times I have to say it in the House but let me say it once again. In selling the power utilities and reaching a marketplace price of between \$4 and \$6 billion—

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: For the benefit of the Deputy Leader, I point out that it is a four year budget strategy. You have a two year commitment of \$100 million: in year 3 and year 4 we hope to have the sale of ETSA in place, and it will then impact upon the budget by reducing the interest bill on an annual basis. The interest bill on an annual basis can then be put into a range of programs: it is as simple as that. It will take us two years to go through the process. You retire the debt: when you retire the debt you do not have to pay the interest—up to \$2 million a day. The interest then can be plugged into a whole range of programs such as education, health, environment and jobs programs.

YOUTH ASSISTANCE

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Youth advise the House what specific assistance the State Government provides to young people to assist them with personal development or leadership activities?

The Hon. J. HALL: I thank the member for her question and for her ongoing interest in the area of youth affairs in this State. In South Australia, there are around 265 000 people between the ages of 12 and 24, which represents nearly 18 per cent of our State population, and that is a very significant component. The youth portfolio is always looking for ways in which to promote an active and very meaningful participation of young people in all aspects of the South Australian community. One such avenue that the youth portfolio has been encouraging in recent times is youth participation in areas where young people promote leadership activities. In this area, the youth leadership grants scheme offers up to \$500 to individuals, youth groups or incorporated associations who work with young people and provide assistance for

innovative personal development projects which are there for the benefit of young people between the ages of 12 and 25—and we are talking about nearly 270 000 people in that bracket, so it is a very important project.

During the 1997-98 financial year, 13 youth leadership grants of up to \$500 were awarded, and that comes to a total of \$5 925 in specific funding. When applying for these grants, the applicant must demonstrate initiative and enterprise by a young individual, a group of young people, or on behalf of young people. They must also demonstrate the present and future benefit to the participants. Further, they must demonstrate that the funding for the individual or group is not an unnecessary duplication or an extension of an existing service or program and, in addition, they have to demonstrate that the need for a grant will ensure a successful undertaking of the specific activity.

There are some very interesting examples of grants that have been given, and I would have thought that some of the members opposite would be particularly interested. A project for a youth camping trip was organised by the Elizabeth South Catholic Parish Youth Grove, which is a group that put together a program for young people involved in the organisation and implementation of fund raising activities. They raised about \$500, but they needed \$650 for the camping trip. The aim of the trip was to provide young people with an opportunity to participate in recreation style activities, to build social networks and gain an understanding of youth issues and to assist them with their general growth and development.

Another particularly interesting project was in the member for Waite's electorate, and that was for the local council of Mitcham to establish a youth web page. I believe that that has been pretty successful, because it provides young people with a user friendly point of access for information—

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order. Mr Speaker, I ask you to rule in terms of the provision of ministerial statements to enable Ministers to provide such information.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The Minister has not yet started to debate the matter. Under Standing Order 98 the Chair cannot draw her to a conclusion, but I remind all Ministers, as I have previously, that there is an opportunity on occasions to utilise the ministerial statement.

The Hon. J. HALL: I would have thought that members opposite would be fairly interested in services being provided for young people in this State. The youth web page in the Mitcham council area provides young people with access to information about education, health and employment. I would have thought that that should be fairly important.

Yesterday I had the opportunity to present some youth leadership grants to a number of individuals who are operating programs in the northern areas of metropolitan Adelaide, and I would have thought that the member for Elizabeth, in particular, might be fairly interested in a couple of these. One relates to the Northern Area Community and Youth Service and another relates to the Northern Area Multicultural Youth Council. They are very important issues, and leadership grants given to young people from non-English speaking backgrounds—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot hear the Minister.

The Hon. J. HALL: These grants will continue because they are important to young South Australians, and I would have hoped that, rather than interject, members opposite

would occasionally support things that are positive for this State.

LEAR CORPORATION

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Will the Minister for Industry, Trade and Tourism inform the House what the Government is doing to save the 80 automotive jobs now under threat at the Lear Corporation? Has the company received any State Government assistance, and what guarantees exist to protect any taxpayer funds provided to the company if it decides to close its Salisbury operations and move to Thailand?

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: No, I am not commenting. Lear Corporation established its Adelaide seat manufacturing operations in 1995. Media reports at the time stated that the company expected to source as much as 95 per cent of materials and components from within Australia, and to make its Adelaide operations a springboard into the Asia Pacific markets. But today's media reports that Lear is to move its sewing and cutting operations out of Adelaide and into Thailand.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has the call.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I have been advised that the department has not provided any industry assistance to Lear and that the department is today discussing matters with the company. My understanding is that the media report is fairly accurate: that the company has decided to purchase goods and have them made offshore because that can be done at a cheaper price. It is a pity for us here in South Australia that we are not able to compete in the international market. This is a very important question, and I will obtain more information for the honourable member as to the department's involvement. As I said, my understanding is that no industry assistance has been provided.

BASIC SKILLS TEST

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Will the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training inform the House whether any specific funds are targeted to help children identified by the basic skills test as needing extra help? After listening to and reading about the endless claims of the Teachers Union and the Opposition, people may well be excused for thinking that the Government does not support the basic skills test results with resources.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I thank the member for Waite.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ross Smith will contain himself.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: The answer is an unequivocal 'Yes.' To be precise, \$1 million was allocated in 1996-97; \$2 million in 1997-98; and a further \$2 million in 1998-99, under what can be called difficult and tough budget conditions. I cannot quite understand why those at the head of the teachers' union continue to destabilise the very school system that they propose to support, and members opposite might have some insights into that destructive behaviour. Those who have been running the union are causing not only high levels of anxiety among parents of children needing extra help but also a great deal of indecision and confusion among their own members.

Let me put it beyond all doubt by saying to the parents, the union and members of this House that in 1996-97 \$1 million was allocated to the basic skills test to help these children. In addition, \$2 million has been allocated in 1997-98 and a further \$2 million in 1998-99. That totals \$5 million, and every cent of that amount has gone directly to schools to assist those young people who require help with basic skills testing. It is on the record: \$5 million has been allocated to assist those students in areas where they are not performing in the basic skills test.

INDUSTRY, TRADE AND TOURISM MINISTER

Mr CONLON (Elder): My question is directed to you, Mr Speaker. I ask you to consider, respond and make a ruling as to whether it is in order, or whether, in fact, it is a contempt for the Minister for Industry, Trade and Tourism having voted in support of a motion in this House then to make statements inside or outside the House which contradict that vote? On Tuesday this week we know that the House voted unanimously, without dissent, for a motion to adopt the report of the Privileges Committee. That report included a finding that the Minister deliberately misled the House. Yesterday, however, the Minister said in the House:

I have apologised without reservation to those who believe I have deliberately misled the House and again would like to make it clear that it was never my intention to do so.

The Minister outside the House told the media:

They [that is, the Opposition] knew full well that after I had made the statement in the House there was no deliberate intention to do it. Is the Minister free to affirm his guilt by a vote in the House and then, in the same session, protest his innocence to the House without misleading the House?

The SPEAKER: It is the view of the Chair that the question should not be posed to me in the form of a question but, if the honourable member has any problems about matters of privilege or as regards himself and the Minister which would impinge on privilege, he is free to raise it as a privilege matter.

BASIC SKILLS TEST

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): My question is directed to the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training, and follows the question asked by the member for Waite. Will the Minister inform the House whether or not the basic skills test is compulsory or voluntary and indicate how funding is allocated? The leadership of the education union in the media this week claims that parents should have the right to boycott the basic skills test but are afraid to do so because their funding will be cut. Will the Minister say whether this claim is correct?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Clearly, the union leadership has a dilemma: on the one hand it opposes the basic skills test with a fervour almost bordering on paranoia; and, on the other hand, it screams for more funds to support children with extra learning needs—clearly, a classic example of wanting your cake and eating it, too. But what are the facts? The first fact is that the union's paranoia about the test is not supported by the parents. Even when it was introduced approximately three years ago, despite strident opposition from the union, 80 per cent of parents supported the basic skills test.

At the time parents trusted teachers' judgments but welcomed the idea of an objective second opinion provided by the tests. Despite the passage of time, the union has dug

in—entrenched in its opposition—while more and more parents have come to see the value of the tests. Let us look at the figures: in 1996, 85 per cent of children in years 3 and 5 sat the tests; and, in 1997, 93.5 per cent of all year 3 students and 91.5 per cent of all year 5 students sat the tests. Parents are clearly voting with their feet on this issue. I remind members that these are the tests which the union tells us will scar the children for life. Will it ever learn!

The basic skills tests are voluntary: no-one is compelled to sit the tests. Each year a handful of children in schools, for one reason or another, would experience difficulties with the tests. These children are well known to principals and, in consultation with the parents, the principals exempt these children from doing the tests. Children exempted by the principal from doing the tests are still entitled to support through basic skills money—they do not miss out on that support. On the other hand, should a parent withdraw a student from the test without consultation with the principal, they do so in the full knowledge that their child will not receive support or the BST assistance.

The Government exerts absolutely no pressure whatsoever on these parents. The choice of whether their child will sit for the test is a decision for the parents. The schools may offer guidance and advice, but the decision to withdraw is that of the parents. The union's accusation that the Government is trying to blackmail these parents is a furphy. The union leadership just cannot accept that there is no support for its stand in the real world, and the union has got it wrong.

An honourable member: Again.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Again. Parents do not need to be protected from the Government nor, for that matter, do they need to be protected from the union's propaganda on the basic skills test. The union's message has clearly fallen on deaf ears. It is self-evident truth that the parents support the BST of children in our primary schools. The support is extremely high and runs completely against what is being put forward in the media by the union.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

Mr CONLON (Elder): I rise on a matter of privilege.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CONLON: I do not expect you to enjoy it. I will not repeat my comments in my previous question to you, Sir, although I did use that opportunity so as not to have to go to this extent—

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the matter of privilege?

Mr CONLON: The matter of privilege is that which I raised with you. I raise two points on the matter of privilege: first, can the Minister vote to affirm his guilt in this House—

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: This is quite a serious point of order, Mr Speaker. The honourable member is insinuating that the Minister for Industry, Trade and Tourism—

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: The honourable member is making a misleading statement about the vote in relation to the Minister for Industry, Trade and Tourism—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: It is.

The SPEAKER: I ask members to let the Deputy Premier continue and to allow me to hear what is being said.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: The honourable member said that the Minister for Industry, Trade and Tourism voted for

the adoption of the report of the Privileges Committee. That is not correct. There was no division on the adoption of the Privileges Committee report. It was carried on the voices. The Minister for Industry, Trade and Tourism did not vote on that motion.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. I have listened to what the Deputy Premier had to say. I will take it into account if and when.

Mr CONLON: I will start again. I ask the Minister to consider two things. First—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CONLON: I really do not expect you to enjoy it. First, in voting to affirm his guilt in this House, and then proceeding to protest his innocence to this House of deliberately misleading the House, has the Minister misled the House but, more importantly, has he reflected on a vote of the House? I refer to your ruling yesterday, Mr Speaker, on a grievance debate when the member for Lee sought to comment on the vote of the House on Tuesday. He was ruled out of order. At that time, Mr Speaker, you said:

That question was put and decided yesterday, and it is a reflection now to go back and revisit that particular vote. The honourable member cannot do that.

Mr Speaker, those are the matters that I ask you to consider.

The SPEAKER: When the member examines what he has just said to me, he will see that he has posed a question: he has not made an allegation. The honourable member must make an allegation for me to even refer it to the House for the consideration of a Privileges Committee.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I rise on a matter of privilege, Sir. The Minister for Industry, Trade and Technology said to the House yesterday:

I have apologised without reservation to those who believe I have deliberately misled the House, and again would like to make it clear that it was never my intention to do so.

That is a quote from the House yesterday. In the media outside the House, he said:

They [the Opposition] knew full well after I had made the statement in the House that there was no deliberate intention to do it.

I allege that the Minister for Industry, Trade and Technology has reflected on a decision of the House, namely, the decision to adopt the Privileges Committee report.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Chair does not believe that there is a matter of privilege involved here. The Minister is entitled to maintain his innocence once the matter has been concluded until the day he dies.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: There was an opportunity yesterday. I believe on the evidence presented to me at this time that there is no way that I can rule that the matter be referred to a Privileges Committee.

MARIJUANA

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Heritage. How many times in the past 12 months has contraband drug production been detected on national parks property, what types of operations have been uncovered and what is being done to stop it?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: The South Australian national parks reserves system is a very important asset which is enjoyed each year by thousands of local people and tourists

throughout the State. Yesterday morning I had the pleasant duty of officially opening a conference of National Parks and Wildlife rangers and support staff at the Fort Largs Police Academy. These are the men and women who carry out the day-to-day work in our parks and reserves and understand the important role they play, and they are certainly keen to provide a safe and enjoyable experience for all our visitors. That commitment is shared by this Government.

It was recently brought to our attention that unscrupulous drug dealers were using areas of national parks to cultivate marijuana crops. To combat this development, Operation Scrublock was initiated. Operation Scrublock was a joint statewide law enforcement operation involving South Australia Police, rangers from the National Parks and Wildlife Service and resource protection investigators, and it had the support of local communities. The operation centred on the eradication of the illegal growing of cannabis within our parks and reserves.

Operation Scrublock commenced in October 1997 and was completed in March this year. A helicopter airborne platform with experienced observers provided the ability to search and identify cannabis drug sites. More than 600 plants were located in the various parks and reserves on Kangaroo Island and on Eyre Peninsula, with an estimated street value of some \$1.5 million. A further 660 plants were located on land under heritage agreement in other parts of the State, and smaller numbers of plants were removed from other parks and reserves.

I am advised that a number of prosecutions have followed the successful implementation of Operation Scrublock. Indeed, the benefits of this program will continue to grow. As a result of Operation Scrublock, there has been a large increase in community support of reporting drugs in parks. The project has also received very strong community support, especially from the area of Port Lincoln. The Port Lincoln Rotary Club has donated some \$5 000 for the production of 40 000 bumper stickers. The message on the sticker is clear and unequivocal. It says, 'Keep Our Bush Drug Free'. That is the message we wish to give all South Australians.

A visit to a park or reserve in South Australia will continue to be safe and enjoyable and drug free. That is thanks to the combined efforts of the people whom I have mentioned previously—the officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, South Australia Police and, indeed, with tremendous support from local communities.

BOLIVAR SEWERAGE PLANT

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Environment and Heritage confirm her advice to the Estimates Committee that SA Water paid the \$500 000 cost of rectifying the Bolivar pong? On 19 June 1998 the Minister told the Estimates Committee that SA Water had paid for the auditor's report on the Bolivar pong—the Hartley report. When asked about the \$500 000 to fix the Bolivar pong, the Minister said, 'They will pay for that as well.'

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I certainly do not recall the details of that question at the moment, but I am quite prepared to take it on notice and bring back an answer for the honourable member.

VIRGINIA DEVELOPMENT

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Will the Minister for Primary Industries outline to the House some of the more recent developments in the Virginia area and how they have assisted in job creation? Concurrent with that question, will the Minister outline the latest trends in horticulture in the northern Adelaide plains area?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: It is an area the honourable member drives through very often and no doubt he takes an enormous interest in it. Last week I had the opportunity to spend a full day in the Virginia area and was certainly very impressed with the way the activities out there are going on. I was able to have lunch with a group from the community. There really is a buzz out there at the moment, and they are really getting on with the job. We are seeing a range of initiatives which has the Government working with industry to create economic growth and new jobs in that area. From the outset—

Mr Atkinson: Export jobs?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Yes. From the outset, when we talk about the Virginia Horticulture Centre, which has really gone ahead out there, we need to praise the work of that centre, headed by its Chairman, Malcolm Lewis, and the Executive Officer, Rachel Fletcher. That certainly follows on from the vision and hard work of the former Munno Para Council CEO, Joe Collins—who, for the benefit of the member for Spence, is a former Crystal Brook footballer. Joe did a terrific job out there. He showed some vision and was able to pull the people together in a way that has not happened in the past.

The centre is a joint effort between the State Government, local government and the community, and it has rapidly become a hub of activity in the area. In what is certainly a very diverse community, it has given them a greater sense of direction and a greater understanding of the importance of quality, marketing and exports.

The annual Virginia Expo to be held in October will be a showcase for that region, and I encourage any members who want an enjoyable day or two to visit Virginia and experience first hand the enthusiasm and sense of purpose in a community that is really showing where it wants to go. Importantly, the activity in the Virginia area in new horticultural developments is leading to many new jobs in the area. Underpinning much of the development is the water to come from the Bolivar project, and that is eagerly awaited.

There are projects such as the huge polyhouse development of International Hydroponics, which has a 32-bay structure, equivalent in size to Football Park. Already many people are employed out there, and the full scope of that project is to put under plastic an area about seven or eight times the size of Football Park, looking at export markets for capsicums, tomatoes and other products. Another 100 people are employed by Comit Farm, which we also visited and which is processing mainly potatoes but also onions, carrots and other vegetables for both the domestic and export markets. A number of similar packaging and processing ventures in the region are supplying much needed jobs in the northern Adelaide plains. Horticulture is well and truly the biggest employer in that area. As well as what we have seen with traditional market gardening and glasshouses there are also a number of large-scale hydroponics ventures. Adelaide Hydro Fresh, which grows lettuces, is one.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the photographer in the gallery that he can only take photographs of those members on their feet.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: There are a number of hydroponics ventures. Adelaide Hydro Fresh, specialising in lettuces, is expanding, and a major mushroom development is leading to more jobs. The traditional market gardeners are also becoming more export orientated, and a number of growers have been on Government delegations over the past couple of years. That has led to many good orders for the area, and that is underpinning this growth. For example, one grower is now supplying containers of cabbages as a result of an order taken at the recent Food Expo in Singapore.

The work my agency is doing with the Vietnamese growers out there is also paying dividends. Their produce is also an enormous help in boosting exports and coming up with the critical mass needed to meet these orders. A great deal of development is happening on the northern Adelaide Plains, which is but one of several areas in the State where labour intensive horticulture and viticulture is providing jobs. We are seeing community prosperity coming out of that.

RAPE COUNSELLING NOTES

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): On behalf of the Attorney-General in another place, I table a ministerial statement made by him earlier today.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I bring up the seventy-fifth report of the committee on the Education Development Centre, Hindmarsh, the Training and Development Unit, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the report be printed.

Motion carried.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): Today I will address the issue of child access change-over centres and call on the Minister for Human Services to establish or assist in the establishment of a centre in the south. I have had correspondence on this issue with the Minister. At the request of a constituent I asked the Minister for Human Services and the Minister for Police to make room in the Christies Beach police station for a child access change-over centre. My constituent, who is one of the 3 per cent of people involved in this issue, where she and her children are considered to be at high risk each time an access visit is organised, felt that a separate room in the police centre would be better than the current practice of handing over children at the front desk of the centre.

However, in discussions with others in the community, and in looking at what is happening around Australia at the moment, it seems that there is a much better answer than establishing a facility in the police station and that we might have an opportunity in the very near future to take advantage of Federal funding on this issue. I hope that we in South Australia will be in a position to do so. This is a very complex and far-reaching issue. It is also a hidden issue. We do not really know how many parents would like to have a safe and secure environment other than McDonald's in which to arrange for one's children to pass from the care of one parent to the other. At the moment it is mainly done at McDonald's, as it is seen as a place where children feel reasonably comfortable and nobody thinks you are strange coming in with one parent and leaving with another. Otherwise it is the unfriendly police station front counter.

The Bowden-Brompton legal service has such a centre in South Australia that is focused on the children and which evaluation has shown is meeting the needs of, in most cases, both parents. It became aware of a need way back in the 1980s and early 1990s, and in 1994 it was found that many others had the same experience, so a national Australian and New Zealand conference on the matter of child access hand over was held in Adelaide. The establishment of centres was seen to be the most child friendly answer to this difficult situation. Bowden-Brompton went ahead, consulted with the community and experts in the area and gained funding from the Save the Children Fund to establish a six month pilot. It seems awful that we have to access funds that are needed on an international level to enable our children to be safe.

The Keating Government in its Access to Justice Statement responded to the needs identified at the conference in Adelaide and established a number of pilots around Australia in 1994, one of which was the continuation of funding for Bowden-Brompton. These centres were generally given about four years funding, and the evaluation is now proceeding. No report is available yet, and one of the requests I have of the Minister is that he ensures that the report be publicly available. Informal indications are that the evaluation is extremely positive and that it identifies a rapidly increasing need. Certainly the workers at the southern women's community health centre tell me that it is an increasing need in the southern area.

I am hoping that funding will be continued. As we know that the Federal Government will probably put this out to tender, I ask that the Minister for Human Services create positions attached to the child protection unit to assist local community groups and experts in the area to be in a position to tender for that funding so that South Australia is at the front of the queue when that money is dispersed. There have been too many instances of South Australia missing out on money that is available federally.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I take this opportunity today to inform the House about a small group of young people for whom I have an enormous amount of respect—Future Echoes. I do not know how many members have had the opportunity to come into contact with this group, but they are part of a national body known as IPAC. They came together at a national conference when a number of young people who themselves had been in care decided to get together to help other young people who were in care or who had been in care, so Future Echoes came about in South Australia. I have had a close association with this group. I admire them tremendously and I commend them publicly for

the support that they are providing for other young people in care.

I am sure that all members in this House are aware of the number of young people who for one reason or another are under the care and control of the Minister. Most of these kids have had fairly traumatic lives. Very few of them have families or parents of their own and many of them have had to battle their way through life. I am very supportive of this group and I am delighted with the support that Future Echoes is getting in the community. I am particularly pleased that Lady Neal, the wife of the Governor, has recently agreed to be the patron of that organisation and came along to the opening of its office in QBE House in King William Street. I also commend QBE for its strong support in providing free accommodation and assisting these young people in a number of other ways.

I have just recently been fortunate enough to chair a small committee which had the responsibility for looking at some 55 applications seeking financial assistance to help young people who are in care or who have been in care in regard to their future education. That came about as a result of \$10 000 being made available to help these young people. The program is referred to as Educating and Supporting Youth in Care (EASY). Of the 55 applications received, it was very difficult to determine which of the applicants would be successful as far as funding was concerned, and the standard of the applications was quite remarkable.

Many of the applicants sought assistance in tutoring or financial assistance to find people who were able to help them regarding future TAFE courses or future tertiary courses. I have been giving a fair bit of thought to that, and I cannot for the life of me believe that, when there are lawyers in this State who are prepared to give up some free time to provide free advice through legal aid, there are no retired teachers, teachers or people who have had tertiary education experience who would not be prepared in a voluntary capacity to assist some of these young people. I want to work through that over the coming months.

I take this opportunity to commend this group for the responsible attitude it has adopted and the assistance that it is providing to other young people in care and those who have been in care. I appreciate the support that is being provided by the Minister for Human Services, because we will always have these kids, they will always need our assistance and respect, and I hope that all members of the House will provide that respect.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Yesterday the member for Bragg attempted to defend the indefensible, that is, to defend the right to recklessly mislead this House and the people of South Australia. It was a very sad day. Yesterday the Deputy Premier and member for Frome said that the member for Bragg had paid a high penalty for his actions, that his family had suffered due to a political exercise. He said:

If members had seen, in the past few weeks, what the Minister and his family have been put through because of what has basically been a political exercise, they would understand that he has paid an enormous penalty. In the hurly-burly of politics we sometimes forget that Minister Ingerson and his family are real people, a real family, and that must be well and truly acknowledged.

I feel for his family and for any other member's family who have had to bear the brunt of public scrutiny. However, in the member for Bragg's case, his difficulties were of his own making. He created his own problems, unlike my constituents and the constituents of other members and their families who

have had to suffer major economic cutbacks and psychological trauma as a direct result of his and his Government's policies.

The member for Bragg let the cat out of the bag when he mentioned in his defence yesterday—and he bragged about this—his involvement in industrial relations reforms. He said:

I have worked closely with many members of this Parliament to help push through important reform in the industrial relations area, particularly in regard to WorkCover. I am proud to say that the unfunded liabilities have fallen from \$276 million in 1995 to about \$70 million today.

Ms Key: It is actually \$87 million.

Mrs GERAGHTY: It is \$87 million, is it? He got it wrong. What he did not mention is the financial and emotional torment and social crisis those reforms have inflicted upon injured workers and their families, families whose loved ones have suffered a workplace injury and who are in the WorkCover system through no fault of their own and who bear the brunt of his reforms and his cutbacks. It is an absolute outrage that so much suffering can be imposed on injured workers, yet the member for Bragg actually feels proud of and gets satisfaction from his so-called savings at the expense of others. Worse still, he feels that he should receive public adulation for it.

Many families in our community are tearing themselves apart because they cannot cope financially or with the pressures that the system and processes of WorkCover and private agents put them through. If the Minister were prepared to meet with some of these families who are suffering as a direct result of his actions, I would gladly go with him. In many cases injured workers and their families have lost or are facing the entire loss of their savings because of the ridiculously low payments that they receive, particularly after the two year review process. Others are in despair because of the low payouts offered, and sometimes they are squeezed into accepting low payouts because of veiled threats either by corporation procedural action in these settlement negotiations—

Ms Key interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: Or by the insurance companies, as my colleague says. Workers put through this process end up psychologically traumatised because they know they cannot afford the additional legal costs to take on the corporation or the agents; yet these injured workers and their families know that not to continue fighting for better remuneration means being thrown onto the social security scrap heap, knowing that they will probably never work again, and that their payouts are totally insufficient for them and their families to live on in the future. Some people have been driven to such despair because of the pressures imposed on them that they have contemplated or attempted and in some cases actually committed suicide, and many marital relationships have been torn apart and family units have been broken down.

Injured workers have complained about the process, because it has meant appeal after appeal by the corporation to thwart any attempts to give them a fair and just financial reward. Members on the Government side of the House would do well to ponder who really is the victim of a political exercise in this case.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): A drug can be defined as any chemical or substance which affects the way in which a person's mind or body works. You would know that, Sir, as a pharmacist. Intoxication by a drug or drugs causes impaired judgment which causes people to take risks they normally

would not take. Climbing to great heights, diving into shallow pools, having unprotected sexual contact and reckless driving, including speeding, are all types of behaviour which carry great risks of harm. By definition, young people are inexperienced in drug use and so this effect is even stronger on a first up experience contact basis. Many teenagers experiment with drugs and most start out with drugs that are easiest for them to get, even though unlawful, that is, tobacco, alcohol, analgesics and inhalants. Around one in three these days, we know, will experiment with other drugs such as marijuana.

Marijuana is an illegal drug that is derived from the cannabis plant, *cannabis sativa*. The main active ingredient which produces the high is Delta 9 tetrahydrocannabinol, commonly known as THC. Marijuana is made from the dried flowers and leaves of the *cannabis sativa* plant. It looks like chopped grass and ranges in colour from greyish green through to brown gold. It is most widely used in the form of cannabis in Australia. It generally contains around 1 to 5 per cent of THC, although the stronger super grass varieties now being cultivated contain up to 15 per cent THC. When one buys this material on the streets, one does not know what the strength will be and, in consequence, what the effect of the joint will be should they choose to smoke one. It affects the memory, concentration, mood, thinking processes, physical coordination, sense of time and ability to perceive and interpret one's surroundings.

Regular smoking of marijuana increases the risk of chronic bronchitis and of cancers of the lung, mouth and throat. It produces more tar when smoked than an equivalent weight of strong tobacco, and cannabis smoke contains higher amounts of cancer causing agents or carcinogens than tobacco smoke. Most teenagers who experiment with cannabis have already tried other drugs such as alcohol and tobacco. To date, Government agencies and the records they have kept of interviews with offenders, as well as the surveys they have done of young people, reveal that most will not try any other stronger drug such as amphetamines, ecstasy or heroin.

Amphetamines, one is commonly called speed, are a group of drugs which stimulate the central nervous system. They appear to reduce the feeling of tiredness, increase endurance and help people (it is thought) to stay awake, albeit in a state of severe physical fatigue, thereby resulting in an inability to perform basic physical actions.

Amphetamines were once generally available only on prescription. Now they are prescribed only to treat narcolepsy and hypokinetic behavioural disorders in children. They come in different forms and can be taken in different ways, but most often they come in white or yellow powder which often has a strong characteristic smell. Sometimes they come in capsules of different shapes and sizes. They can be swallowed, inhaled through the nose or dissolved in a small amount of water and intravenously injected. The immediate effect is to speed up activity of the body because they are stimulants: the heart rate, breathing and blood pressure go up, the pupils of the eyes get larger, and a dry mouth and increased sweating may occur. Amphetamines reduce the appetite. Some users become anxious, irritable, hostile and aggressive, and commonly they feel a sense of power and superiority over other people.

Those who regularly use them often become malnourished: having reduced their appetite, they do not eat properly. Frequent heavy use or high doses cause what is known as amphetamine psychosis. The symptoms include delusion, hallucinations and bizarre behaviour, which are similar to the symptoms of schizophrenia. The symptoms usually disappear

shortly after the person stops using them so long as it is early in the occasion they have chosen to use it. Regular amphetamine users are more prone to infections because they do not eat sufficiently and their immune system runs down. They do not sleep properly and are generally run down and have a severe immune deficiency leading to infections.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Sometimes I am asked why the Australian Labor Party so strongly opposes the views of Pauline Hanson's One Nation, so I thought it might be useful to explain why Labor believes One Nation is such a destructive and divisive poison within our society. The ALP believes racism has no place in Australian law or Australian life. We believe generation after generation of Australian migrants have helped build and enrich our nation. Labor believes our diversity is Australia's great strength, not our weakness. We believe migrants and the children of migrants have helped to forge the great Australian traditions of fairness and freedom, and reinforced Australian values, our faith, our family life and our sense of community. Labor believes that Australian Governments have a duty to encourage and promote opportunities for all our children to advance and make the most of their potential. We believe that our economy is weakened if we fail to utilise to the fullest the energies and skills of every Australian.

Pauline Hanson's One Nation has different views. One Nation sees some Australians as 'them' not 'us' and believes every job for 'them' is a job somehow taken away from 'us'. One Nation believes the origins and views of its 'leaders' are somehow superior to the origins and views of other Australians. Day after day their targets change. One Nation attacks multiculturalism as destroying the character of a nation that has celebrated its migrants and its cultural diversity for more than 200 years. One Nation has attacked Asian migrants. To win votes, it has smeared legal migrants to our country who work hard, pay their taxes, contribute to our economy, serve our community and care about their children's future. Aboriginal people have been shamefully vilified and Pauline Hanson seems to think they do not deserve a vote. She attacks Aborigines for receiving Government assistance even though the first Australians are still the last Australians when it comes to job opportunities, education, health and longevity.

But the targets both change and continue—single parents one day and even Jews, who know all about racism. Each group is singled out and made the latest scapegoat for the difficult economic circumstances facing many Australians. One Nation pretends that it has all the answers and that complex problems can be solved instantly by simple solutions. Pauline Hanson's slogan should not be 'Please explain': it should be 'Don't explain'—just blame someone else, diminish their background, character and contribution to our country.

Pauline Hanson says we should abolish multiculturalism but I am not sure how that can be achieved in a migrant country. As Kim Beazley said, 'You might as well call for the abolition of mateship.' For votes, One Nation exploits the fears of people who are insecure by attacking people who are vulnerable. But by hurting Australians, One Nation hurts Australia abroad as well as at home. When we were in Tokyo last year fighting to save the car industry and win investment, Pauline Hanson's anti-Asian views were being reported by the media in Japan and throughout Asia. She was doing us enormous damage. Pauline Hanson and her Party are costing Australia jobs, investment and exports. Her policies will

ensure that those Australians who are already insecure about their future will have no future.

When Australians go overseas, we have a right to feel proud about our country. But how can we feel proud if we become divided at home and despised abroad? The tragedy for Australia is that the damage caused by One Nation could have been avoided if John Howard had shown the courage required by a leader and repudiated Pauline Hanson's views. The Prime Minister failed the test because he hoped that a fellow conservative exploiting prejudice nationally might help his Party politically. He put Party before country and allowed racism to do its damage without a fight. Now his failure to lead is damaging him and his Government, as well as our country. Kim Beazley summed up Labor's position when he said that the political leadership of Australia has a duty to govern for the nation as a whole, secure in the knowledge that this whole is greater than the sum of its diverse parts. That is why it is vitally important for each of us to take a stand and put One Nation last on our ballot papers and on our how-to-vote cards.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Some time ago I highlighted a few factors relating to aspects of roads in my electorate, and I would like to continue with that matter.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: It is interesting to hear the Opposition's comments, because Yorke Peninsula is different and unusual compared to other electorates. As members would know it is a peninsula, which was densely settled in earlier days. Of course, Goyder was South Australia's first Surveyor-General, and he is the one who was responsible for people settling the areas basically below the 10 inch isohyet.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I do not know what is upsetting some members opposite so much. Road maintenance is a major problem for not only the State Government but also local government and, to some extent, the Federal Government. I am pleased that the Federal Government has made available so much money in the past few years to enable us to build a dual highway through to Port Wakefield. It is interesting to note that someone from a business in Wallaroo said to me that each time the dual highway has been extended his business increased by in excess of 10 per cent. When the road was first extended it went to Two Wells; then it went basically to Dublin, then Port Wakefield. If we could get it right through to Kadina and Wallaroo, of course, that person's business would skyrocket. I am sure that one day that will be the case, although I do not know whether it will be in my lifetime.

Members may not appreciate that, given the extent of our roads network, there is so much work to be done, first, in sealing unsealed roads. We are well on the way to doing that; in fact, we are ahead in our 10 year plan. Secondly, many of the roads have reached a stage where they need a major upgrade; for example, the road from Maitland North through to Arthurton. I have had to push the upgrade of that road for many years, although some work has been done. Part of the reason why more money has not been spent is that that road is not used to the same extent as is, say, the road from Maitland to Ardrossan and thence the coast road. It is heartening that a 7 kilometre stretch of that road has been widened, and it is planned that that widening will continue. However, because of budgetary constraints due to the inefficiency of the members opposite—

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Your predecessors, who were members of the then Labor Government.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Yes, but, unfortunately, I believe that your views are indicative of the views that were expressed by other members before you took your seat in Parliament. I understand your concerns, but how do you think we feel when you criticise us? Obviously, the record of the previous Labor Government is a disastrous one, and nothing has happened to restore my confidence in the members of that Government. Getting back to the roads—

Members interjecting:

Mr WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The clock has stopped.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am reliably informed that the clock has not stopped. If we wait for a couple of minutes, we will see whether that advice is correct.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MEIER: There is no doubt that the road from Port Wakefield through to the South Hummocks needs attention. The problem with that road is the massive amount of movement involved, so that any money to be spent there should go towards giving it a proper and firm foundation. A huge amount of money has been spent on the road from Kadina through to Wallaroo, and more money still needs to be spent. I am making that sure that every dollar spent is spent wisely and that it is not spent on just cheap patch-up jobs. It will be an excellent road when it is finished in probably the better part of two years. I wish that it had been finished by now.

Given that we have road trains going up and down on the coast road, that is also another important road. Certainly that whole issue will have to be reassessed and analysed, depending on the decision of the deep sea ports committee when it is finally handed down. Members should be aware that that committee, which is an industry body, has been meeting for over five years, and it has brought down two interim reports. However, whatever its recommendation, I know that our Government will be approached for commitments on road widening or new roads in certain areas. Likewise, down at the bottom end, we have done a lot in the Innes National Park, where we have built a magnificent new road. Other roads there under council control require maintenance, and the State Government may have to look at assisting with that maintenance, if it can afford to do so, once we get our budget on track. Members opposite should ensure that they put pressure on their colleagues in another place to vote in favour of the sale of ETSA, because it will help this State enormously.

CITY OF ADELAIDE BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 22 July. Page 1544.)

Mr CONLON (Elder): The member for Spence has already made some comments about the City of Adelaide not being like any other local government body, and that is the filter through which we must look at the Bill. He is, of course, right. I would go further and say that it is not simply not just

another local government body because it is the capital city but it is a capital city in itself of considerable uniqueness. It is a city of great charm and beauty. Of course, our parklands are in themselves unique. In the past, I have been required to work interstate on a regular basis. One of the great joys of flying back to Adelaide in the late afternoon is coming back over the Hills and seeing the panorama of the City of Adelaide, with the cathedral, Adelaide Oval and the city square circled by the parklands. It makes one reflect that, while we have some difficulties in this State, while we face economic problems, and while we have problems with population and so on, we have other great compensations in the City of Adelaide, and its layout is certainly one of those.

An honourable member: And the Central Market.

Mr CONLON: And the Central Market, which we like to frequent so that we can see the benefits of multiculturalism not known to Pauline (I'm not eating that foreign muck) Hanson. I should say at this point that we support some of this Bill, which, far from being a brave or comprehensive measure, is probably the least that might have been done without causing embarrassment to the Government. Be that as it may, we support aspects of the Bill—

Members interjecting:

Mr CONLON: You have tried. You have done slightly better with the City of Adelaide than you have done with wasps but I would say to the Minister that it is still only about five out of 10 at the moment. The truth is that the City of Adelaide is overdue for some change. It is a shame that in this Bill we have not looked at more change. The boundaries of the City of Adelaide still encompass fairly much, as I understand it, Colonel Light's vision. We have a great legacy from Colonel Light and his city planning but the truth is that (and this is one of the things that we have to face up to) no-one's vision should ever be cast in concrete, and boundaries set on the vision of Colonel Light may not necessarily be the best way to govern the City of Adelaide and South Australia.

I place on the record my own personal view—and this is not a matter that has been discussed by our Caucus, because it is not a matter dealt with in the Bill—which is that the City of Adelaide is enjoyed and loved by so many people. As such a wide range of South Australians participate in activities in the City of Adelaide and earn so much money (let us be frank about it), there should be more South Australians involved in its governance. My personal preference would be for broader boundaries extending on all sides to make a great city council and one which does not suffer the defects of the current city council in terms of its governance. Plainly, one of those defects to which other people have referred is the very narrow base of residents who exercise—and I look at the former Lord Mayor when I say this—an inordinate control, or an inordinate influence in the matters of the city. I believe that that is unfortunate. A Government with a little more ticker, with a little more bottle, might have been prepared to do something about it: this one was not. I imagine that—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr CONLON: After 10 rounds with the wasps and a further two rounds with the Minister for North Adelaide, he was all tuckered out. The truth is that that is one of the things that we might have done in the city. This is a city of which I am very fond: other than the wine industry, it is the greatest thing about South Australia. We would all recognise that there has been a decline in its role as a commercial centre, and even a shopping centre, in the past decade or so—or more than a decade.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CONLON: I agree, it is not the council's fault. One factor is the foolish obsession of some members on the opposite side with continually expanding things such as shopping hours in the suburbs.

Members interjecting:

Mr CONLON: And shopping centres—and we are the poorer for it. I defy anyone who travels the suburbs as they are now and visits the shopping centres, for whatever benefits they serve, to tell me that they are not much more soulless, much less aesthetic and do not vibrate, or resonate with the same warmth, excitement, beauty and aesthetics as the City of Adelaide. I blame both sides of the Parliament in this. We have governed over the decline of the City of Adelaide, and we should look at measures beyond this Bill to arrest that and to revitalise the city, because it is a jewel.

Those are the challenges that are before us: improving on the great legacy left us by Colonel Light; maintaining and preserving those great things about the city (and they are still there) and improving and advancing on that vision in light of the late twentieth century and the role that the city plays in so many lives. That has not been done. But what has been done by this Government? That was the test, and what was the answer?

Before I relate the answer, let us consider a few more things about how even the Government at one stage thought that this was a matter of considerable importance, to the extent that the former Premier, or should I say the former and future Premier—I will leave that one—staked his career and his leadership on reforming the City of Adelaide. He was a poor punter: he should have staked something a little less, because he lost.

Three years down the track, after all that, after the tortuous findings, we have a Minister for Local Government who was beaten in 10 rounds with wasps and we have a former Premier who received a clean knock-out by Henry Ninio. It does not speak great volumes for the Government. But that is what happened. The former Premier staked his leadership on it, including all those things that we know and love about the city and the importance of it. And three years down the track we see the loss of a Premier and the decline of the city. What has the Government done about it? It has formed a committee. Of course, some here might say that we have had a few committees on the City of Adelaide—and, by golly, we have. What the City of Adelaide needs is some vision, some action and some plans for the future. But we have a committee. I say to the Minister, in case he is worried about our opposing the measure, that I do not see that it does a great deal of good. It is an advisory committee but, framed as it is, it does not appear to do a great deal of harm. If this is the Minister's indulgence, we will give it to him but he could have done a lot better.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr CONLON: I am sure that the member for Norwood will be happy to talk to you at some other time. The Bill makes some changes that we support. As I said, we probably feel neutral about the committee: the Minister could have done a lot better.

We support the reduction in number of councillors to eight, and the Lord Mayor being elected at large from the electorate. We understand that the original Bill, in the wisdom of the Minister, would have allowed for the abolition of wards and the election of councillors at large. The Minister is shaking his head and nodding it at the same time—it may be a wasp or it may indicate disagreement. However, as we understand it, the Minister for North Adelaide intervened in

that process in drawing up the Bill, and decided on these provisions in the interests of those constituents whom he loves so dearly, the North Adelaide residents. Let me say that I am not here to slag or insult North Adelaide residents: in fact, some of my best friends are North Adelaide residents.

But the simple truth is that, whilst I have nothing against the residents of North Adelaide, I have a very great deal of love for the City of Adelaide, and I believe that its governance should be in the hands of a broader range than simply those people who, in my view—not all of them but some of them, as evidenced by the closure of Barton Terrace, I might say (and no doubt the member for Spence will address this matter at length later)—have treated some areas of the city and the parklands as being more their private property than the common weal of the people of South Australia. I believe that that is a shame. Those people also, as we know, enjoy rate rebates not afforded to the ordinary toiling masses of South Australia—and that is something that we will also address.

However, we support the reduction in the size of the council. We will oppose the use of wards, because we see it as no more than a device by the Minister for North Adelaide to protect his own voting bloc and, I assume, his own interests as a member of Parliament. We applaud the Minister's intention to remove the ability of the City Council to give its ridiculous rate rebates to some of the wealthiest people in South Australia. I understand on these matters that it will not be necessary for the Opposition to amend these things, because the Independents and—

Mr Clarke: The fierce Independents.

Mr CONLON: The fierce Independents and, I understand, the member for Colton have shaken off their lethargy and have given a firm commitment to avoid their usual gymnastics. We have them on leaded shoes so that they in fact will keep going in the same direction and not perform the acrobatics we are used to seeing from them in this Chamber: they will in fact be moving and supporting amendments that will remove wards and accelerate the phasing out of rate rebates. That is something we support and something for which we will be voting.

There are other matters that we support and with which we will deal—in particular, the Government's blind ideological hostility towards compulsory voting. We note that the Government's own review recommended compulsory voting. We support it as a matter of principle as being healthy and important for democracy. We will deal with that matter upstairs, not wishing to waste the time of this House. A number of other matters in the Bill will be dealt with by way of amendment when it goes to the Legislative Council and we hope for some success there. Having said those things, I am keen to assist the Government to get the Bill into Committee so that it can then pass to the Upper House in time to allow the proper administrative procedures to take place in respect of the elections which are planned for November. We welcome some change to the City of Adelaide. We believe that it falls a long way short of what a courageous Government with vision would have done, but it is a start. However, when we take this Government's place, as inevitably we will in a few years, we will do the rest.

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): I support the comments of the member for Elder and, given the hour and the warning from the Whip to be quick if we want to knock off by six, I will try to keep my comments to 10 minutes or less.

Mr Hill interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: But no-one believes me—thank you, member for Kaurna. I support the thrust of the Bill, as did the member for Elder, and I support the composition of the committee. As the member for Elder says, it does not seem to do any harm by having it there, and the fact that it is enacted in legislation may do some good because it will force Ministers, Premiers and Lord Mayors, on a regular basis throughout the year, to sit down and hopefully thrash out certain policy positions for the development of the city.

If it is not in the legislation, it relies simply on the goodwill of the Lord Mayor and the Premier of the day to telephone each other and make appointments. We all know how that happens. You might be lucky to be able to convene one formal meeting a year, or something of this nature, on an *ad hoc* basis, rather than looking at the city strategically. As the member for Elder pointed out, the problems of the city are more to do with the general economics of the State than the fact that there has been poor administration of the city council. The fact that the State Government sacked approximately 16 000, or more, full-time equivalent State public servants, the overwhelming majority of whom worked in the CBD area, has a significant impact on the businesses of the City of Adelaide through the loss of pay packets and the associated supporting jobs.

Likewise, I think that the State Government was very derelict in not using its planning laws to prevent the expansion of the Marion Shopping Centre, because that clearly helped hollow out the city; likewise with respect to the expansion of Tea Tree Plaza by Westfield. Of course, the Government keeps trying to toy with shop trading hours and would desperately love to extend Sunday trading to the suburbs, which would hollow out the city even further. However, there is also a need to reform the legislation, particularly in respect of the removal of wards.

I am very supportive of removing wards because they make the governance of this city far too parochial. Many times have I spoken to North Adelaide councillors on issues that have affected the city as a whole, whether it be road closures or a range of other issues, to be told privately that 'Yes' they agree but, because they must placate their voters in the North Adelaide wards, they dare not take a position that is to the benefit of the city and the State as a whole. It is far better to have the entire city as one electorate, where the business community must try to reconcile itself with residents to win their votes and trust to get elected. The residents must also have a broader vision by reaching out and trying to gain the trust of the business community in their decisions so that they can also get elected to office.

I do not believe that it is too expensive for candidates to run in a city-wide election with only one electorate as against wards. Given the geographic size of the area, if you have a few supporters you do not even have to worry about letter-boxing. You should be able to do it with a dozen friends quite readily and, if you cannot get a dozen friends together to hand out leaflets, it is a pretty sad indictment of your level of support and perhaps you ought to rethink your options and running for office in the first place. I want to make it clear that I am not bashing North Adelaide residents because, for almost 12 months last year, I had the pleasure of living in North Adelaide in a rented property.

I enjoyed the ambience of living there and all the rest that goes with living in an inner city suburban area. I might say that I do resent intensely how the residents of North Adelaide have gone about their business, particularly over the past decade and a half, of trying to turn it into a fortress, impen-

erable by anyone other than local residents. I particularly resented the fact that the residents got the council to close Stanley Street, MacKinnon Parade and Kingston Terrace which, for those of us who regularly use those thoroughfares to go about our daily business, is a major impediment, and it almost destroyed Melbourne Street as a commercial centre. Peak hour traffic is just so thick in that street that local traders find it extremely difficult to encourage passing traffic to stop so that people can shop in that area.

Mr Atkinson: It will all change when we are in Government.

Mr CLARKE: I am pleased to hear the member for Spence say that it will all change, and I look forward to that day. However, what I do resent is that so many other persons who use the City of Adelaide and its immediate environs were put at some considerable inconvenience by the selfish actions of those North Adelaide residents who used their power and electoral muscle within North Adelaide and the Adelaide City Council to achieve their ends. I will not go into the Barton Road issue and the closure of it because I would far prefer the member for Spence to detail it, and we will deal with that amendment in Committee.

I merely say that that was but the most recent act of sheer elitism on the part of the North Adelaide residents exercising their power within the City of Adelaide. Again, time out of number North Adelaide ward councillors and other councillors have said to me how they thought Barton Road ought to be opened for the general traffic but, of course, they were never able to do so because of the iron-clad control the North Adelaide residents society had over its ward councillors. They would have been turfed out of office if they did such a thing as to take into account the interests of other people who use the City of Adelaide, but we will deal with that in more detail at a later date.

We have also dealt with the residential rate rebate of up to 45 per cent, which has been reduced this year by 5 per cent. There is no justification for it to continue. I certainly do not agree with the transitional provisions of up to five years—it should be less. In my view it could be done from day one, but I appreciate that sometimes one must take things in stages. At least the Government is moving in the right direction by doing it over five years, and I am sure that amendments will be put forward to reduce that period somewhat significantly.

Mr Atkinson: It was not worth losing it over Barton Road.

Mr CLARKE: I would commend that position to the House. I note that the Bill contains a maximum period of office for a Lord Mayor of two terms. The Opposition will move an amendment to allow the Lord Mayor to stay in office—as every other mayor can do in the State—for longer than two terms, if that is what the electors want. I can see some merit in the argument put forward by those who say that it should be for only two terms in that it is largely a ceremonial office and one showing leadership and guidance to the council. However, it can obsess some people to the point that they think they are *de facto* chief executive officers of the city council.

Problems can be caused for the administration of the council where Lord Mayors confuse their role with that of the Chief Executive Officer of the council. That situation can cause conflict. Given the nature of the city, I think that, in some respects, there is no harm. I can understand an argument for allowing some reasonable rotation of the Lord Mayor's position and not allowing someone, once in office,

to think that they have a God-given right to stay there forever. However, I am more than quite comfortable with the position that will be put by the Labor Party. In terms of other matters, I am more than happy to await the Committee stage of the Bill and perhaps speak more fulsomely—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: The member for Spence keeps tempting me to speak more.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: I will deal with North Adelaide later. In closing, I suppose I should declare an interest in that I was the Labor Party candidate for the old seat of Torrens in 1977 and 1979. I did very well in 1977, and it was an act of grace—in fact, a terrible act—that I was defeated in 1977 at the tender age of 25. I hold nothing against the people of North Adelaide because the majority of them did not vote for me. That has nothing to do with my present position whatsoever. I have more affection for Walkerville where, once we are in Government, I will be able to incorporate the Corporation of the Town of Walkerville with the City of Port Adelaide Enfield. That will be my crowning glory whenever we finally get into Government. I look forward to seeing the face—

The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: It could not be worth 5 per cent to the member for Adelaide—he already has 95 per cent of the vote. The other 5 per cent are my mother and father who still vote Labor in Walkerville.

Mr HILL (Kaurna): I, too, have been told to speak briefly so that we can get out of here by 6 p.m. I would like to raise a number of issues, all of which involve North Adelaide, but not in the same terms as the previous speaker. The real dilemma for reform of the Adelaide City Council is what to do with North Adelaide. It is an unusual circumstance that a capital city has just one suburb attached to it, and a suburb which is not reflective of the general population of the city which it is in. In other States, the capital cities are much larger and have a whole range of suburbs which reflect a much broader socio-economic mix. That is certainly the case in Sydney, Brisbane and, I understand, Melbourne.

We have an usual circumstance in Adelaide where the capital city is basically the business centre plus one relatively privileged suburb attached to it. It does make an unusual kind of problem, especially in terms of how to get the votes to work out in a way where you can get reasonable government. We have known over recent years, particularly before the current Lord Mayor took her tenure, that there was great division in the city council, and that division has led to this piece of reform legislation. There has been a problem about how you govern the city when there are two sets of interests completely at loggerheads with each other competing for the final say.

The question is: how do you deal with North Adelaide? At one stage I believed that North Adelaide should be removed from the city, but I have now changed my mind. It does make sense to leave North Adelaide with the city.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HILL: Thank you, Sir, it was making it difficult for me. I would not want to take more than 10 minutes—

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr HILL: No, I have at least eight minutes, and I might go longer than that. How do you resolve the problem of North Adelaide? One way would be to remove it from the city. That is an option I contemplated previously. Now that I am

wearing the responsibility of the shadow Minister for Environment and Heritage I can see other reasons for keeping North Adelaide within the central city.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr HILL: I will get to that in a moment.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr HILL: It may well. I will not lose any sleep over it, either. The second way of doing it is much more sensible, and I regret that the body which looked at this Bill did not address this issue in its report. My suggestion to the review process, as the Secretary of the Labor Party and as a multiple voter in the City of Adelaide, was that another group of electors should be brought in to dilute the power of the existing stakeholders. We have roughly a division between the commercial interests and the residential interests of North Adelaide, and they are at loggerheads. One way of breaking down that type of conflict is to bring in a third group of voters, a third interest group. The interest group which I suggested, and I am pleased that the member for Spence supports this, was people who work in the City of Adelaide. Those who have a strong interest on a daily basis in what happens in the City of Adelaide should have a vote in the council elections.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HILL: It would not be such a difficult thing to do. You would construct a roll, and anyone who works in the city, including members of this House and people who work in this House, would be able to register as voters and then have a say in the election. If that had been the case, I would have supported having three separate boundaries. You could have had a set of boundaries producing three councillors representing residents, three councillors representing the commercial interests and three—

Mr Atkinson: A supplementary roll.

Mr HILL: Exactly. There would also be three councillors representing the workers of the city. Because such a large number of people work in the city, there would be no way of fixing their roll, but the rolls for the other two groups can be fixed relatively easily by vested interest. This method would provide a more dynamic electoral system which would produce a better range of results reflecting the broader interests of the South Australian community. Sadly, that suggestion was ignored. However, I hope that at some future stage the member for Spence and I can work together on that particular reform.

Since that is not the case, it seems to me foolish in the extreme to establish three wards in the City of Adelaide because it will entrench the division between the various groupings in the city. There will be a North Adelaide faction and a commercial faction. This is what has been wrong with the structure of the city council for sometime, and it should be abolished. The simple way of doing it is to get rid of all the wards and have one general electorate. That does make sense. There is not a very large number of voters in the system, depending on the voting system. All interests groups could be represented in that process in any event.

Incidentally, with respect to the wards, I point out to the Minister that it is unfortunate that the wards have been given the same names as House of Assembly seats—Light, Kaurna and Mitchell. If this is not reformed in some way, or if the amendment of the member for Colton does not get up, we will end up with three wards named after House of Assembly seats, and that would be confusing. I do not want somebody from the city or North Adelaide running around the place representing themselves as the member for Kaurna, because

I know what kind of confusion that would create. I do not want their correspondence or to have to deal with their issues. I would oppose that very strongly.

I would like to make some general points about Adelaide. I believe it is important that we do have reform of the city. Most of the measures in the Bill are worthy of support. It is important that the City of Adelaide is given particular focus. There is absolutely enormous potential in this city, and we all know it. The great tragedy is that that potential is not being utilised. One of the problems we have is trying to get the right balance between heritage and growth of the city. Sadly, every time somebody wants to grow something, they want to knock something down which has heritage value. There is absolutely masses of space in this city where there are no buildings or where very ordinary buildings are in place.

There is plenty of opportunity in Adelaide for growth and development of high quality. Unfortunately, in the past, we have seen interesting and beautiful examples of Adelaide heritage knocked over and replaced with cheap and rather crappy bits of architecture. We really have to get the balance right between development and—

Mr Clarke: How do you describe Trades Hall?

Mr HILL: It is absolutely one of the worst examples of architecture in the city. The balance between heritage and growth needs to be done properly. If we can do that, we will have one of the best cities in Australia. We already have one of the best cities, but we will have one of the leading cities in the southern hemisphere.

We have lots of potential in the city, as we all know. Tourism, food and wine have already been mentioned, as has the Central Market. This is a city that people like to come to because it is different from other Australian cities. It does not resemble an American west coast city. It is a different sort of city, and we should be proud of that difference and maintain it and support it. We have great capacity in South Australia, because of its size, to promote arts, culture and education. We know how well the arts festivals have gone over the years. There is a capacity for this city to become a university city, as the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition have said, and the capacity to attract people from all over the world is enormous. We need extra resources and support in that regard.

I hope that the new capital city team is able to take on that issue in particular. We need more population in the square mile of Adelaide—probably 20 000 or 30 000 more—to make it a vibrant, lively, metropolitan centre. There are far too few people living in the City of Adelaide. If there were more people, it would be a vibrant city. I would like the commission to take on that aspect. We also need better public transport to and from the City of Adelaide so that we do not have traffic congestion and more and more car parks taking up valuable space in the square mile.

I refer now to the parklands. Many people refer to the parklands in relation to Adelaide. It is important that North Adelaide and the City of Adelaide stay together because the parklands surround them. People talk about Adelaide being a city surrounded by parks. It has been put to me—so it is not a fresh but an insightful idea—that we should see Adelaide as a city built within a park. It is an interesting way of looking at Adelaide. It is a city built in a park, not surrounded by or divided from a park but part of a park. If that was a theme as a way of developing Adelaide, it would give a truly green focus to the city, which would be an advantage in terms of some of the other economic purposes that the commission might want to pursue.

Finally, I pay tribute to the present Lord Mayor, Dr Lomax-Smith, who is doing a fine job as Lord Mayor and getting the city focused on what it should be doing and who is a great improvement on some of her predecessors.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I will also be brief. As other members have pointed out, there is a recognition that there have been considerable problems in the administration of the City of Adelaide over recent years—going back further than just a couple of years. That recognition is probably more pronounced outside the immediate area of the City of Adelaide, including the Central Business District and North Adelaide, where many people, I dare say, think things are going along quite well. People outside that area recognise that there are considerable problems. One of the problems—the rating system—has been highlighted by a few speakers, and I will refer to that in a moment.

One problem is that the City of Adelaide as a local government area, and the city council as the local government authority, should be seen to be completely different from any other local government authority in the State of South Australia. South Australia is a city state: Adelaide is not the capital of the greater metropolitan area of Adelaide but the capital and the city of South Australia.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: It is a nice town; you should visit it some time. The member for Kaurana a few moments ago said that he originally thought that part of the city, namely, North Adelaide, would be better off if it was removed from the city. I have some feelings along the same lines, but I have been convinced of the historical nature of Light's Vision and what that means to all South Australians. In recent times I have discussed with the Minister what he is attempting to do with regard to the City of Adelaide and I have taken on board the historical nature of Light's Vision and the City of Adelaide.

I am happy to try to fix up what we have without making any major changes. If it works, that would be good. I have some doubts in some areas, but I am willing to go along with the basic thrust of this Bill to see whether it will work and achieve the outcomes that the Minister is hoping to achieve.

The member for Kaurana referred to the City of Adelaide and the situation in North Adelaide. He talked of the involvement of the City of Adelaide and the system under which people who work in the City of Adelaide can vote for the city council. I point out to the member for Kaurana and all members opposite that once again the Labor Party has chosen to ignore all of regional South Australia, which has a very important and vested interest in what goes on in the City of Adelaide. The City of Adelaide is the capital of South Australia: it is not the capital of the metropolitan area of Adelaide but the capital of South Australia. This Parliament should recognise that.

Mr Atkinson: You ought to be on the supplementary roll, too.

Mr WILLIAMS: Under the system of the member for Kaurana, I work (I hope it can be regarded as such) in the city. I ask that members opposite, on all matters they consider, recognise that many people reside outside the metropolitan area of Adelaide; they should recognise that 60 per cent of the export income of South Australia is derived from regional South Australia. Much of that money ends up in the City of Adelaide, and that brings me to the matter of rates and rate rebates.

The rate rebate—cross subsidisation between the business and residential sectors of the City of Adelaide—has long been

debated. I might have missed the contribution of some members, but I do not believe that any member mentioned the valuation system used in the City of Adelaide, which is an even bigger rort than the rate rebate. I say that because the valuation system used in the City of Adelaide—and I understand that it is the only local government authority in the State that uses this system—known as the annual value system, means that rating is based on the rental expectation of the property rather than the site value or the capital value, as used in all other jurisdictions.

Mr Atkinson: What a rort!

Mr WILLIAMS: It is certainly a rort regarding residential properties because, for properties particularly at the top end of the market with a valuation of more than \$300 000, the annual value does not reflect the property value. Once we get into the higher end of the residential market, before they even get the rate rebate, there is a substantial rebate because of the valuation system. I hope that the Minister is listening to my remarks, because I ask that he address this issue under the local government legislation that he is currently drawing up and debating with the local government industry in this State.

When I was talking to quite a few local government people from my electorate here in Adelaide yesterday, they expressed that sentiment also. There is a problem. Before we even talk about the rate rebate, residential properties in North Adelaide and in the city square mile attract a huge discount through the valuation system. That system is not used in any other council area and it mitigates against the business community and toward the residents. It could be suggested that a rate rebate for certain properties and property classes would be ideal. I refer to people of meagre means who have lived in a property in the city or in North Adelaide for 40 or 50 years, having gone into those properties at a time when such properties had reasonable values and were not valued more highly than properties in other suburbs.

Over time, even though the property might not be substantial, because it is in the city or North Adelaide, the capital value might have increased substantially. Removing the rate rebate very quickly might adversely impact on people who have lived in a house or cottage in any part of the city, given that the value of the cottage has increased substantially over the last 40 or 50 years. I ask the Minister to consider that in the context of the Local Government Act as I am not sure whether it is possible to do anything about it under this Bill.

Another issue that I would like to raise is that not only is there cross subsidy between the business people and the residential people because of the valuation system and because of the rate rebate but I believe that there is cross subsidy among regional South Australia, metropolitan Adelaide and the City of Adelaide. This is a point that I make quite often in my electorate. With the centralisation of Government services, in particular, the taxes that are paid by the people whom I represent way down in the South-East of the State contribute more to wages paid in the city square mile than they do in any other part of the State. There is a trickle down effect for all businesses in the city. The city council, because it runs with cross subsidisation in the two ways that I have pointed out, uses money that comes from taxpayers all over the State to subsidise residential ratepayers in the city.

Another subsidy that the City of Adelaide gets irks me. It is obviously not short of money, because it can offer a 45 per cent rebate to a large number of its ratepayers and that runs into a considerable amount of money. However, the City of Adelaide also gets from the Local Government Reform

Fund an amount in excess of \$900 000 a year. That is ostensibly to offset some of the cost of maintaining the parklands, but that money comes from all local government authorities in the State, and I believe that is another rort.

The City of Adelaide is already doing very well out of the State Government, through the taxes that the Government spends in the city and the trickle down effect that is created; yet with all those things coming into the city, it still needs an extra \$900 000 or thereabouts from the Local Government Reform Fund and in addition it can afford to give a 45 per cent rebate to its residential ratepayers. Other issues will come up in this Bill but, because we are in a hurry, I will conclude my remarks, but I might have some further comments to make at the third reading stage.

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): This Bill needs to strike a balance between growth and heritage. It needs to strike a balance between making sure that we get more people living in the city and ensuring that the central business district is flourishing and—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WRIGHT: As long as they are happy, Sir, having a general discussion amongst themselves—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WRIGHT: The member for Spence's description of the contribution by the member for MacKillop was apt, because it was very good.

Members interjecting:

Mr WRIGHT: I will not take long, Steve; don't panic. I said that I will take only a few minutes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WRIGHT: The honourable member made a lot of very good points in regard to cross subsidisation and the revenue base, and account should be taken of them. This Bill goes part of the way, but I hope that there are some changes as we go through Committee to strengthen it a bit more. Through this Bill I would like to see a better balance between heritage and growth to make sure that we get more people coming into the city, and to make sure that we achieve a balance between the commercial and residential interests. It is critical that we do that and it is critical that we make sure that the central business district is flourishing.

It is true to say that the City of Adelaide is unique, not only from the point of view of its being the council which looks after the city but, rightly so, we regard many of the facilities and much of the infrastructure that is in place in the City of Adelaide to be unique. I refer to the parklands, Adelaide Oval, Memorial Drive, the River Torrens, and the Central Market, just to mention a few. The drawing power of a lot of that infrastructure is substantial.

With respect to certain sections of the Bill, I would generally say that the Capital City Committee proposal is well and good. Let us give it a try, let us formalise it and let us see how it operates. It may not be the ideal way to go, but let us give it a try to see how it works. With regard to the ward structure, the proposal is better than the existing system but it does not go far enough. I would prefer not to see any wards, because if we went down that line we would create the opportunity for a better balance to be struck between the commercial and the residential interests, and that is critical. That is what needs to be at the hub as we go into the next century to make sure that we overcome the problems that have existed in the past and to make sure that we get a

balance in the City of Adelaide. I see that as critical and essential with regard to this Bill.

In conclusion, I pass on my congratulations to Dr Lomax-Smith. She has done an excellent job in a very difficult framework to overcome, in part, some obvious difficulties that have existed in recent years. I look forward to the further progress that she is able to make in her leadership role, and I welcome the leadership that she has shown in the City of Adelaide. It augurs well for the future. I wish the Bill well, because it goes part of the way to what we want to achieve. It is critical that we get the right balance, and that is what this Bill should be all about.

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): This is a very important Bill because it is our last chance to do something constructive about the governance of the City of Adelaide and to put it in proper perspective to serve not only the people of Adelaide but all the people of South Australia. I was very impressed by the speech of the member for Elder and the glowing terms in which he referred to the City of Adelaide, because most of us, if not all of us, feel exactly the same way. We feel very privileged to live in a city of this quality and to be able to enjoy a lifestyle that must be the envy of many people throughout the world. Colonel Light certainly planned a great city. His father, Colonel Francis Light, made a disaster of Georgetown, Penang.

In speaking on this issue, I want to make one thing quite clear. I applaud the member for Adelaide for trying to support, and I am sure that we will hear from him fairly soon about the ward system. However, I think that it is a totally unfair system, the reason being that after this legislation goes through the City of Adelaide will still be the most over governed body at any level of government throughout the whole of Australia.

We will have one representative for every 1 800-odd people. Why should not every voter in this city have the right to receive the ballot paper on everyone who nominates and be able to select the eight representatives they want to represent them on the Adelaide City Council? Why should they be restricted by wards where they can vote only for those people who nominate in their particular section of the city rather than giving them the ability to elect every one of the eight? What that means is that each one of those eight representatives is responsible not to a particular little section of the city but, through the ballot box, to every voter for every decision they make. That is the whole crux of the matter.

It is a two-way situation. It means that those who in the past have perceived that they represent only the commercial sector will have to be responsible and think about what they will do when they vote on matters pertaining to the residential sector. In reverse, the people who in the past have had the safeguard—be it in the south-east, south-west or up on the hill at North Adelaide—and have said, 'I can make a decision because all I have to worry about is that, as long as I can collect 600 votes from my ward I can continue to be a member of the Adelaide City Council, and I want to make a decision involving the CBD which I do not believe is what the representatives are pushing for', can make that decision and never be responsible to anyone for doing so.

Let us take a few examples in recent times. Let us look at the Le Cornu's site. What a blight it is on this city that for five or six years now hundreds of thousands of people have had to drive along O'Connell Street and see a situation such as that. The other day there was an application for a block of

units on the corner of Grenfell Street and Frome Road opposite the East End Market development. The developer wanted to erect a building with eight levels. The council said, 'No, you can only go to a limit of six; it has to be the same as the East End.' As Lord Mayor I used to say: 'I can have an absolute box of concrete with six levels built. If I allow you to erect a building with eight levels and I think it will be good for the city, I will do it on one basis; that is, you give me a building of outstanding architectural design and material finish on which I can hang my hat. If you are prepared to develop to that quality, then I will give you an exemption.' That would never have done any harm.

The people in North Adelaide and south-east Adelaide made the decision for the CBD, but whom did they affect? They affected the 700 retailers who were trying to make an existence in the City of Adelaide. They affected the 70-odd people in the Central Market, the people in the Victoria Square shopping centre and the market arcade. They affected every little trader in the City of Adelaide. The compromise in the end, through the efforts of the Minister, was to have seven levels instead of eight. The level that was cut off would have housed another 30 people. That would have placed another 30 people in an otherwise bleak part of Grenfell Street. They could have been eating in Rundle Street East, shopping in the Myer Centre, getting their hair cut in the Victoria Square shopping centre and supporting and strengthening the Central Market. We said, 'No, we cannot have that level—out they go.'

What about the bastardisation—I am sorry to use that word but it is the only word I can use—of Victoria Square? Some people were playing politics for Peter Duncan to give him a corner of Colonel Light's major square to create an outdoor restaurant on which the council spent \$444 000 of my money on the base of the restaurant, when only 150 yards away we have Gouger Street with its 200 restaurants of 26 different nationalities serving food. Those decisions have been made because of the polarisation of wards, where people have said, 'I'm safe in my little domain. I don't have to worry about what they do in the CBD.'

Mr Atkinson: Tell us where Duncan lives.

Mr CONDOUS: That is right, in North Adelaide. At a later date I will talk about my old friend Mr Elbert Brooks and his part in the whole thing and about everyone else who voted for it and the way that it went, because it is very important that that happen. Do you know that at the moment this city stands on a knife's edge? It is in a more precarious position than it has ever been in its entire life. We cannot blame the council; we have to blame Governments—this Government, the previous Labor Government and every previous Government—for allowing certain things to happen. We created the donut effect of allowing things to happen in the suburbs which created the problems confronting the city today. Why did we allow Marion Shopping Centre to build 31 theatres there when the only other centre in the world—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: —yes, I am saying that—is in Los Angeles, which has a population of 10 million. We have allowed that to happen in the City of Adelaide and taken every theatregoer out of the City of Adelaide. We have allowed it to happen at Norwood, and it is happening at Tea Tree Plaza and Glenelg. Then we wonder why the city is in trouble. I tell members that when the shopping hours—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: You are quite right. There can be no extension of shopping hours in the suburbs any more. If

members want an extension of shopping hours, extend shopping hours in the city where we have the captive audience and where we can attract people. What have we done? We have continued to move things out. We were responsible for Bankers Trust and Westpac going into the suburbs. What do the 1 800 people at Westpac Finance Centre do during their lunch hour? They sit in the lunch room because there is nothing to do. If they were in the CBD, those 1 800 people would hit the pavement during the lunch hours and be spending tens of thousands, if not millions, of dollars every year in the city. They would be eating in the city; they would be doing everything in the city. I say to Governments—not only this Government but all future Governments—'In future, if it fits in the city, then put it in the city because that is the way in which you will make Adelaide viable.'

Let me mention another couple of matters that occurred during the Labor era because I do not just want to brand my Government as being responsible. I spoke to John Bannon about this matter. I said, 'John, please do not create the Entertainment Centre at Hindmarsh. Do not put the remand centre in the heart of the city. Put the Entertainment Centre at the top end of Hindley Street.' We would then have found that after a show, instead of people going onto Port Road, catching cabs and going straight home, or going to the car parks, getting into their cars and driving home, there would be people at the top end of Hindley Street. They would have walked down Hindley Street and had supper or gone to the discotheques. The city would have flourished. We would have had thousands of people in the top end of Hindley Street, whereas what we have now is people waiting in the remand centre to appear in the courts.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: That is right—and it could have been worse, too, I am told. In future those are the sorts of things which we have to look out for. This city is a beautiful city and it attracts a lot of people. We have 250 000 bed nights and credit must go to the previous Government in creating the Convention Centre—and I do not mind giving praise where it is due. The Convention Centre has created a magnificent income for this State and it is now being expanded by this Government because it has decided that it should support that enterprise. All those people coming to this city for a convention—be it a gynaecologist, an engineer, a chef in a hotel or someone else in the food trade—are leaders in their field. They will judge the City of Adelaide on what they see in the city. They will not go to Marion or Henley Beach: they will stay in the city. What they perceive and see while they are here is the reflection they will take back home.

At present, that reflection is 22 per cent vacancy rates in commercial properties in the city. That has to be one of the great tragedies. If we are serious about a residential rate rebate—and I will talk about that later—we should be saying this: if you have a commercial property that has been vacant for 12 months or longer, the Government will enter, with the council, in the spirit of a five year non-rate and SA Water rate holiday, if you are prepared to convert your commercial property into a residential property. Let us get more people living in the city. The buildings in question are vacant; they look ugly; there are 'For lease' signs on them. That does not do the image of the city any good. Let us get people back into the city. As we all agree, the more people you have living in the City of Adelaide, the more life, the more glamour and the more appeal it will have to everybody. I refer here to the residential rate rebate, because my friend, Councillor Moran,

had a couple of goes at me, and I will quote her article on Saturday. She is talking about—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: That's right, the tight budget. Regarding her statement, if I were asset rich and cashed strapped, I would go from a \$700 000 home to a \$300 000 one and put in the rest of the money so that I was no longer cash strapped and could eat better. She criticised me for having supported the residential rate rebate when I was Lord Mayor but for now giving it a bashing. Some 23 years ago, when I was on the Adelaide City Council, they decided to talk about a residential rate rebate. I supported it, and I did so for one reason. In those days the rate in the dollar—and I can remember it well—was 20¢. They were rating the houses the same as they rated the business sector. The unfair part for the people living in the City of Adelaide was that they were paying a lot more to live in the city than people were paying in comparable areas in the suburbs. Therefore, I agreed and said, 'That's fair enough; I don't think anybody should be unfairly done by, so I will agree to a residential rate rebate so that we introduce that equality.'

Today, when I decide to cross the floor and join members opposite in doing away with the residential rate rebate and the proposition involving three years instead of five years, I do not want anybody in the City of Adelaide living in a house worth \$350 000 to pay 1¢ more than is being paid in comparable areas anywhere else. That is being pretty fair. I want everybody to make a fair contribution. I will quote some figures now which will blow members' minds. I did not go to the CEO of the Adelaide City Council to get these figures, because I did not think I would get the right figures. As I was told previously, the rate is based not on capital value but on rental value. I decided to go along to a few auctions and ask the auctioneer what were the rates on the properties in question. They are all available in black and white, and I am happy to lay these details on the table of the House. There are seven letters from chief executive officers, as well as one from the CEO in member for Norwood's area. I asked about the rates for certain values of homes in the City of Adelaide, and I am quite happy for all members of Parliament to know those rates.

By way of example, a property at 219 Stanley Street, North Adelaide, sold for \$912 000. When I asked what the rates were, they told me \$2 414.20 a year. However, I was told, 'If you live in the place the 45 per cent rate rebate will apply; therefore on the \$912 000 home you will pay \$1 327.80. I will quote some of these figures. I then went to the trouble of picking out a house worth \$345 000 in North Adelaide, the auction of which I attended. According to the rate notice that was sent out, in the City of Adelaide a \$345 000 home would incur \$706 a year in council rates. In Norwood, Payneham and St Peters, it would incur \$1 470; in Prospect, \$1 429; in Walkerville, \$1 120; in Burnside, \$1 266; in Unley, \$1 283; and in Charles Sturt, \$1429.

I will go to the other end of the scale and quote figures. The member for Spence will be interested to know that Charles Sturt has the most expensive rates of them all. I then took a home worth \$100 000 in Salisbury and Playford councils. For a \$100 000 home in Salisbury, you would pay \$623.90 a year. In the electorate of Playford, if you are an ex-Elizabeth ratepayer, you would pay \$860 a year in rates. As an ex-Playford ratepayer, you would pay \$633.25 a year in rates. In North Adelaide, for \$345 000 you pay \$706. Do members know why? Because all the mugs in the CBD are all paying for it. If members went to the Pooraka market at

3 o'clock in the morning on a day like today, they would think they were in the South Pole. However, 46 stall holders in the Central Market are out there at Pooraka wheeling and dealing at 3 a.m., trying to buy the best produce at the best price, dragging it all the way into Gouger and Grote Streets, putting it on show in the Central Market and hoping at the end of the week that they might make \$800 to put in their pockets and feed their families. They are the ones who are subsidising every resident in this city.

I will get a little multicultural on this issue, given that I am the parliamentary secretary for that portfolio. I quote by way of example the little Italian girl who went to TAFE for four years to get a hairdressing certificate. She gets up at 7 o'clock in the morning, she has opened her salon by 8 o'clock, cleans up the place and gets ready. She might pay \$4 000 a year in council rates in the Da Costa Arcade to operate a little business, conscientiously, hoping to take home \$600. She, too, is subsidising the residents of the City of Adelaide.

I also quote the example of the little snack bar proprietors who get up at 6 o'clock, go to their shop, slice their meats and vegetables and set up their shop ready for business. They also subsidise the residents of the City of Adelaide. How long can the CBD continue? It was great in the heady days in 1980s when we could afford all those things. Today, it is bleeding in there. Business is finding it hard. Why did I not change it? Because today, of the 16 members of the Adelaide City Council, 14 live in the city. Who will turn around and make changes when it will hit those involved in the hip pocket? I tried to get it changed legally so that the people concerned could not vote. I was told that legally they could vote, because they were one of a class and therefore had the right to sit there and make those decisions. It was not as though I did not try. It is a social injustice that every member in this Chamber—including me—has to go back to their wards and try to convince everybody in their electorate why they should pay rates while Adelaide, which is the wealthiest suburb, does not pay its full load.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Following the member for Colton, I am glad he raised the rates issue, because I intend to quote exactly the same figures. I will come to that issue later. It is stated in the second reading speech by the Minister that the goal of this Bill is to establish mechanisms to enhance the role of Adelaide as the capital city of South Australia, and that is a goal that I certainly support 100 per cent. Various members have talked in glowing terms about what it is like to live in Adelaide, and I concur with that. Adelaide is my choice of the city in which to live. I have lived in several Australian cities, and I have lived overseas. In spite of tempting opportunities in other cities, I make it a conscious choice to live in Adelaide, because it is such a special place.

I spent a lot of my time growing up in Brisbane. I remember visiting Adelaide many years ago and seeing the first mall in Australia. What an innovation! I saw Adelaide as a cultured, vibrant and attractive place in which to live. However, now I see Adelaide in a totally different light. It is my choice of place to live. I love the architecture of Adelaide; I like the culture of Adelaide; I like the tradition of food and wine in Adelaide and the great things in life one gets in Adelaide. It is an inexpensive place in which to live, and I love living in Adelaide. But the city could, and should, be a lot better: it could, and should, be a lot more vibrant. This city desperately needs rejuvenation.

I acknowledge that there has been progress over the years. Activities in certain sections of the city are going very well,

and obviously the council and the State Government have played a large part in achieving those goals. But it could be so much better, and I believe that it is necessary that we visit a Bill, such as the Bill before us, to put into place some of the structures that will bring about that necessary change. In South Australia at the moment we have a very lacklustre commercial and retail sector. We have a very high vacancy rate in our commercial buildings in the city: it is just not thriving, and it really could be.

A lot of that has to do with the culture and the way in which Government and the council operate. We have touches of excitement in the city around the East End, Hutt Street and places in Hindley Street and Gouger Street, but we have some very dead sections of the city. The south-west corner is dead. When riding one's bicycle around the city on the weekend, sometimes one is lucky to see a person in the street in some sections of the city: it is really run down. In that respect, it is lagging behind a lot of other Australian cities. We really must rejuvenate the city: it is enormously important to do that.

Some members have talked about the competition, within the current structure of Adelaide City Council, between heritage and commercial interests. I believe that there is a necessary improvement to be made as to the structure of the council to improve the outcome of that balance, because the city is a very special place. It is the face of South Australia—at least, to the tourist visiting this State. It is the key symbol of our cultural, educational and commercial identity. In a number of ways, Adelaide needs to be rejuvenated. It has many of the assets of South Australia that belong to the people of South Australia, including the buildings, the organisations, the facilities—whether they be sporting or library facilities. It involves more than just the people of the Adelaide square mile, or the Adelaide City Council area.

I agree with the member for MacKillop that regional South Australia has a very large interest in what happens in the City of Adelaide. In that respect, I do not agree with my colleague the member for Kaurua that it might be a good idea to have a portion of the voting say about council matters coming from those who work in the city alone: I believe that the wider community has an interest in the city. However, I do agree with the member for Kaurua's suggestion that we could organise the representation for the City Council of Adelaide in a better way than is currently the case, to take away undue biases—whether they be in certain sections towards the commercial interests or whether they be towards the residential interests. The balance is not right and it needs to be changed.

The question of whether North Adelaide should be incorporated into the City of Adelaide is one about which I have not completely made up my mind: I believe that there are arguments for and against. I do get frustrated at some decisions of the city council which I interpret to be biased by the influence of North Adelaide residents. However, on the other hand, I agree with the argument that the parklands are a defining boundary and that there are community assets that belong to the whole city that happen to be in North Adelaide, and they need to be looked after and operated in a special way. So, I remain at this point unresolved as to whether North Adelaide should be included in the City of Adelaide or not.

However, I feel differently about the rate rebate. I tend to agree with the member for Spence's suggestion that the rate rebate should be abolished for North Adelaide, but I believe that there are very good arguments for a rate rebate in the city square mile. And I also agree with the member for Colton that circumstances alter cases. Many years ago there may well

have been a reason for North Adelaide residents to be given a rebate, but I believe that those reasons have changed and that North Adelaide residents should no longer have that rebate.

In relation to the issue of ward boundaries, I do not believe that there should be any. I agree with those members who have stated so far that it is the right and the privilege of all those who have a vote, or have a say in the decisions of the Adelaide City Council through their vote, to be able to elect the total council. The City of Adelaide is so small that to divide it into sectional interests does not make the best sense at all.

In line with Labor Party policy, I support compulsory voting and would like to see that implemented for the City of Adelaide, because I strongly believe that the rights and responsibilities that come with compulsory voting will create more interest in the decisions of council, if that comes to pass. As to the Capital City Committee being set up—another committee, oh dear!

I would like to close on the issue of the rate rebate and to reiterate something that the member for Colton beat me to saying. Where I live, at Paralowie, in the northern suburbs, I pay just as much in rates (as do my neighbours) as people living in Unley and all the inner city suburbs and many of the people living in Adelaide. The people in Adelaide, who pay virtually the same rates as I do, have houses valued at three times what my house is valued at and several times what some of my neighbours' houses are valued at. They have much better services and facilities than I and my neighbours have at Paralowie and the Salisbury area, yet they are subsidised in a place where many of my neighbours would dearly love to live if they could only afford to, and they receive all those services on top of it.

There can be no justification for me and my constituents who live in the northern suburbs and who travel frequently to the city to either shop or work and who, alas, pay extraordinary rates to see the privileged residents of North Adelaide enjoying all those facilities and services not paying the same rate of levy as do people in the Salisbury area, and that can also be said of other council areas. I appeal to members to consider these very important matters, because many of them are social justice matters. When voting I ask all members to remember the unfairness of the rate rebate.

I ask members to consider the fact that even though I and my neighbours might live a long way from the city we have a great interest in the city, and I ask them to support the amendments to be moved by the Labor Opposition—I understand further amendments will be moved in the Upper House—because, in the end, I believe that every member of this Parliament wants to rejuvenate the city. It is a great city, it has great architecture and it is a great place to live, but it is a city that is not thriving and it could be.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): I wish that the people who read *Hansard* could experience the bear pit roar that rose from the Opposition when I stood to speak. In speaking to this Bill, I am pleased to declare a personal interest: I am a resident of North Adelaide and have been for about 20 years. I do this for a number of reasons: first, because it is obviously important that I do so; and, secondly, because of that long-term residency I know many of the players in the debate. I certainly know the vehemence with which the views are held, and I believe that other speakers should contemplate whether they should have also declared an interest.

In speaking to this most important Bill, I indicate to the House that I do so saddened by the fact that members opposite, in my view and, indeed, other members, have overlooked the big picture, which is the brightest possible future for the City of Adelaide, and allowed personal vitriol directed at me, which has been quite clear in their contributions, to cloud their thinking. That is a pity. It is an every day occurrence but it is fact. The Bill is the result of an intense process of discussions over months, even years, undertaken latterly in a most productive manner. Basically there is now agreement between the major players regarding the Bill before the House.

I fervently hope—but, given the level of debate, I am not particularly expectant—that our level of Government will not sabotage the goodwill which has been evident by the passage of amendments which may be unacceptable to local government. I do not intend to discuss every clause of the Bill in detail during this contribution, but I will address what are the key issues as brought to my attention in my electorate office. Certainly I do not have time to rebut the multiple inconsistencies that have been recorded in this debate. Legitimate rebuttal obviously would not change the minds or, importantly, the votes of people who are responsible for those inconsistencies.

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: One member said that the City of Adelaide is over-governed and that this would be remedied by diminishing the number of wards. Of course, it would not: it would be effected by diminishing the number of councillors, not the number of wards. That is one inconsistency. Adelaide has a diverse population and a cosmopolitan lifestyle which is the envy of many. However, I stress that it is not an enclave for the wealthy, despite what the Labor Party has said about it. Residents within the city council boundaries include a number of people who enjoy wonderful advantages but who are not wealthy.

There is a lot of history involved in Adelaide and the city council. The previous six and now current wards were named after the first six Governors. The wards themselves have publicly honoured the contribution these Governors made. The City of Adelaide, and such gems as the parklands, are a big part of the ethos of South Australia. The Government believes, and I consider that most people acknowledge, that it is vital to have a vibrant hub of activity in and around the City of Adelaide. But to do anything other than have the most livable and vibrant city possible would cause us to be a laughing stock. To have an alive and buzzing centre is important not only for the City of Adelaide but also for the State as a whole.

Every one acknowledges that, because of the number of difficulties which the council collectively has faced over the past decade or so, things need to be changed. That is the general view that has been brought to my attention in my electorate office. I acknowledge that there are people who do not want to make any change, and they have made their views very clear to me. During the course of the past two or three years, whilst a number of options have been explored concerning the City of Adelaide, there have been a number of vacillations in feeling towards the council. A result of all this fluctuation in feeling is the current Bill and the outcomes that it will produce.

A most important feature of the Bill is that, rather than relying on the goodwill of individual councillors and the Lord Mayor to advance Adelaide, as is now evident, it will legislate for a structure which means that there is a firm,

productive and collaborative relationship between the city council and the Government. This sets that relationship in stone, no matter who is the incumbent in any of the relevant positions, to the benefit of Adelaide and South Australia well into the next millennium. Importantly, if the council needs to undergo positive change, and most people acknowledge that it does, this Bill achieves it in a cogent and careful fashion.

The Adelaide City Council wrote encouragingly to support the passage of the Bill during this session. So, whilst there may be minor points of disagreement at the edges, the council supports the general principle. The Adelaide City Council's letter states:

Adelaide City Council . . . has a unique role to play together with the State Government of the day in driving economic development and vitality within the city. The benefits of a strong inter-governmental relationship are clear with the foundations of such having been significantly strengthened in the past year.

It is the importance of fostering this economic development and vitality which is the first and foremost priority in the Bill. In the Capital City Committee, I see a structure which provides for specific collaboration between the councils and the State Government, no matter how divergent may be the individual personalities of the people involved.

A very important matter to discuss in relation to the Adelaide City Council is the alleged tension between the commercial interests and the residential interests. Put succinctly, I do not believe that this alleged tension is as evident as the popular press and opponents of the Adelaide City Council might presume. Certainly, I do not believe that there ought to be a battle. I contend that greater maturity in this so-called sectional debate is evident. Over the past three or four years I have noticed the increasing popularity of areas surrounding the East End of Rundle Street, precisely because of its vitality and vibrancy. To contend that people who want to live in Adelaide or in the Adelaide City Council area want only quiet, leafy streets is ridiculous. To contend that residential and business interests cannot co-exist is ludicrous.

I note the comments made regarding the residents of the Adelaide City Council area. Mention was made of 9 000 residents being eligible to vote and 6 000 commercial voters being registered, and the fact that commercial voters under this Bill will increase in number to about 9 000. Given the brouhaha which previously has passed for substance regarding this issue, and some of the words that have passed for argument in this Chamber, I wish to discuss this specific point.

When I commenced a medical practice on North Terrace, realising that I was eligible to vote and being interested, I wanted to register. All I had to do to procure my right to vote was to make one telephone call. For people to say that a barrier to legitimate voting interests has been exercised by commercial interests, or that there has been a ground swell from commercial interests to out-vote residential interests, is clearly wrong. Anyone can make a telephone call. Factually, the business interests have not been interested or have not been bothered. Yet, under the Bill, the Electoral Commissioner has indicated that the system of voting and wards proposed in the Bill balances the supposed competing interests as well as possible. It is interesting to note that the debate on the Bill thus far clearly shows that the Labor Party places commercial interests ahead of residential interests.

Recently I presented a petition to the House in relation to the Governance Review Advisory Group Report—Adelaide City Council. The terms of the petition were as follows:

to retain the present external boundaries of the City of Adelaide;

to retain the opportunity for local ward representation by locally elected ward councillors; and

to reject the model of a commission as proposed by the Governance Review Advisory Group.

I am pleased to say that this Bill delivers all those goals. The issue of wards and the opportunity provided in this Bill for local ward representation to be retained is important, as was requested by the results of the petition I mentioned. In relation to the wards—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Members opposite laugh, and that is strange, because they enjoy presenting petitions. I actually believe they are important. In relation to the wards, the current Local Government Act provides for local councils to make decisions as to whether or not they should have wards. If such a choice were to occur in Adelaide, as is provided for in every other local government area, the petition provides ample evidence that wards would be supported by the residents. So, if we were to allow the people of Adelaide the same rights as are reflected across the rest of South Australia, they would actually want wards, as provided in the Bill.

The Electoral Commissioner has said that the three wards provided for in the Bill will ensure adequate and fair representation. Other benefits of wards include more opportunity for people of different backgrounds and capacities to offer themselves for election; the opportunity for a wider range of representatives reflecting the predominant character of the different parts of the city; and the keeping down of election costs. The GRAG report, I acknowledge, recommends no wards, but it then goes on to say:

... local area community bodies should be established.

I think that conclusion is misguided. The local area community bodies are already present. They are wards. To consider that local area community bodies, as suggested in GRAG, will act as other than small splinter groups within an electorate wide electoral system is fanciful. I think this presents grounds for much greater conflict, which surely this Bill is designed to avoid.

However, in this Bill, there is provision for local ward elections, which the Electoral Commissioner says are fair and adequately provide for good representation. This gives Adelaide the best chance of having a non-factionalised council. The last thing wanted is local area community bodies. I note that the Bill decreases the number of wards from five to three and eliminates the position of alderman—a significant alteration to the composition of the council and clear evidence that the Parliament expects future councils to be rigorous contributors to the future of South Australia.

I note that in this Chamber, we are actually all elected to represent local communities. We, if you like, are elected on a kind of ward system, strongly dependent and evidenced in the House of Assembly. We defend it rigorously in the House of Assembly. I hear no member of the House of Assembly saying we should be voted in on a statewide basis. That is what the Legislative Council is all about, and the Labor Party is on record as saying we should get rid of the Legislative Council. The reason is that people enjoy and, indeed, expect to have their local community represented as they do with local wards.

I mentioned the Capital City Committee earlier. I wonder whether the House would be prepared to acknowledge that, under the Local Government Act, other areas are able to make this decision by referendum. Would they allow the

status quo of the Bill to go ahead and hold a referendum in concert with the first election which would say whether or not ward structures are wanted? In relation to wards, in particular in relation to what I have just said about the referendum, the Adelaide City Council in its motion adopted on 24 June this year particularly talks about local accountability and local representation in accordance with the practice of local government bodies. I think they are clearly saying that they want the same rights.

I have had input from members of the council about the ministerial review under clause 22, and in their view this matter ought to be a responsibility for them as the local body accountable to their electorate. I do understand where they are coming from but, given that I have already had input from a number of people that some of the councillors have already indicated that they would run their next election campaign on reverting to the present structure, that would be a retrograde step. Accordingly, to legislate for a required number of wards with a review to be carried out into which collaboration between the Government and the council could be included, which is quite clearly identified, is the best way to go.

As I have already said, I presented a petition to the House in relation to the GRAG report and I remind the House again that this Bill delivers all the goals. A total of 2 372 people signed the petition. I know that the member for Spence and the member for Elder laugh when people mention petitions because that is local democracy but, nevertheless, 2 372 people signed it. Sir, you will note that the residential rate rebate was not mentioned within the terms of the petition.

In the course of discussion about the future of the Adelaide City Council, I attended two public meetings, one at the Town Hall and one at the Old Lion Hotel, at which these various matters were discussed. In particular, the petition terms were formulated at the second meeting and the residential rate rebate was not one of the major features incorporated in the terms. I acknowledge that our people believe it is important, but the terms of reference of the petition were the ones that the people wanted.

The terms were settled upon by a diverse group. For every cost there is obviously a benefit. If a cost benefit analysis is undertaken with the cost being the cost to the city council of the residential rate rebate, the City of Adelaide residents would argue that the residential rate rebate in effect actually outweighs the costs. I have previously circulated material to residents asking people to present me with their views so that I could inform my parliamentary colleagues about the residential rate rebate. Well, Sir, I did this and, unfortunately, the ALP has clearly indicated it is not willing to listen, as have other members of the Chamber. Also, as I understand will become clear later in the debate, other members of both Chambers consider that the residential rate rebate must be removed. In this Bill, my representations—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for continuing to interject after being cautioned by the Chair.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: —have produced a five year phase out plan which I acknowledge is less than some residents seek but, in contrast to the immediate cessation favoured by some members, it is reasonable. I repeat: my constituents, when asked whether they would rather retain the residential rate rebate or have the three elements in the petition that I mentioned before, unanimously identified the petition goals as the most important factor.

There has been a lot of discussion between the Government and the council in relation to all the issues in the City

of Adelaide Bill, and it has been reported to me that some councillors say they preferred the Government to remove the residential rate rebate so that any odium that would result would apply to the Government and not to the council. In any case, clearly the council is already moving independently towards the reduction in rebates, as is evidenced by a council decision taken, I believe, last week to diminish the residential rate rebate.

The Adelaide City Council reduced the residential rate rebate to 40 per cent and, as a result of this and other changes, 78 ratepayers have had a maximum rebate of \$1 000 imposed and, over all, 2 235 owner-occupied properties have had a reduction in their residential rate rebate. This represents a significant change in policy and, by doing this, the council has acknowledged it is unable to do all the things it wants if the residential rate rebate continues.

Over a number of years, many residents have spoken to me and complained about the inability of the council to address the big issues: not only roads, rates and rubbish, but things like the upgrade of North Terrace, Victoria Square, Hindley Street, and enhanced maintenance and improvement to parklands, such as the wetlands in the south parklands. The council cannot accomplish these grand plans without the funds, and it is felt that, if the sort of rebate which has applied were to be removed and council were to spend that money judiciously on some of these grander plans, everyone would benefit.

Adelaide and its town planning structure are recognised around the world as being exemplary: this is not debatable. Adelaide is very special and is acknowledged as being special worldwide. No matter what the local politics of this Bill may be—for example, Liberal versus Labor—either we can make an absolute mess of the job by letting the political argy-bargy take precedence or we can nurture Adelaide for the future of South Australia.

I acknowledge the input of my constituents who have made their representations very clear to me through a number of meetings in my electorate office, through many letters, through a number of deputations of which I have been a part with the Local Government Minister—and I thank him for that input—through meetings of the North Adelaide Society—a residents and ratepayers group—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The members for Hart and Spence laugh at residents and ratepayers groups. There were also the two meetings that I mentioned previously. I have had many representations at shopping centres and as I have been door knocking in North Adelaide. I am grateful for the rigorous input. I regard it as an absolute privilege to represent the electorate of Adelaide, which obviously includes parts of Prospect and Walkerville councils, and I am fiercely of the view that we ought to acknowledge that the councils are doing a good job at a difficult time.

My entreaty to members of this Chamber in their voting pattern is to look past political grandstanding to the great future which this Bill and the collaborative effort of the Adelaide City Council and the State Government will ensure can be grasped for Adelaide.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Local Government): I thank all members for their contribution. I am sorry that an element of tribalism tends to creep into contributions opposite, but I acknowledge that some commonsense is spoken. I acknowledge the earnest contribution of the member for Adelaide, who is unfairly criticised by those

opposite. He has involved himself at all stages in the consultation process with the city, with councillors, with his voters and with me and has always been prepared to listen to another viewpoint and play both a conciliatory and arbitrary role. That is why this Bill comes in the position it does before the House.

Before saying anything, I wish to correct a furphy that has been promulgated opposite that the member for Adelaide somehow influenced the notion of the introduction of wards. I want it clearly understood that I introduced to the Party room the concept of wards, and the Party room supported me—and it is no secret that the member for Adelaide supports that concept. I will not walk away from the fact that I support the concept of wards in this Bill; it is the Government's position and one for which the Government is prepared to argue.

I thank the member for Elder for his mark of five out of 10. In the past couple of weeks I have sat on a committee with the member for Elder and I know how tough he is with his marking, so five out of 10 could be a rather good score. He says that no matter should be set in concrete. Every member in this place will realise that. We have before us a very good step in assisting in the future and better governance of the City of Adelaide. It is the best Bill that can be devised at this time. Are there improvements that may be made one day in the future? The answer is 'Quite possibly.' Should those amendments have been made in the past? The answer is 'Quite possibly.' I point out to the member for Elder that in the 1970s and the early 1980s reports suggested exactly as he has suggested—an enlarged metropolitan area—and the Government of the day in its wisdom saw fit not to proceed with that strategy, as this Government in this day sees no point in reorganising the governance of what we have to complicate and overlay the arrangements between two tiers of government, compounding that by expanding the boundaries.

A number of members mentioned shopping centres. This Government was not responsible for the implementation of the planning laws of this State but only their on-going monitoring, and that is a matter which the Parliament may need to address. The Government cannot stop the consent use, which is the development in other places. I personally believe it has caused some problems and is a matter that the Parliament and the Minister for planning may choose to address in future. It is a valid point but hardly relevant to this debate or to the need for revitalising the city as it affects this Bill.

I reiterate that the provisions of this Bill do not set precedents for the rest of local government or determine outcomes for the Local Government Act review. That is one of the reasons why the member for Adelaide eloquently argued that we have to achieve a balance in what we believe for the local government sector in general and that we do not so far subvert the special nature, as the member for Spence pointed out, of the City of Adelaide that we give it a draconian regime of governance entirely out of kilter with that level of governance that we would naturally expect to apply to every other citizen in this State. There is a compelling argument that, whatever we do, a sense of natural justice must apply as much for the ratepayer in North Adelaide as it does for the ratepayer in Salisbury. It is this balance that the Government has tried to achieve in this legislation.

The main players—the Corporation of the City of Adelaide, through its staff and elected members; the Local Government Association; members in this Chamber on

various sides and within my own Party; citizens of Adelaide; and interest groups—have all cooperated to produce this Bill. The Government and all who have cooperated can be proud of the achievements that this Bill represents.

Whilst the Local Government Association supports the establishment of the Capital City Committee and generally supports the Bill in addressing matters relevant to the City of Adelaide, the association has expressed a number of concerns. Those concerns are based on the fact, as the member for Spence said, that this is a special provision for a special area of local governance and that those provisions, therefore, are unique to the city and should not apply generally across the sector.

So, in the context of closing this debate, I give my assurance that inter-governmental aspects of the Bill, particularly as they relate to the objectives of the councils as outlined in clause 31, should not be construed as establishing a precedent for councils generally. These provisions are solutions specific to the City of Adelaide council, and all matters relating to inter-governmental decisions affecting other councils remain to be negotiated during the established processes for the Local Government Act review. Another point that the Local Government Association and others have argued is that assurances should be sought that other councils (and the member for Spence raised this matter) would be consulted in the processes surrounding the committee and by the City of Adelaide council on issues that may affect such other councils.

Adelaide 21 noted the organisational isolation of the Adelaide City Council from other local governments. This situation has improved in recent times and the City of Adelaide Governance Review report recommended that formal cooperative mechanisms be developed between the Adelaide City Council and adjoining councils to coordinate these activities more effectively. Matters which the report identified for cooperative consideration by the central sector councils were economic development; social and economic infrastructure development; environmental management; resource sharing; strengthening of the collaborative base of the metropolitan area taking into account the shared concerns of transport, telecommunications, planning and infrastructure; shared service delivery arrangements, including cooperative tendering; and funding transfers where appropriate.

The Government has recognised the unique role of the Adelaide City Council in this Bill, and this includes recognising the City of Adelaide as an integral part of the metropolitan city fabric, which needs to engage directly with broader metropolitan councils. The council indicated in its submission on the Bill, as the Bill requires, that it will participate in broader strategic planning as far as it is relevant to the city, and that includes an assessment of local and wider issues affecting the City of Adelaide and the council's response to these issues. This will include cooperation with other councils and bodies and also ensure consistencies with planning strategy for metropolitan Adelaide and other relevant policies and plans. Indeed, there is an undertaking for the member for Spence that some of the traditional matters with which he has long inveigled the House will be addressed in a new spirit of cooperative approach.

I assure the Local Government Association that it will be consulted on allowances and benefits to be prescribed for the Adelaide City Council and these will not be inconsistent with the general framework being developed for local government generally, although they may well differ from those levels that are applied to the rest of local government. If we accept

the fact that the city is special, the allowances applicable in the city may well themselves be special.

I am happy to reiterate that there is no intention to use this Bill's provision fixing the Adelaide City Council structure and process for reviewing it, financial reporting, strategic plans or election provisions as precedents to flow to other councils. In addition, the Local Government Association will be consulted on electoral regulations subject to the need to deal with those expeditiously.

In its submission on the Bill the Adelaide City Council welcomed the benefits of the Bill in attaining a strong intergovernmental relationship by virtue of the role and function of the Capital City Committee. The council noted that the committee will ensure that there is no room for lack of coordination between the Government and the council in working towards the common good of the city and delivering on its joint programs. I sincerely thank the Opposition for recognising the valuable contribution which this committee may well give rise to—the valuable new spirit of cooperation. The council expressed the view that it would be a retrograde step if the strong working relationship recently developed is not legislatively recognised through the establishment of the committee.

I am heartened by the support that the Bill has received from other bodies. For example, the Property Council, which has advocated structural change to city governance for a considerable time, has welcomed the Bill. The council considers that it is vital, together with the initiatives identified in the Adelaide 21—

An honourable member: I thought you were in a hurry.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I am. A governance structure is established which is held responsible for managing the City of Adelaide as the capital city of the State. The North Adelaide Society, much maligned by the member for Spence and others, whilst having reservation about some aspects of the Bill, acknowledges, as the member for Adelaide has said, the relative advantage conferred on City of Adelaide residents by residential rate rebates when compared not only with adjoining councils but other cities. The society has also considered that a phasing-out period of five years is appropriate. I have also received letters of support from individual councillors and aldermen.

Last but not least the Lord Mayor (Dr Jane Lomax-Smith), who has been graciously complimented by a number of members of the Opposition and certainly by members on this side of the House, has welcomed the State Government's unambiguous commitment to the rejuvenation of the city centre and the draft Capital City Development program to be further developed by the Capital City Committee. She has also expressed her strong personal commitment to the council working with the State Government to achieve great things for the city.

On the matter of rate rebate, the member for Spence commented that he hoped that there would be a provision for the square mile of Adelaide, and I point out to all members that the provisions in this Bill proscribe only that the city council cannot have a blanket residential rebate. It will be possible to provide rebates to those who are in financial need and to certain classes of development. If the council wanted to provide incentives for student accommodation within the city square mile or within North Adelaide, those sorts of individual developments and individual rebates would still be allowed. The only thing that this Bill stops is a blanket rebate applicable to an entire class of citizen.

I thank the member for Mackillop for his contribution, but I must say that the matter of annual values, which he picked up and which is indeed a problem, is a problem that has been given to the city council by the State Government. Under the Local Government Act, the State Government allows for only one kind of rating system to be fixed across a local government area. The honourable member is right: we must look at it, and we will look at it in terms of the Local Government Act. Although it might be seen to give a greater subsidy to some classes of citizens within the city, it is hardly the city's fault. This Chamber must look to itself for the answer to that. In closing, I thank all members for their contribution and urge them to support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

The CHAIRMAN: Given that the substantive matter with regard to the amendments is not dealt with until much later in the Bill, it might be appropriate to postpone clause 2 at this stage.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I move:

That clause 2 be postponed and dealt with at a later stage.

Motion carried.

Clause 3.

Mr ATKINSON: I move:

Page 1—

Line 20—After 'capital city' insert 'and heart'.

Line 23—After 'Adelaide' insert 'and the representation of the interests of South Australians not enfranchised to vote in elections for the Corporation'.

After line 24—Insert:

(d) to ensure access to the City of Adelaide for all South Australians.

The effect of the first amendment is to make paragraph (a) read:

to recognise, promote and enhance the special social, commercial, cultural and civic role that the City of Adelaide plays in the capital city and heart of South Australia;

If South Australia is the body and the City of Adelaide including North Adelaide is the heart, all the blood circulates through the heart, and I want all South Australians to have free access to circulate through the whole city of Adelaide, including North Adelaide. I am seeking to add words to paragraph (b) of the 'Objects' clause because, as things stand, only residents of the CBD and North Adelaide and people who are registered to vote on the supplementary roll by virtue of their real property or commercial interest can vote.

It is important that this Bill have as one of its objects, and an overriding interpretation, a provision that the powers under it be exercised on the understanding that the interests of people who live outside the parklands are represented also, and that includes not just people who live in the suburbs but people who live in rural and regional South Australia. Too many decisions by this Adelaide City Council have pandered to a very small number of people, particularly in North Adelaide and particularly wealthy, privileged individuals who live in mansions on Hill Street, Molesworth Street, Barton Terrace West and Buxton Street who have an influence in the deliberations of the Adelaide City Council out of all proportion to their role as citizens. They truly are—in the words of George Orwell in *Animal Farm*—'more equal than others'. It is important—

The Hon. M.H. Armitage: That is rubbish, Sir.

Mr ATKINSON: Sir, could I have some protection from the member for Adelaide?

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Spence.

Mr ATKINSON: Sir, the member for Adelaide is one of those—

The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Adelaide—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Spence has the floor.

Mr ATKINSON: Sir, is the word 'crap' used by the member for Adelaide parliamentary?

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: I would have thought the member for Adelaide's remarks really tended to demean the tone of the Committee but we will let them go. The member for Adelaide is one of those over mighty citizens in Molesworth Street, North Adelaide, who exercises influence on the deliberations of the council out of all proportion to his role as a citizen. As someone who lives in Kilkenny in the north-western suburbs, I would like a say in the Adelaide City Council, too. I would like the council to take account of my interests, as would my constituents who live in Hindmarsh, Croydon, Bowden, Ovingham and Brompton—quite near North Adelaide. They would like their interests taken into account, too.

The mothers who drive their children from the western suburbs through Jeffcott Street to Saint Dominic's Priory School would also like their interests taken into account. So would the people who use Calvary Hospital like their interests taken into account. The people who attend the Red Cross, visit their relatives at the Helping Hand Aged Care Home and attend mass at Saint Laurence's Church would like their interests taken into account, too. That amendment is designed so that the people who are handling this Bill when it becomes law will take into account the interests of people who live outside the parklands—and there is more than a million of them who ought to be taken into account. Paragraph (d) provides:

to ensure access to the City of Adelaide for all South Australians.

I do not think I need elaborate on that point, given that this council has closed Beaumont Road, North Adelaide Station Road, gone within one vote of closing War Memorial Drive and has on the books a plan to close Jeffcott Street as well. I reckon that the member for Adelaide would close every street leading out of the City of Adelaide, including Main North Road, if it did not lead to the rest of the world.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Until the member for Spence spoke the Government was prepared to accept the amendments. Luckily for him it still is but with this qualification. While we support the insertion of paragraph (d), if the member for Spence thinks we support the reopening of Barton Road he had best think again. However, we accept the amendments.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: In relation to the issue of access to the City of Adelaide for all South Australians, one only needs to look at events such as the Sky Show and other things which occur regularly in the parklands—Glendi Festivals and so on—to see just how easy it is for all South Australians to access the City of Adelaide. People do it easily: there are roads at many points of the compass. The important thing is that, if one actually wants to see the workings—I guess would be a way of putting it—of someone who I believe is obsessed about issues, one only needs to look at the most recent contribution from the member for Spence,

because to suggest that the residents of the western suburbs are unable to access North Adelaide and indeed pass through North Adelaide to all of the benefits of the central business—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: O'Connell Street is a perfect example because, frankly, if you want to enter O'Connell Street from the western suburbs, the easiest way to do so is through Jeffcott Street, not through Barton Road, which the honourable member would like to open. The simple fact is that his contribution indicates that the argument has ceased to be rational—and I understand that. It is a passion and we all understand from where the member for Spence is coming. The most important thing when one sits on this side of the House is the look on the faces of all the Opposition members behind the member for Spence when he starts on this sort of diatribe once again. But as I indicated—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Well, no, they don't actually, they smirk—and it is not necessarily a smirk of pleasure: it is actually a smirk of 'Well, here he goes again on his high horse.' I merely reiterate, in relation to the insertion after line 24, that for anyone to believe that there is not adequate access to the City of Adelaide for all South Australians clearly is ridiculous.

Mr CONLON: I was not going to speak on this amendment but I must say this, too—

The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:

Mr CONLON: The honourable member has made no contribution of any worth in a year and nine months; it is unlikely that he will tonight. We have been prevailed upon to assist in passing this legislation and we have tried to do that in the interests of the City of Adelaide preparing for elections in November. For us to do that for the Minister and then to have the matter held up with the gratuitous comments from the Minister for North Adelaide, who has accused the member for Spence—

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Mr Chairman, I rise on a point of order. As I indicated in my second reading speech, my electorate is Adelaide. I am proud to represent it, it is a broad constituency and I do not represent only North Adelaide. I would ask members opposite to withdraw.

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Elder will come to order. I am not quite sure what the Minister is asking the Chair to have members withdraw.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am asking to have withdrawn the accusation, which previously I let pass, that I am the Minister for North Adelaide. Sir, that is clearly indicating that I am not carrying out my duty as an elected representative of all members of my electorate—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: That is an accusation which is absolutely incorrect—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: —and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order and I believe that it is not necessary for the matter to be withdrawn on the part of members.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the Minister please resume his seat. I was going on to say that it is appropriate for all members to refer to other members in the Chamber by their accurate electorate name.

Mr CONLON: I will refer to the person in question as 'the member for Adelaide'. However, I say this about his contribution earlier: never has so much naked self-interest been dressed up as principle as it was in his contribution to this debate. Let me say this, too. When the honourable member accuses the member for Spence of being somehow obsessed about this, let me tell him that it went to our Caucus and we all shared the obsession—not a voice failed to support him.

I tell the honourable member why Barton Road is closed: Barton Road is closed because the honourable member does not like people such as us driving through his suburbs. I can tell the Minister that we will re-open it and I will drive through every weekend in my old car. There are other things I would do, too, but I will not describe them because they would be unparliamentary. I support the amendments. I also support the efforts of the Government to proceed with this quickly in the interests of the City of Adelaide. Perhaps the honourable member could remember that.

Mr ATKINSON: In rebuttal of the member for Adelaide, if one lives in Ovingham, Bowden, Brompton or Hindmarsh in my electorate, in order to get to western North Adelaide, which we can see from our homes, we must either trek south along Park Terrace, over the railway bridge and past the Entertainment Centre and the Brewery down Port Road—

Mr Brokenshire: You'd catch a train.

Mr ATKINSON: That's a good point. I get through on the train. The member for Adelaide has not been able to stop the train yet.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Adelaide said it is ridiculous and he would not try, by they do make a lot of noise. In order to get to western North Adelaide, you have to go down Port Road in a southerly direction and then turn left through the lights at the Squatters Arms Hotel, past the police barracks, over the railway line and then up the hill towards the Newmarket Hotel. You then have to turn right and go down West Terrace, past the Heaven Nightclub and McDonalds, turn left into Hindley Street—

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Unley offered to buy members of the Committee a road directory to pursue this route. We then have to go left over the Morphett Street Bridge and up Montefiore Hill in order to get to that place that we can see from our homes. If we required the member for Adelaide to do that he would be pretty upset. An alternative to that is for us to try to get up Park Terrace to the north and then get through the lights, turning right at the Torrens Road junction (which is pretty hard to do in one go) and into Jeffcott Street by the Adelaide Aquatic Centre.

Having got through those lights, we then have to get through the lights into Jeffcott Street at the Barton Terrace West intersection. Then we have to come back through one of the east-west streets of residential North Adelaide—so this is actually putting more cars onto Jeffcott Street, Childers Street and the east-west streets—and that gets us back to Hill Street to a location from which we were separated by only a few metres before we started.

This is a very unreasonable imposition on people in the western suburbs. It is important to note that, if you divide the City of Adelaide into quadrants on a north-south axis and then a west-east axis and you analyse how many cross-over points there are from the suburbs into the city, you see that there are ample crossover points in the south-west, there are

many crossover points in the south-east, alongside the member for Unley's electorate, and there are a number of crossover points such as Mann Terrace, Medindie Road, Main North Road and Prospect Road in that north-eastern quadrant. If you look into the north-western quadrant there is only one crossover point—Jeffcott Street. From Jeffcott Street right around to Port Road on the other side of the Torrens there are no crossings, and why are there no crossings?

The Hon. M.H. Armitage: Because of the river.

Mr ATKINSON: No, not because there is a river. There is plenty of room there for a crossing. There could be a perfectly adequate crossing for the whole of the City of Charles Sturt along a section of road no longer than this Chamber. Why is it closed? Because the member for Adelaide—

The Hon. M.H. Armitage: Because the council closed it.

Mr ATKINSON: Yes, because the council closed it—by resolution, with no consultation whatsoever! So it is an objective of the parliamentary Labor Party to reopen that little bit of road, and we will be happy. However, while that piece of road remains closed, I give Adelaide City Council this warning: these are the spectacles through which we will view every issue involving the council.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I intend to make but one further contribution in relation to this matter. I have seen the routes the member for Spence details to get out of Brompton into North Adelaide.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I have seen them previously. What the member for Spence has done—and I know that this is a game of politics—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Listen, Michael; I listened to you. At least allow me the courtesy of being able to say this in silence. I know this is a game, and I know members opposite are all supporting the member for Spence. However,

the member for Spence has omitted to say that another route could be taken, which is to travel in a north-easterly direction along Gilbert Street to Torrens Road and turn right into North Adelaide. However, Gilbert Street has been closed for exactly the same reason that Barton Terrace was closed by Adelaide City Council. Gilbert street was closed by the council which the member for Spence represents.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: It is now but not when the road was closed. The council closed it to maintain the residential amenity of its council area, which is exactly what the Adelaide City Council has done in relation to Barton Road. At that stage, Churchill Road came straight down through Gilbert Street, and the local council made what I consider to be a perfectly reasonable decision to close a section of road so that trucks and cars could not go through. That is exactly what Adelaide City Council has done.

The member for Spence, who is obsessed about this issue, not once in the eight years that we have been in Parliament together has acknowledged that that road closure would make access to North Adelaide a soft snap for his residents. However, it was closed by his local council for exactly the same reason that Barton Road was closed by Adelaide City Council. I appeal to the member for Spence and the Charles Sturt council to reopen Gilbert Street, because that will give them the access that they desire.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

GAMING MACHINES (GAMING TAX) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 4 August at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 21 July 1998

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

SCHOOL RETENTION RATES

117. **Ms WHITE:**

1. What are the apparent retention rates of year 12 students during 1997 and 1998, including percentages for males, females and for all students, from the original year 8 cohort in Government schools over a four year period, and also including repeating year 12 students, as published for previous years 1992 to 1996 in the Department for Education and Children's Services statistical summary?

2. What are the apparent retention rates for full time equivalents or part time year 12 students during 1997 and 1998, including percentages for males, females and for all students, and also including repeating year 12 students, as published for previous years 1992 to 1996 in the Department for Education and Children's Services statistical summary?

3. What are the retention rates for each Australian State from 1992 to 1998 including full time equivalents of part time year 12 students, including those repeating?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: It is recognised nationally that the current Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) apparent retention rate definition used to determine the apparent retention rate is inadequate. It is too simplistic and does not account for the many changes that occur in the student cohort as it moves from year 8 to year 12. Students in the year 8 cohort are not necessarily the same students who eventually, after four years, reach year 12. There are a number of reasons for these changes such as migration within Australia.

The Department of Education, Training and Employment successfully supports senior school students to undertake vocational

education courses in schools while continuing with their studies in the South Australian Certificate of Education. Some of these school students also pursue vocational education courses in TAFE colleges. Many of these students are only studying part time in a school.

In 1997, the actual number of students in South Australia who were part time in year 12 was 2390 (25.3 per cent). The percentage of full time equivalent students (FTE) that were part time in year 12 was 15.8 per cent compared with the Australian average percentage of 4.2 per cent. However, part time students are not included in the apparent retention rate calculation in accord with the ABS definition. Consequently, the South Australian apparent retention rate does not reflect the considerable success we in South Australia have had in encouraging students to take more flexible pathways to gain vocational education qualifications while at school.

1. The 1997 apparent retention rate for full time year 12 students for South Australian Government schools was 57.5 per cent. This does not include part time students. For males in year 12, the apparent retention rate for 1997 was 52.3 per cent and 63.1 per cent for females. The apparent retention rate data includes repeating year 12 students' data.

The apparent retention rate is based on mid year census data available in August each year, therefore the data for 1998 is not yet available.

2. The apparent retention rate data (based on full time, part time and repeating year 12 student data and expressed in full time equivalents), has not been published but can be derived from 'Schools Australia', a publication of the ABS. The following information has been derived from this ABS publication.

The 1997 FTE apparent retention rate in South Australia (based on full time and part time students data) was 68.4 per cent. For males in year 12, the FTE apparent retention rate for 1997 was 61.8 per cent and 75.1 per cent for females. No data currently exists for 1998.

3. Published data for part time students has only been available since 1995. Part time data prior to 1995 is available from the Ministerial Council for Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA) National Schools Statistics Collection Manual but individual States and Territories approval must be sought before comparisons can be made. Approval for this is being sought. No data currently exists for 1998.

The following table provides the Year 12 apparent retention rates based on FTE students for Australian Government schools for 1995, 1996 and 1997.

| | N.S.W. | Vic. | Qld. | S.A. | W.A. | Tas. | N.T. | A.C.T | Aust. |
|----------------|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|
| 1995 Govt. FTE | 65.2 | 70.7 | 72.7 | 76.7 | 71.0 | 68.0 | 48.4 | 110.2 | 70.0 |
| 1996 Govt. FTE | 63.3 | 70.4 | 72.6 | 71.7 | 69.4 | 59.7 | 47.7 | 108.3 | 68.5 |
| 1997 Govt. FTE | 62.9 | 70.9 | 74.5 | 68.4 | 68.8 | 64.8 | 46.5 | 106.6 | 68.6 |

EDUCATION, ENTERPRISE BARGAINING

118. **Ms WHITE:** Has the Government delivered on all commitments it made in the 1996 Department for Education and Children's Services Enterprise Agreement and, if not, which commitments have not been met and why not?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Attached is a progress report on the implementation of the Department for Education and Children's Services Enterprise Agreement 1996.

All agenda items which have funds allocated have been agreed to and substantially implemented, except for outstanding matters related to country incentives.

There are a small number of items to be attended to in the remaining life of the Agreement, that is, by December 1998.

Negotiations will continue on these items.

**DECS Enterprise Agreement 1996 Implementation Progress Report
(23 June 1998)**

| Clause | Working Party | Excerpt from Clause | Progress | Comment |
|--------|---|--|---|---|
| 9.2.2 | Workplace reform. No specific working party has been established for this clause. | Cooperation in work place reform, including implementing best practice models, appropriate reorganisation of work and classification mix in schools, through an agreed consultative process. | The implementation of best practice models and appropriate reorganisation of work and classification mix in schools is yet to be addressed as a specific issue. | Many of these factors will be addressed through the implementation of the other clauses, or are dependent on the implementation of other clauses. The implementation of Flexible Initiatives Resourcing and individual school restructure has occurred. |

DECS Enterprise Agreement 1996 Implementation Progress Report
(23 June 1998)

| Clause | Working Party | Excerpt from Clause | Progress | Comment |
|--------|---|---|--|--|
| 9.2.10 | No working party has been formed—on Enterprise Agreement Implementation Group agenda. | Implementing local school management trials in schools/clusters. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A draft Trialing Framework has been tabled by the AEU and is being considered by the department in its preparation of a further draft. Mitcham/Unley/Urrbrae involved in financial management trials. | Parties to commit to a framework. Parties have not yet reached agreement on a trial framework. |
| 9.2.13 | Country Incentives Working Party | The continued implementation and review of Country Incentives. \$2.0M. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal costs for contract teachers implemented by the department 0.1 support for graduates implemented by the department Outstanding matters—Principal and Deputy Principal country incentives and total review of country incentives. | Recent proposal by the department under consideration by the AEU. |
| 9.2.16 | Leadership Working Party | Review of employment conditions and the appropriate deployment of advisory and seconded teachers. | This matter to be addressed as part of the leadership deliberations. No negotiation on seconded personnel has occurred at this time. | Parties agreed to defer this matter initially pending resolution of the Principals and Deputy Principals structure. The Department is seeking to deal with this issue as part of other leadership strategies/issues. |
| 9.2.17 | Guidance Officers Working Party | Review of employment conditions, role and utilisation of Guidance Officers within DECS and a commitment to implementing the outcomes of the review. | A department proposal is intended to be developed following the outcome of special education report. | This item is currently being addressed. |
| 9.2.18 | Early Childhood Working Party | An evaluation of the use of contract staff in Family Day Care. | No action to date. | This was a second order priority by agreement of the parties. |
| 9.2.22 | Ancillary Working Party | A review of the current Ancillary Formula. | Parties have agreed not to proceed with this item. | Deferred to EA#2 because parties conclude that insufficient time available to develop the range of options and reach agreement. |
| 9.2.23 | Ancillary Working Party | Further PIDs (Position Information Document). | PIDs have been established, pending union agreement. | Awaiting union response. |
| 9.2.24 | Curriculum Working Party | Review of Senior secondary and middle schooling. | Working party has not yet met. | This was listed as a second priority issue by agreement with the parties. To be addressed in the next six months. |

SCHOOLS, EARLY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

121. **Ms WHITE:** Which schools have received grants in 1998 under the Early Assistance Program and how much was allocated to each school?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: In 1998 all schools with Reception to Year 2 enrolments received an early assistance grant. This consisted of a \$1 000 base grant plus a per capita allocation of approximately \$36 per student. A total of \$2 million was allocated to schools for early assistance planning.

A list of schools and actual amounts is attached.

| School Name | Early Years |
|---|-------------|
| | \$ |
| Aberfoyle Hub JPS | 8131.26 |
| Aberfoyle Hub Primary School | 0.00 |
| Aberfoyle Park Campus—Heysen Primary School | 3906.58 |
| Aberfoyle Park Campus—Spence Primary School | 5495.06 |
| Airdale JPS | 4582.53 |
| Airdale Primary School | 0.00 |
| Alberton Primary School | 3838.98 |
| Aldgate Primary School | 4785.31 |

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------|
| Aldinga JPS | 10598.47 |
| Aldinga Primary School | 0.00 |
| Alford Primary School | 1777.34 |
| Allenby Gardens Primary School | 3805.19 |
| Allendale East Area School | 3940.38 |
| Amata Anangu School | 1811.14 |
| Andamooka Primary School | 1608.35 |
| Angaston Primary School | 4379.74 |
| Angle Vale Primary School | 5089.49 |
| Ardrossan Area School | 3061.64 |
| Ardtornish Primary School | 8469.23 |
| Ascot Park Primary School | 5359.87 |
| Ashford Special School | 1405.57 |
| Athelstone JPS | 6272.40 |
| Athelstone Primary School | 0.00 |
| Auburn Primary School | 1709.75 |
| Augusta Park Primary School | 6644.17 |
| Balaklava Primary School | 4447.34 |
| Banksia Park Primary School | 4582.53 |
| Barmera Primary School | 4852.91 |
| Basket Range Primary School | 1878.73 |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------|----------------------------------|----------|
| Beachport Primary School | 1878.73 | East Adelaide Primary School | 0.00 |
| Belair JPS | 6779.36 | East Marden Primary School | 4548.73 |
| Belair Primary School | 0.00 | East Murray Area School | 1844.94 |
| Bellevue Heights Primary School | 2520.88 | Eastern Fleur R-6 S | 8503.03 |
| Berri Primary School | 4819.11 | Eastern Fleurieu R-12 School | 0.00 |
| Birdwood Primary School | 3974.17 | Eastern Fleurieu-AC | 1675.95 |
| Black Forest Primary School | 7928.47 | Eastern Fleurieu-LCC | 2216.71 |
| Blackwood Primary School | 5833.03 | Eastern Fleurieu-MC | 1878.73 |
| Blair Athol Primary School | 3906.58 | Echunga Primary School | 3703.79 |
| Blakeview Primary School | 10091.51 | Eden Hills Primary School | 2892.66 |
| Blanchetown Primary School | 1574.56 | Edithburgh Primary School | 1878.73 |
| Blyth Primary School | 1337.97 | Edwardstown Primary School | 6677.97 |
| Booborowie Primary School | 1371.77 | Elizabeth Downs Primary School | 0.00 |
| Booleroo Centre Primary School | 2318.10 | Elizabeth Dwns JPS | 6508.98 |
| Bordertown Primary School | 7184.93 | Elizabeth East JPS | 5224.68 |
| Braeview JPS | 7658.09 | Elizabeth East Primary School | 0.00 |
| Braeview Primary School | 0.00 | Elizabeth Grove Primary School | 0.00 |
| Brahma Lodge Primary School | 4210.75 | Elizabeth Grv JPS | 4447.34 |
| Bridgewater Primary School | 2689.87 | Elizabeth North Primary School | 5326.07 |
| Brighton Primary School | 7218.73 | Elizabeth Park JPS | 4819.11 |
| Brinkworth Primary School | 1844.94 | Elizabeth Park Primary School | 0.00 |
| Broadmeadows Primary School | 3095.44 | Elizabeth South Primary School | 0.00 |
| Brompton Primary School | 2858.86 | Elizabeth Special School | 1540.76 |
| Brown's Well District Area School | 1439.37 | Elizabeth Sth JPS | 5765.44 |
| Burnside Primary School | 7658.09 | Elizabeth Vale Primary School | 4109.36 |
| Burra Community Area School | 2926.45 | Elliston Area School | 1912.53 |
| Burton Primary School | 7691.89 | Enfield Primary School | 3163.03 |
| Bute Primary School | 2047.72 | Ernabella Anangu School | 2419.49 |
| Cadell Primary School | 1743.54 | Ethelton Primary School | 2791.26 |
| Callington Primary School | 2588.48 | Eudunda Area School | 2453.29 |
| Caltowie Primary School | 1168.99 | Evanston Gardens Primary School | 3940.38 |
| Cambrai Area School | 2047.72 | Evanston Primary School | 4852.91 |
| Camden Primary School | 0.00 | Fairview Park Primary School | 2892.66 |
| Campbelltown Primary School | 3940.38 | Ferryden Park Primary School | 3974.17 |
| Carlton Primary School | 2453.29 | Fisk Street Primary School | 4345.94 |
| Carrieton Rural School | 1168.99 | Flagstaff Hill JPS | 7421.51 |
| Ceduna Area School | 4751.51 | Flagstaff Hill Primary School | 0.00 |
| Challa Gardens Primary School | 4345.94 | Flaxmill JPS | 6610.37 |
| Christie Downs Primary School | 3703.79 | Flaxmill Primary School | 0.00 |
| Christie Downs Special School | 1270.38 | Flinders Park Primary School | 4616.32 |
| Christies Beach Primary School | 3568.60 | Flinders View Primary School | 4514.93 |
| Clapham Primary School | 6542.78 | Forbes Primary School | 6914.55 |
| Clare Primary School | 6137.21 | Frances Primary School | 1439.37 |
| Clarendon Primary School | 2149.11 | Fraser Park Primary | 3467.21 |
| Cleve Area School | 3737.59 | Freeling Primary School | 4278.35 |
| Clovelly Park Primary School | 5123.29 | Fregon Anangu School | 2047.72 |
| Cobdogla Primary School | 2825.06 | Fulham Gardens Primary School | 2858.86 |
| Colonel Light Gardens Primary School | 6982.14 | Fulham North Primary School | 6238.60 |
| Compton Primary School | 2216.71 | Gawler East Primary School | 8198.85 |
| Cooper Pedy Area School | 4920.50 | Gawler Primary School | 4278.35 |
| Cook Area School | 1033.80 | Georgetown Primary School | 1574.56 |
| Coomandook Area School | 2656.07 | Gepps Cross Primary School | 3264.43 |
| Coonalpyn Primary School | 1777.34 | Geranium Primary School | 1878.73 |
| Coorabie RS | 1135.19 | Gilles Plains Primary School | 4650.12 |
| Coorara Primary School | 7049.74 | Gilles Street Primary School | 2385.69 |
| Coromandel Valley Primary School | 4683.92 | Gladstone Primary School | 2318.10 |
| Cowandilla Primary School | 4278.35 | Glen Osmond Primary School | 6137.21 |
| Cowell Area School | 2453.29 | Glenburnie Primary School | 2149.11 |
| Crafers Primary School | 4143.16 | Glencoe Central Primary School | 2216.71 |
| Craigburn Primary School | 9111.38 | Glenelg JPS | 10767.45 |
| Craigmore Primary School | 1844.94 | Glenelg Primary School | 0.00 |
| Craigmore South JPS | 5664.04 | Glossop Primary School | 2284.30 |
| Craigmore South Primary School | 0.00 | Golden Grove Primary School | 8604.42 |
| Croydon Park Primary School | 0.00 | Goodwood Primary School | 3906.58 |
| Croydon Primary School | 0.00 | Goolwa Primary School | 5528.85 |
| Crystal Brook Primary School | 3636.20 | Gordon Education Cnt | 1067.59 |
| Cummins Area School | 4210.75 | Grange JPS | 8232.65 |
| Curramulka Primary School | 1405.57 | Grange Primary School | 0.00 |
| Darke Peak Primary School | 1439.37 | Greenock Primary School | 2216.71 |
| Darlington Primary School | 4345.94 | Greenwith Primary School | 9652.14 |
| Davoren Park JPS | 7691.89 | Gumeracha Primary School | 3737.59 |
| Davoren Park Primary School | 0.00 | Hackham East JPS | 5833.03 |
| Dernancourt JPS | 7151.13 | Hackham East Primary School | 0.00 |
| Dernancourt Primary School | 0.00 | Hackham South Primary School | 4109.36 |
| Devitt Avenue Primary School | 3568.60 | Hackham West JPS | 7928.47 |
| Direk JPS | 8942.39 | Hackham West Primary School | 0.00 |
| Direk Primary School | 0.00 | Hahndorf Primary School | 4548.73 |
| Dover Gardens Primary School | 2960.25 | Hallett Cove East Primary School | 10429.48 |
| East Adelaide JPS | 8908.60 | Hallett Cove School | 4582.53 |

| | | | |
|--|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Hallett Cove South Primary School | 3501.01 | Lucindale Area School | 3095.44 |
| Hamley Bridge Primary School | 2858.86 | Lyndoch Primary School | 2622.28 |
| Hampstead Primary School | 3703.79 | Lyrup Primary School | 1574.56 |
| Happy Valley JPS | 6339.99 | Macclesfield Primary School | 2588.48 |
| Happy Valley Primary School | 0.00 | Madison Park JPS | 7151.13 |
| Hawker Area School | 1811.14 | Madison Park Primary School | 0.00 |
| Hawthorndene Primary School | 3974.17 | Magill JPS | 10902.64 |
| Heathfield Primary School | 3636.20 | Magill Primary School | 0.00 |
| Hectorville Primary School | 2487.09 | Maitland Area School | 3872.78 |
| Hendon Primary School | 7725.69 | Mallala Primary School | 4379.74 |
| Henley Beach Primary School | 3365.82 | Mannum Primary School | 4041.77 |
| Hewett Primary School | 2926.45 | Manoora Primary School | 1135.19 |
| Highbury Primary School | 6238.60 | Mansfield Park Primary School | 4447.34 |
| Highgate JPS | 10725.21 | Marion Primary School | 4988.10 |
| Highgate Primary School | 0.00 | Marla Primary School | 1135.19 |
| Hillcrest Primary School | 2960.25 | Marree Aboriginal School | 1304.18 |
| Hincks Avenue Primary School | 3838.98 | Marryatville Primary School | 4852.91 |
| Holden Hill North Primary School | 3095.44 | McDonald Park JPS | 8807.20 |
| Houghton Primary School | 2182.91 | McDonald Park Primary School | 0.00 |
| Indulkana Anangu School | 1946.33 | McLaren Flat Primary School | 2656.07 |
| Ingle Farm East Primary School | 4548.73 | McLaren Vale Primary School | 6948.35 |
| Ingle Farm Primary School | 6002.02 | McRitchie Crescent Primary School | 0.00 |
| Iron Knob Primary School | 0.00 | Meadows Primary School | 3838.98 |
| Jamestown Primary School | 3230.63 | Melrose Primary School | 1709.75 |
| Jervois Primary School | 2182.91 | Memorial Oval Primary School | 3940.38 |
| Kadina Primary School | 7015.94 | Meningie Area School | 3805.19 |
| Kalangadoo Primary School | 1878.73 | Mil Lel Primary School | 1608.35 |
| Kangarilla Primary School | 2520.88 | Millbrook Primary School | 1574.56 |
| Kangaroo Inn Area School | 2453.29 | Millicent North Primary School | 5664.04 |
| Kapunda Primary School | 4244.55 | Millicent South Primary School | 2892.66 |
| Karcultaby Area School | 1608.35 | Miltaburra Area School | 1675.95 |
| Karkoo Primary School | 1304.18 | Mimili Anangu School | 2419.49 |
| Karoonda Area School | 2453.29 | Minlaton Area School | 2554.68 |
| Karrendi Primary School | 4886.70 | Mintabie Area School | 1473.16 |
| Kaurna Plains School | 1946.33 | Mintaro/Farrell Flat Primary School | 1946.33 |
| Keith Area School | 4886.70 | Mitcham JPS | 9854.92 |
| Keithcot Farm Primary School | 6576.57 | Miticham Primary School | 0.00 |
| Keller Road Primary School | 2689.87 | Moana Primary School | 5123.29 |
| Kenmore Park Anangu School | 1168.99 | Moculta Primary School | 1405.57 |
| Kersbrook Primary School | 1844.94 | Modbury School CPC-7 | 3872.78 |
| Keyneton Primary School | 1777.34 | Modbury South Primary School | 3061.64 |
| Kidman Park Primary School | 4312.15 | Modbury Special School | 1709.75 |
| Kilburn Primary School | 3805.19 | Modbury West JPS | 7793.28 |
| Kilkenny Primary School | 3703.79 | Modbury West Primary School | 0.00 |
| Kilparrin Teaching and Assessment Unit | 1506.96 | Monash Primary School | 3433.41 |
| Kimba Area School | 2960.25 | Moonta Area School | 5326.07 |
| Kingscote Area School | 5630.25 | Moorak Primary School | 2318.10 |
| Kingston Community School | 4852.91 | Moorook Primary School | 1811.14 |
| Kingston on Murray Primary School | 1777.34 | Morgan Primary School | 1844.94 |
| Kirton Point Primary School | 6002.02 | Morphett Vale E JPS | 8266.45 |
| Klemzig Primary School | 3399.62 | Morphett Vale East Primary School | 0.00 |
| Kongorong Primary School | 1946.33 | Morphett Vale South Primary School | 2554.68 |
| Koolunga Primary School | 1675.95 | Morphett Vale West Primary School | 4312.15 |
| Koonibba Aboriginal School | 1709.75 | Mount Barker Primary School | 5224.68 |
| Kulpara Primary School | 1202.78 | Mount Barker South Primary School | 4616.32 |
| Kybybolite Primary School | 1304.18 | Mount Bryan Primary School | 1439.37 |
| Lake Wangary Primary School | 2115.31 | Mount Burr Primary School | 2081.52 |
| Lameroo Regional Community School | 3703.79 | Mount Compass Area School | 3129.24 |
| Largs Bay JPS | 9280.37 | Mount Gambier East Primary School | 0.00 |
| Largs Bay Primary School | 0.00 | Mount Gambier North Primary School | 5190.88 |
| Largs North Primary School | 2858.86 | Mount Pleasant Primary School | 2013.92 |
| Laura Primary School | 2825.06 | Mount Torrens Primary School | 1878.73 |
| Le Fevre Peninsula Primary School | 5190.88 | Mt Gambier East JPS | 5326.07 |
| Leigh Creek South Area School | 2892.66 | Mulga Street Primary School | 5393.66 |
| Lenswood Primary School | 1473.16 | Mundulla Primary School | 1709.75 |
| Light Pass Primary School | 1811.14 | Munno Para Primary School | 5224.68 |
| Lincoln South Primary School | 2182.91 | Murputja Anangu School | 1439.37 |
| Linden Park JPS | 11375.81 | Murray Bridge JPS | 9280.37 |
| Linden Park Primary School | 0.00 | Murray Bridge Primary School | 0.00 |
| Littlehampton Primary School | 4312.15 | Murray Bridge South Primary School | 5495.06 |
| Lobethal Primary School | 3264.43 | Murray Bridge Special School | 1033.80 |
| Lock Area School | 1946.33 | Mylor Primary School | 2149.11 |
| Lockleys North Primary School | 5833.03 | Mypolonga Primary School | 1878.73 |
| Lockleys Primary School | 4244.55 | Myponga Primary School | 2723.67 |
| Long Street Primary School | 4548.73 | Nailsworth Primary School | 4345.94 |
| Lonsdale Heights Primary School | 3872.78 | Nairne Primary School | 5461.26 |
| Loveday Primary School | 1304.18 | Nangwarry Primary School | 1743.54 |
| Loxton North Primary School | 2318.10 | Napperby Primary School | 2013.92 |
| Loxton Primary School | 6339.99 | Naracoorte Primary School | 5123.29 |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Naracoorte South Primary School | 6137.21 | Renделsham Primary School | 2182.91 |
| Narrung Primary School | 1270.38 | Renmark JPS | 7996.07 |
| Nepabunna Aboriginal School | 1135.19 | Renmark North Primary School | 3501.01 |
| Netley Primary School | 0.00 | Renmark Primary School | 0.00 |
| Newton Primary School | 1912.53 | Renmark West Primary School | 3365.82 |
| Nicolson Avenue JPS | 6441.38 | Reynella East JPS | 8300.24 |
| Nicolson Avenue Primary School | 0.00 | Reynella East Primary School | 0.00 |
| Noarlunga Downs Primary School | 5224.68 | Reynella Primary School | 8874.80 |
| Noarlunga Primary School | 2081.52 | Reynella South Primary School | 3805.19 |
| North Adelaide Primary School | 5021.89 | Richmond Primary School | 3433.41 |
| North Haven JPS | 8739.61 | Ridgehaven JPS | 5157.08 |
| North Haven Primary School | 0.00 | Ridgehaven Primary School | 0.00 |
| North Ingle Primary School | 3467.21 | Ridley Grove Primary School | 5292.27 |
| Northfield Primary School | 5596.45 | Risdon Park Primary School | 7421.51 |
| Norton Summit Primary School | 2385.69 | Riverdale Primary School | 6339.99 |
| Norwood Primary School | 4650.12 | Riverland Special School | 1202.78 |
| Nuriootpa Primary School | 5123.29 | Riverton Primary School | 2858.86 |
| O B Flat Primary School | 1270.38 | Robe Primary School | 2554.68 |
| O'Sullivan Beach Primary School | 3940.38 | Robertstown Primary School | 1642.15 |
| Oakbank Area School | 3534.81 | Rose Park Primary School | 6846.95 |
| One Tree Hill Primary School | 3906.58 | Rosedale Primary School | 1439.37 |
| Oodnadatta Aboriginal School | 1574.56 | Roseworthy Primary School | 2081.52 |
| Open Access College | 3061.64 | Roxby Downs Area School | 9516.95 |
| Orroroo Area School | 2588.48 | Saddleworth Primary School | 2385.69 |
| Owen Primary School | 1506.96 | Salisbury Downs Primary School | 6948.35 |
| Padthaway Primary School | 1878.73 | Salisbury Heights Primary School | 0.00 |
| Palmer Primary School | 1540.76 | Salisbury Hts JPS | 8638.22 |
| Para Hills East Primary School | 6373.79 | Salisbury JPS | 8976.19 |
| Para Hills JPS | 7015.94 | Salisbury N-W JPS | 5866.83 |
| Para Hills Primary School | 0.00 | Salisbury North R-7 School | 6238.60 |
| Para Hills West Primary School | 6948.35 | Salisbury North West Primary School | 0.00 |
| Para Vista Primary School | 6204.80 | Salisbury Park Primary School | 5664.04 |
| Paracombe Primary School | 1709.75 | Salisbury Primary School | 0.00 |
| Paradise Primary School | 3602.40 | Salisbury South East Primary School | 3805.19 |
| Parafield Gardens Primary School | 0.00 | Salt Creek Primary School | 1439.37 |
| Parafield Gdns JPS | 8638.22 | Sandy Creek Primary School | 1675.95 |
| Paralowie School | 5157.08 | Scott Creek Primary School | 1574.56 |
| Paringa Park Primary School | 4886.70 | Seacliff Primary School | 4075.57 |
| Parkside Primary School | 2520.88 | Seaford Primary School | 5123.29 |
| Parndana Area School | 2858.86 | Seaford Rise Primary School | 8739.61 |
| Paskeville Primary School | 1371.77 | Seaton Park Primary School | 4514.93 |
| Penneshaw Area School | 1473.16 | Seaview Downs Primary School | 4312.15 |
| Pennington JPS | 7928.47 | Sedan Primary School | 1337.97 |
| Pennington Primary School | 0.00 | Semaphore Park Primary School | 2892.66 |
| Penola Primary School | 3534.81 | Settlers Farm JPS | 14620.36 |
| Penong Primary School | 1608.35 | Settlers Farm Primary School | 0.00 |
| Peterborough Primary School | 3095.44 | Sheidow Park JPS | 6069.61 |
| Pimpala Primary School | 3602.40 | Sheidow Park Primary School | 0.00 |
| Pinnaroo Primary School | 2115.31 | Smithfield Plains Primary School | 0.00 |
| Pipalyatjara Anangu School | 1875.35 | Smithfield Primary School | 2757.47 |
| Plympton Primary School | 5258.47 | Smithfld Plns JPS | 6475.18 |
| Point Pearce Aboriginal School | 1270.38 | Snowtown Area School | 2318.10 |
| Poonindie Primary School | 2453.29 | Solomontown Primary School | 3467.21 |
| Pooraka Primary School | 6677.97 | South Downs Primary School | 3568.60 |
| Port Adelaide Primary School | 3602.40 | Spalding Primary School | 1540.76 |
| Port Augusta West Primary School | 3196.83 | Springton Primary School | 2115.31 |
| Port Broughton Area School | 3568.60 | St Agnes Primary School | 3501.01 |
| Port Elliot Primary School | 4041.77 | St Leonard's Primary School | 4210.75 |
| Port Germein Primary School | 1439.37 | Stansbury Primary School | 1878.73 |
| Port Kenny Primary School | 1202.78 | Stanvac Primary School | 3940.38 |
| Port Lincoln Primary School | 0.00 | Stirling East Primary School | 4954.30 |
| Port Neill Primary School | 1439.37 | Stirling North Primary School | 4312.15 |
| Port Noarlunga Primary School | 5224.68 | Stradbroke JPS | 11071.63 |
| Port Pirie Special School | 1168.99 | Stradbroke Primary School | 0.00 |
| Port Pirie West Primary School | 5021.89 | Streaky Bay Area School | 3163.03 |
| Port Vincent Primary School | 1473.16 | Surrey Downs Primary School | 4244.55 |
| Port Wakefield Primary School | 1844.94 | Suttontown Primary School | 2216.71 |
| Price Primary School | 1405.57 | Swallowcliffe JPS | 5359.87 |
| Prospect Primary School | 6576.57 | Swallowcliffe Primary School | 0.00 |
| Pt Augusta Sp S | 1168.99 | Swan Reach Area School | 1946.33 |
| Pt Lincoln JPS | 11240.62 | Tailem Bend Primary School | 3872.78 |
| Pt Lincoln Special S | 1033.80 | Tantanoola Primary School | 1675.95 |
| Quorn Area School | 3670.00 | Tanunda Primary School | 5190.88 |
| Ramco Primary School | 2250.50 | Taperoo Primary School | 2960.25 |
| Rapid Bay Primary School | 1540.76 | Tarlee Primary School | 1844.94 |
| Raukkan Aboriginal School | 1405.57 | Tarpeena Primary School | 1709.75 |
| Redwood Park Primary School | 6035.82 | Tea Tree Gully Primary School | 5157.08 |
| Regency Park Centre School | 1743.54 | Terowie Rural School | 1236.58 |
| Reidy Park Primary School | 6069.61 | The Heights School | 6204.80 |

| | |
|--|----------|
| The Pines JPS | 10767.45 |
| The Pines Primary School | 0.00 |
| Thorndon Park Primary School | 2487.09 |
| Tintinara Area School | 1912.53 |
| Torrensville Primary School | 5021.89 |
| Townsend School for Vision Impaired Children | 1439.37 |
| Truro Primary School | 1709.75 |
| Tumby Bay Area School | 2723.67 |
| Two Wells Primary School | 6069.61 |
| Ungarra Primary School | 1337.97 |
| Unley Primary School | 7218.73 |
| Upper Sturt Primary School | 1608.35 |
| Uraidla Primary School | 3940.38 |
| Vale Park Primary School | 4616.32 |
| Victor Harbor JPS | 9753.53 |
| Victor Harbor Primary School | 0.00 |
| Virginia Primary School | 4683.92 |
| Waikerie Primary School | 5528.85 |
| Walkerville Primary School | 7421.51 |
| Walleroo Mines Primary School | 1980.13 |
| Walleroo Primary School | 3703.79 |
| Wandana Primary School | 3974.17 |
| Warooka Primary School | 2385.69 |
| Warradale Primary School | 4210.75 |
| Warrambo Primary School | 1168.99 |
| Wasleys Primary School | 2250.50 |
| Watervale Primary School | 1608.35 |
| West Beach Primary School | 4278.35 |
| West Lakes Shore JPS | 9685.94 |
| West Lakes Shore Primary School | 0.00 |
| Westbourne Park Primary School | 6238.60 |
| Wharminda Primary School | 1473.16 |
| Whyalla Special School | 1270.38 |
| Whyalla Stuart JPS | 5427.46 |
| Whyalla Stuart Primary School | 0.00 |
| Whyalla Town Primary School | 3703.79 |
| Williamstown Primary School | 4819.11 |
| Willnsden Primary School | 3703.79 |
| Willunga Primary School | 6339.99 |
| Wilmington Primary School | 1811.14 |
| Winkie Primary School | 1709.75 |
| Wirrabara Primary School | 1574.56 |
| Woodcroft Primary School | 13167.07 |
| Woodend Primary School | 6407.59 |
| Woodside Primary School | 3602.40 |
| Woodville Primary School | 8841.00 |
| Woodville Special School | 1337.97 |
| Woomera Area School | 2182.91 |
| Wudinna Area School | 2926.45 |
| Wynn Vale JPS | 7962.27 |
| Wynn Vale Primary School | 0.00 |
| Yahl Primary School | 2081.52 |
| Yalata Aboriginal School | 2013.92 |
| Yankalilla Area School | 3838.98 |
| Yorke town Area School | 3163.03 |
| Yunta Rural School | 1337.97 |

EDUCATION, SPECIAL

123. Ms WHITE:

1. What are the details of expenditure in 1998 of the \$9.25 million for Special Education as agreed in section 9.2.12 of the 1996 Department for Education and Children's Services Enterprise Bargaining Agreement?

2. Which schools have received additional funding?

3. How much did each school that received Special Education funding receive?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:

1. (a) 8.4 full time equivalent (FTE) salaries were allocated to support students with extreme behaviour. This was allocated using the following criteria per identified students.

Criteria for the distribution of additional support for 1998

1. Students with disabilities considered for a staffing allocation totalling 1:6 FTE will have been part of the Interagency Referral Process.

or

2. They have chronic behavioural difficulties which have not responded to planned behavioural interventions supported either by the Department of Education, Training and Em-

ployment personnel or personnel from other agencies.

This may include students who:

have been identified as having a psychiatric illness with severe behavioural implications;

have been identified as having a conduct disorder;

exhibit unpredictable behaviour;

exhibit violent behaviour;

exhibit obsessive behaviour disorders;

have intellectual functioning and sensory deprivation;

are able to access school for only a limited time without support.

43 schools and about 120 students were involved in these allocations.

(b) Tier 2 salaries: allocations to schools to support students with disabilities who have Additional and Direct levels of support were maintained at a unit rate of .0201 FTE teacher salary.

Support for students with disabilities who have Intensive levels of support received the 1:8 staffing as per special schools. This, per capita, becomes 0.125 FTE.

All of these are allocated as per the individual student's negotiated curriculum plan.

This allocation effectively increased the 406 Tier 2 salaries by a further 38.48 FTE salaries.

(c) Supplementation to support services to schools: 8.25 FTE salaries have been allocated to Disability Support Services (for North, South, East and West groups of districts).

These salaries were converted to school services officer (SSO) hours and allocated according to need in special classes, special schools and, in particular, to students with disabilities who are in crisis or who require short term health support.

(d) 2.0 FTE salaries were allocated to Regency Park School to support 15 students with disabilities in the link program at Ross Smith Secondary School. Five of these students use augmentative communication devices. The salaries will be used to develop a course with Flinders University and Crippled Children's Association in the use of augmentative communication devices which is unique in Australia. Funds will pay for course development, Higher Education Contribution Scheme (HECS) fees and Temporary Relief Teachers (TRTs). A summer school will trial the course.

(e) 1.0 FTE has been allocated to support students with disabilities who need toilet training. Modbury Special School will begin an action research program with the Intellectual Disability Services Council (IDSC) for terms three and four, 1998. Other programs are being negotiated with two other special schools (one country and one metro) using other external agencies in the South group of districts. The outcomes of all three sites will be evaluated and a future model developed for use in 1999.

(f) Curriculum support: Special schools have agreed to share 1.0 FTE salary amongst specific students with severe multiple disabilities who require consumable materials for personal care and curriculum support. A per capita amount for students in special schools, special units, and for isolated students in 10 schools has been calculated and will be allocated following approval by the Chief Executive, Department of Education, Training and Employment.

(g) 1.0 FTE salary has been allocated to support students with several multiple disabilities in transition from special schools to adult services. Negotiations have just been completed with special schools and adult service agencies for referral and support for, and evaluation of, about 15-20 students in this program. Final allocations will be calculated according to the support needs of individual students.

(h) 2.0 FTE salaries have been allocated for skilling staff to work more effectively with students with disabilities who exhibit extreme behaviours.

The Flinders University has entered into a Memorandum of Agreement with the Department of Education, Training and Employment to develop and deliver two courses on Behaviour Management and Autism.

Funds have been/will be used to cover:

- costs to Flinders University for course development;
- TRT for course developers, presenters and participants;
- HECS fees for 35 participants.

Selection of participants was completed in early June and enrolments will be completed for July.

The courses have been in high demand with more applicants than funds available.

(i) 4.0 FTE salaries have been directly allocated to the appropriate schools who have students with severe multiple disabilities and students with sensory impairments. Previously there were two separate formulae for students with severe multiple

disabilities (1:8) and students with sensory impairments (1:4). This caused some confusion within schools and often left students disadvantaged due to incorrect formulae allocation. The cost of rationalising these two formulae across the state was 4.0 FTE salaries, and resulted in an increased School Services Officer (SSO) time allocation for students with severe multiple disabilities by approximately 70 hours per group of eight students.

(j) 1.0 FTE salary was allocated directly to Centres for Hearing Impaired Children (CHIC) to enable secondary teachers to have the same support as primary teachers to teach students with hearing impairments.

(k) 1.0 FTE has been allocated to the Bilingual Assistant Program in preschools to fund interpreters to work with families and preschool directors during the negotiation of curriculum plans. Funding is also used to translate information, reports and support materials for families and preschool staff.

The policy framework for this new scheme has been developed early in 1998 and, to date, ten families and their preschools have accessed the program.

(l) 1.0 FTE salary has been directly allocated to Klemzig Primary School to support the implementation of Auslan in a pilot project. The total student population was involved in developing Auslan as a Language Other Than English (LOTE) Part of the funds has also been used to employ deaf bilingual officers.

(m) 50.6 FTE salaries have been allocated proportionately to all schools to support students with learning difficulties.

(n) \$100 000 was allocated to the Bilingual Assistant program to increase the capacity of preschools and Child Parent Centres to support young children of a non English speaking background. Over 100 preschools received support for different languages and ethnic groups. Each of these sites had at least one and up to 12 different languages and ethnic groups. 476 children in total receive a service. The program has increased as it has become more acceptable to parents of a non English speaking background and as assistants for a wider range of languages have been identified. Aboriginal languages are now supported. The program will increase within available budget before the end of 1998.

(o) \$150 000 was allocated to the Preschool Support Program to increase the capacity of preschools and Child Parent Centres to support children with developmental delay and children with disabilities. Currently, approximately 615 children receive individually negotiated support in many preschools and child parent centres across the state.

(p) 2.0 FTE salaries have been allocated to traineeships for SSOs. A course entitled 'Integration Aides' has been negotiated and training has begun at TAFE Institutes for approximately 25 people. Country trainees have been targeted as a priority. Negotiations are continuing with the Australian Education Union for the expenditure of a further \$220 000 within this project.

2. All schools and preschools in the State have received a range of allocations from the Enterprise Agreement. Not all sites benefited from all the items in the Agreement.

3. Preschools and schools received funding according to the formula for each item in the Agreement.

Resources are currently not available to determine the exact dollar amount provided to each school and preschool for the various programs.

There are still some funds to be expended but any delays are due to the negotiation of projects and the collaboration with other service providers, eg. Flinders University, or the lack of available staff, eg. a Bilingual Assistant for a specific language.

The allocation process has been complex but immediate for direct salary support to preschools and schools.

HEMOLYTIC UREMIC SYNDROME

131. **Ms STEVENS:**

1. How many cases of hemolytic uremic syndrome (HUS) were reported in South Australia in 1996-97?

2. How many HUS cases were hospitalised in 1997-98?

3. Did investigations into cases of HUS in 1997-98 reveal the source and cause of infection, and if so what were the details, and were any of the cases related to a common source?

4. How many prosecutions were launched under the Food Act in 1997-98 and what were the nature of the offences prosecuted?

5. How many cases of Legionnaires disease were reported in 1996-97 and 1997-98?

6. Did investigations into cases of Legionnaires disease 1997-98 reveal the source and cause of infection, and if so what were the details, and were any of the cases related to a common source?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:

1. 1996-97: 0

1997-98: 4

2. 4.

3. Investigations revealed no sources and no common features were found that might link the cases.

4. Expiation notices issued 1997-98 (to 2 June 1998)—total 9.

1—Manufacture of sausages—meat content below the standard

1—Manufacture of mettwurst—failure to monitor and record pH & E.coli

6—Manufacture of sausages—excess sulphur dioxide preservative

1—Failure to label packaged foods in accordance with the Food Standards Code

Prosecutions—Two cases as follows:

1—Failure to monitor and record fermentation temperature and monitor for E.coli.

This case was heard on 16 June 1898. The Crown Solicitors Office has advised that the person pleaded guilty to failing to monitor and record fermentation temperatures and failure to monitor E coli in a raw and unfinished product.

The penalties imposed, plus costs, were:

· failure to monitor for E coli: \$1 125

· failure to monitor fermentation temperatures: \$750

2—Failure to label packaged foods in accordance with the Food Standards Code

(currently with the Crown Solicitors Office for assessment)

5. 1996-97: 16 cases of Legionella pneumophila infection (Legionnaires disease)

1997-98: 5 cases of Legionella pneumophila infection (Legionnaires disease)

6. All cases of Legionella pneumophila infection reported in 1997-98 were investigated. In only one incident was a common source identified. This source, now confirmed as water vapour from the communal spa pool at the Ozone Hotel on Kangaroo Island, was responsible for at least four cases of the infection.

Investigation of all other reported cases of Legionella indicated they were sporadic and isolated.

HOSPITALS, EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

136. **Ms STEVENS:** How many admitted patients waited in emergency sections for longer than 12 hours since 1 July 1997 at each of the following hospitals: Flinders Medical Centre, Royal Adelaide Hospital, Women's and Children's Hospital, Lyell McEwin Hospital, Noarlunga Hospital, and the Daws Road Repatriation Hospital?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The following table summarises current performance of the major Health Units in relation to extended wait times in Emergency Department for admission (referred to as exit block).

| | Numbers of patients waiting longer than 12 hours for admission |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Flinders Medical Centre | 672 (July 97 to April 98) |
| Royal Adelaide Hospital | None |
| Women's and Children's Hospital | No statistical data is available, but anecdotal information provided indicates the incidence of this has been very small and has only occurred during winter months at times of peak activity. |

| | Numbers of patients waiting longer than 12 hours for admission |
|--|--|
| North Western Adelaide Health Service: Queen Elizabeth Hospital | Statistical data is only available for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for February and March, when 8 patients had extended waiting times. |
| Lyell McEwin Health Service | In lieu of hard data, anecdotal information from both campuses has been obtained which indicates that the incidence of this has been very small. |
| Noarlunga Health Service | None |
| Repatriation General Hospital | None |

As indicated above, the problem of extended waiting times in Emergency Departments for admission to an acute bed is principally occurring in Flinders Medical Centre. FMC is doing everything possible to manage this problem in both the short and long term. Recent actions taken include:

- opening of 10 additional beds in November 1997
- improved bed management practices and strengthened links between community resources, GPs and Repatriation General Hospital.
- the establishment of a discharge 'transit lounge' furnished with recliner chairs, where patients who are awaiting transport or discharge formalities are cared for. This frees up the acute bed ready for a new admission.
- establishment of a chest pain assessment unit to streamline management of patients with cardiac problems.
- introduction of Hospital at Home services to allow some patients' treatment to be provided in the home.

Flinders Medical Centre reports these actions are beginning to show results. Comparing the period January to April 1997 and January to April 1998, shows waiting time numbers have declined by approximately 80 patients, in spite of these months being busier than the same period in 1997.

Royal Adelaide Hospital, Noarlunga Health Centre, Repatriation General Hospital all advise that exit block is not a problem with no patients waiting for admission for longer than 12 hours.

North Western Adelaide Health Service and Women's and Children's Hospital have only limited statistical information available, but anecdotal information from both Health Units reports that it occurs for small numbers of patients only.

All Health Units have strategies in place to minimise the occasions when this occurs and all report that other than the discomfort of the Emergency Department barouches, no adverse clinical deterioration has occurred for any patient as a consequence of the waiting times.

It should be noted that, to enable more efficient collection of information to support improved standards, the SAHC has recently undertaken the installation of an Emergency Department Information management system in the major metropolitan Health Units. With better understanding, the extent of the problem, eg times of the day and days of the week, when the wait times are most extended, actions can then be targeted toward these specific problems times, giving better chances of success in rectifying the problem.

GOVERNMENT CREDIT CARDS

141. Mr KOUTSANTONIS:

1. What is the progress of EFTPOS and credit card payment facilities installed by Government departments?
2. What are the names of Government departments which have these facilities?
3. What are the names of Government departments which do not have these facilities and is it intended to introduce them and, if not, why not?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:

1. An agreement between the Reserve Bank, ANZ and the Treasurer was executed on 9 April 1998, for the provision of a merchant card facility to the South Australian Government. This facility enables agencies who join the ANZ program the ability to accept payment using either debit or credit cards. Currently, the only credit cards which are able to be used are Visa, Bankcard and MasterCard. Negotiations are currently under way with the Reserve Bank and Amex for the acceptance of the American Express card for payment. This additional method of payment should be available in the coming months.

2. The first agency to take up this service was Registration and Licensing, which has introduced this in all of its suburban and re-

gional offices. Registration and Licencing has also installed 20 terminals in its telephone payment area.

The Department of Education, Training and Employment has also been approached and is preparing to advise all government schools of the availability of the service. Some government schools currently accept credit cards for payment of fees, however, these schools will be encouraged to participate in the government program as merchant fees charged will generally be lower. TAFE colleges have also been approached.

The Attorney-General's Department, namely Births, Deaths and Marriages and Liquor Licencing will be approached next.

3. The merchant card facility is offered to all government agencies which wish to participate in the government program with ANZ. Whether to accept debit and credit card for payment of accounts is an issue which each agency must address individually.

EMPLOYMENT

147. Ms THOMPSON:

1. What is the definition of a job used in the context of the recent announcements relating to job creation and is there any distinction between ongoing jobs and jobs that exist for a specific period of time?

2. How can members of the public identify whether a job is a one year traineeship, an ongoing job or a job of specific tenure?

The Hon. J. HALL:

1. The South Australian Government has a role in job creation through adopting a range of strategies, for example by promoting economic development projects that stimulate employment opportunities, and by providing employment encouragement initiatives for small businesses. These strategies and their potential for job creation are promoted by the Government to demonstrate its commitment to employment. The jobs are therefore not usually distinguished in terms of tenure but rather to highlight success.

The State Government provides a range of employment initiatives which are designed to complement its economic and social objectives. The recently released employment statement highlights a number of strategic initiatives that range from business assistance programs to regional development programs. The type of job outcomes will vary according to individual programs. The focus of many of these initiatives is on sustainable jobs linked to economic development or traineeships as in the case of the Small Business Employer Incentive Scheme.

2. Jobs that are created as a result of State Government funding will vary depending upon the particular Government strategy that is being implemented. The State Government has a responsibility to promote success stories to the general public resulting in promotions focusing on the success of a strategy in terms of total job numbers. Sponsors of individual projects are more likely to promote specific details of jobs as appropriate. It is therefore difficult for the State Government to provide specific details of jobs to members of the public within broad based promotions or announcements. For example:

- Jobs that are provided within the State Government are generally traineeship and graduate placements and are promoted accordingly.
- Jobs that are provided through the employment statement will vary depending upon the individual initiative. Each initiative targets a particular group such as small businesses, regional boards, or unemployed people within a disadvantaged group. The range of jobs may therefore include traineeships, community projects that trigger long term employment opportunities, or short term jobs that provide a pathway to future longer term employment. As the majority of these programs are provided via intermediaries, it is the responsibility of the intermediary to promote the program to the relevant target group. Availability of information about the specific nature of jobs that are indirectly provided by the State Government, for example

through funding capital works projects, establishing joint ventures or promoting economic development projects, will depend on the individual contractor's workforce requirements. Access to these jobs will also vary between each project. Inquiries from members of the public regarding jobs that may arise through the projects must be directed to the relevant contractor who is responsible for the project. A list of State Government projects with an estimated value over \$10 million has been developed by the Project Coordination Unit, Department of Industry and Trade. This list, which is currently being updated, contains contact details of each project and is available to members of the public.

CAPITAL WORKS BUDGET

149. Ms WHITE:

1. What is the break-up of expenditure in the 1998-99 capital budget for schools of \$84.174 million including major projects, information technology, capital assistance scheme, program maintenance, investigations and design, purchase of land and property, purchase of school furniture and school buses and other items?

2. What are the details of the budget for 1998-99 for major project expenditure including the scope of works, the program budget, the project commencement date and the estimated date of completion?

3. What are the details of all major projects in the forward estimates for capital works in 1999-2000?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:

1. The following is a break-down of the capital works budget for 1998-99:

| | Estimated Expenditure \$'000 |
|--|------------------------------------|
| · Major Projects | 25 006 |
| · Information Technology—Improved Student Access | 15 000 |
| · Capital Assistance Scheme | 2 000 |
| · Programmed Maintenance and Minor Works | 38 208 |
| · Preliminary Investigation and Design | 1 000 |
| · Purchase of land and property | 900 |
| · Purchase of Furniture | 1 500 |
| · Purchase of School buses and other vehicles | 560 |
| Total 1998-99 Capital Budget | 84 174 |

2. The details of major projects are as follows:

Adelaide High School
Planned commencement October 1998, estimated completion December 1999.

Upgrade and improve facilities to meet curriculum requirements with particular emphasis on addressing OHS&W issues and meeting of code and legislative demands.

Estimated total cost \$3 million.
Anangu Schools—Amata/Oak Valley
Planned commencement May 1999, estimated completion February 2000.

The provision of new facilities and the upgrading and consolidation of existing facilities to meet code, legislative and educational requirements.

Estimated total cost \$2 million.
Clare High School
Planned commencement July 1998, estimated completion July 1999.

The provision of facilities to establish a consolidated approach to the delivery of educational services to early childhood and years 7-12, encompassing the development of new facilities, the redevelopment and upgrading of existing facilities and the establishment of an integrated child care/preschool service.

Estimated total cost \$1.5 million.
Jamestown Schools
Planned commencement December 1998, estimated completion February 2000.

The provision of accommodation to allow for the consolidation of the primary school onto the existing high school site and to meet the needs of specialist teaching plus relocation of transportable buildings to provide general classroom spaces. Included is the upgrading of the library resource centre and administration facilities.

Estimated total cost \$2.750 million.
Kent Town Preschool
Planned commencement July 1998, estimated completion April 1999

The relocation of the current facility on to a new site with provision of appropriate facilities to cater for the special needs of students.

Estimated total cost \$0.7 million.
Salisbury North R-7 School
Planned commencement July 1998, estimated completion October 1998

The upgrading and expansion of the facilities to cater for the growth in the school generated through the amalgamation of the junior and primary schools. This will include changes in the administration facilities, particularly to address OHS&W requirements.

Estimated total cost \$0.317 million.
William Light R-12 School Stage 2
Planned commencement July 1998, estimated completion March 1999

Second stage of the redevelopment of the former Plympton High School site into the R-12 education facility which includes addressing of code, legislative and educational requirements and further consolidation of facilities.

Estimated total cost \$3.6 million.
Woodville Special School
Planned commencement November 1998, estimated completion February 1999

To address the OHS&W issues specifically associated with meeting the needs of the students and to reflect the changes associated with curriculum initiatives.

Estimated total cost \$0.5 million.
3. The Capital Works Program for 1999-2000 and beyond is preliminary and subject to prioritisation and change as new and more definite information becomes available. Therefore I am unable to provide details of major projects in the forward estimates for 1999-2000.

EDUCATION, TARGETED VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES

150. Ms WHITE:

1. How many targeted voluntary separation packages have been approved by the Commissioner for Public Employment for the Department of Education, Training and Employment by 31 December 1998?

2. What classification of employees will make the reduction of 220 employees from DETE during 1998-99 as shown in the Portfolio Statement, Budget Paper Number 4 and is the reduction of 90 to 100 classroom teacher jobs announced in the budget in addition to this forecast reduction?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:

1. The current Government TVSP scheme expires on 31 December 1998. The previous Department for Employment, Training and Further Education's approval of 120 positions was effective until 30 June 1998. This has now been extended until the end of 1998 for the whole of the Department of Education, Training and Employment with an additional 60 approvals, making a total of 180.

As additional budget strategies are implemented further, TVSP approvals may be requested by the department.

2. Budget Paper No. 4, Volume 2, shows the total estimated workforce level (including Administered Items) for 30 June 1999 as 20 960 FTEs compared to 20 732 FTEs estimated for 30 June 1998, a net reduction of 222 FTEs. This reduction includes 90-100 teacher positions announced in the Budget.

It is incorrect to assume that the reduction of the 90-100 positions relates to classroom teachers. As I have previously indicated, the department will develop a proposal to reduce these positions in a way which minimises the impact in the classroom. The existing staffing formula for schools will be maintained.

The projected reduction of 222 positions is a net figure ie it represents the variation in employment levels, taking into account a range of factors such as:

- implementation of initiatives commenced last year and new initiatives in 1998/99
- changes in the employment mix
- natural attrition due to enrolment decline
- planned reductions ie. 90-100 positions
- administration restructure/amalgamations and other efficiencies
- continuation of outsourcing of some TAFE functions commenced last year

It should be noted, therefore, that the net reduction is not all related to the department's savings target set by Government.

A precise breakdown of the reduction by classification is not possible as in some instances decisions about employment types are yet to be made. However, in broad terms, the reduction will apply across all classification structures within the department.

COUNTRY TEACHING REVIEW

152. Ms WHITE:

1. Has the agreement on the country teaching review been honoured and, if so, what changes have occurred in the five specific areas set out in the agreement?

2. Does the 1998-99 budget include an additional \$2 million to implement the agreements and what are the details of how this money has been allocated?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:

1. The DECS Enterprise Agreement 1996 provided for a commitment of the parties to a total review of country incentives, and this review was to include a number of issues including:

- reconsideration of the list of "designated schools" which qualify for country incentives
- consideration of introducing country incentives for all leadership positions in the "designated schools"
- incentives to attract suitably experienced teachers to remote country locations
- country incentives leave
- incentives to attract qualified teachers in specialist areas to school term teaching vacancies.

\$2 million has been allocated for implementation of this review.

Extensive discussions during 1997 resulted in the department making a formal offer to the AEU in November 1997. The offer became the issue of further discussions and correspondence between the parties during 1998. A revised offer was provided to the union in March 1998 but this was also rejected by the AEU.

Further discussions and correspondence ensued over the following months and on 29 May 1998 the department provided a further offer to the AEU. The details of the offer remain confidential to the parties, having been made on a without prejudice basis. The AEU has yet to respond to this latest offer.

As a sign of good faith the department took the initiative earlier in the year to provide funds for removal costs for contract teachers and staffing resources to support teacher graduate recruits. These initiatives formed part of the original offer of November 1997.

2. The department's 1998-99 budget includes a level of funds to support currently agreed enterprise bargaining initiatives which may or may not continue into the new agreement. There has been no determination of any specific allocation at this point pending the outcome of negotiations to be conducted in the latter half of 1998.

EDUCATION, TEACHERS APPEAL BOARD

155. Ms WHITE:

1. Is there a backlog of appeals to the Teachers Appeal Board at 30 June 1998 and if so:

- (a) is it due to the failure to appoint board members and, if so, when will it be attended to?
- (b) does the Minister monitor the operation of the board and, if so, why has the board fallen behind?

2. What is the average delay between the lodgment and determination of appeals?

3. Are there any appeals lodged in 1977 that have not been determined as at 30 June 1998?

4. What is the benchmark time required by the board to hear appeals?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:

1. There are currently four appeals from 1997 and five appeals lodged to date in 1998 that have not been determined concerning seven different appellants. Of these, three are waiting for formal advice of discontinuance and two have not been listed due to a request from the appellants as a result of continuing negotiations. The remaining four appeals from two appellants effectively requiring two hearing dates are waiting to be listed once the Teachers Appeal Board appointments have been made.

Nominations for appointment to the Teachers Appeal Board have been made and appointment pursuant to the Education Act is imminent.

The presiding member of the Teachers Appeal Board is nominated from time to time by the President of the Industrial Court of South Australia from members of the Industrial Court for the purpose of hearing and determining appeals. The Presiding Officer, usually a judge, has full control of the conduct and operations of appeals. It would be inappropriate for a potential respondent to have a monitoring role.

2. The Teachers Appeal Board determines all appeals as soon as possible but the length of time required to determine an appeal is influenced by a number of factors, including complexities of the merits of the case, legal and jurisdiction issues, requests for adjournments for the purpose of negotiation between the parties, and availability of solicitors, Board members, witnesses and hearing dates. Some hearings take an hour or two and others take over ten days or more just to hear evidence and submissions, after which time the Board must consider its decision.

3. There are four appeals lodged in 1997 that have not been determined by 30 June 1998. Two of these are waiting for formal notice of discontinuance, one has not been listed at the request of the appellant due to continuing negotiations, and the fourth is waiting to be listed for the determination of preliminary issues after the Teachers Appeal Board met on two occasions in 1997 to arrive at this point.

4. Regulations under the Education Act require the Teachers Appeal Board to hear appeals as soon as practicable. A minimum of seven days notice of the time and place of the hearing must be given to the appellant and the respondent.