

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 6 August 1998

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

### EDUCATION FUNDING

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms White:

That this House expresses concern that South Australia's public school and TAFE systems will suffer unprecedented budget cuts over the next three years and censures the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training for failing to protect the future of education and training in this State and for accepting the Government's cuts to his portfolio which far exceed those in other departments.

(Continued from 9 July. Page 1414.)

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** I move:

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

acknowledges the tight budgetary situation faced by the State and commends the Government in these difficult circumstances for increasing the education, training and employment outlays by \$15 million in the 1998-99 year and by so doing maintain the high quality of education services in this State.

**Mr CLARKE:** I rise on a point of order, Sir. The amendment totally negates the motion and therefore must be ruled out of order.

**The SPEAKER:** The Chair has examined the amendment and upholds the point of order. The mover of the amendment may wish to revisit it in another form of words if that is the intention, but at this stage the amendment is not accepted.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** 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,

which Mr Clarke has moved to amend by inserting after the words 'country regions' the words 'and the State and Federal Liberal Governments for their neglect of rural and regional sector jobs both State and Federal lost to regional South Australia.'

(Continued from 23 July. Page 1552.)

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I oppose the amendment not because I do not care about rural areas and not because I do not understand that there has been centralisation, depopulation and a cutback in services in the rural areas but because it is an attempt to politicise the matter. The reality is that in the past 10 to 15 years I believe that the rural areas have been hard done by—by all governments—and disadvantaged by the national competition policy, and enough is enough. The reason why—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The House will come to order. There is too much audible conversation on my right. If members must converse, I ask them to either keep it quiet or go out to the lobbies.

**Mr SCALZI:** There are many disillusioned people in the rural areas because all Governments have failed to understand

the impact of the changes that have taken place in country areas. They have failed to understand the negative multiplier effect when an office closes in a rural area or country town and the impact it has on the whole community. The impacts are very different in the rural areas than they are in the metropolitan area. For the member for Ross Smith to see it as an opportunity to have a go at the Federal Liberal Government is really political opportunism. The Federal Liberal Government does not have a monopoly over the policies that are in place.

The deregulation of the banking system in 1983 was during the time of a Federal Labor Government. If I were to blame the Labor Government for the deregulation policies of the banks I would be just as opportunistic as the member for Ross Smith is with his amendment, because both major Parties went down that road. It is the same as the Federal Labor Party now trying to have go at the present Federal Coalition Government about tax reform and the goods and services tax. I remember quite clearly in 1985, when I was an economics teacher at Ingle Farm High School, option C of a 12.5 per cent broad based consumption tax. Who was the main proponent of that tax?

**Mr Brokenshire:** Paul Keating.

**Mr SCALZI:** Paul Keating. He then became a born again opponent of the tax when it suited him politically. The problem is that the public in general are sick and tired of political gymnastics, sick and tired of politicians trying to make political mileage from policies or changes in directions brought upon us by technological changes and changes to the global economy, the consequences of which go far beyond the action taken by State or Federal Governments. We must be honest with the public and acknowledge that we can only do so much in changing the economic circumstances brought upon us by technological changes and changes in structural employment.

The Australian Bankers' Association agrees that banks have an obligation to rural communities, and now they are considering the impact on a community before branches are closed. The banks themselves have acknowledged that. The impact of any closure, even school closures, in the rural areas is different from the metropolitan area. We can get on a bus or go to a Rediteller more readily than can anybody in a country area. We are fortunate in the Adelaide metropolitan area. Within 20 minutes—whether north, south, east or west—we can get to the centre of Adelaide. People in the rural areas do not have that luxury. It is about time that politicians of all persuasions understood that rural communities have a special need. I understood that when I was an economics teacher.

**Mr Clarke:** I thought it was when you were in Naples.

**Mr SCALZI:** No, I was not in Naples: I was 50 miles north-east of Naples. Rural problems are no different anywhere else in the world, because people in the cities somehow forget the special needs of the outer areas. Whether they live in Adelaide, Melbourne or Sydney, they forget the special needs of rural communities.

Regardless of income, it is difficult to educate children in a rural setting. They do not have the options that we have in the city, and one must acknowledge that. What I am trying to say is that the issue with the banks is only one of the problems that rural communities have to deal with. I am pleased that the banks acknowledge that, and I know that this State Government acknowledges the special problems that rural areas are facing. Special programs are in place in the Education Department to deal with them. The Federal

Government also acknowledges that rural communities have a special problem.

It saddens me that the problems faced by rural communities are being manipulated by certain groups for short-term political gain. I do not put the member for Ross Smith in that category, because he has a very good track record on these issues. He would not do that. I am talking about other groups which are trying to hijack the frustration of rural communities. I am talking about three corner Jane with the vocabulary of Tarzan. That is the person who is trying to hijack the rural communities.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** Would you mind explaining that?

**Mr SCALZI:** The three corner Jane with the vocabulary of Tarzan. I am talking about Pauline. She is not the salvation Jane of the rural or metropolitan areas: she is more like Paterson's curse. We have to be very careful with motions such as this that we do not add to the hysteria that the rural areas have been forgotten by the major Parties. I do not believe that is the case. As former Senator Richardson said on *60 Minutes*, I believe that the major Parties have done their best. There are mistakes on both sides, but the answer is not to bash Governments.

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

**Ms BREUER** secured the 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 23 July. Page 1552.)

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** It gives me a great deal of pleasure to support this most important motion that has been moved by the committed member for Heysen, the Hon. David Wotton. The honourable member has a genuine passion for looking after the Mount Lofty catchment regions and the Mount Lofty Ranges in general and also understands the difficulties that confront those who live in the Mount Lofty Ranges and the Fleurieu Peninsula on a daily basis. The Hon. David Wotton has taken the initiative by moving a motion in private members' time that highlights the importance of considering these issues.

The particular point that the honourable member has raised is only one of a number of issues that need to be addressed. The member for Heysen has suggested that the amalgamation of titles within catchments should be just one of the incentives in policy direction with respect to waiving the associated costs. I support this. I also support a number of other matters that should be considered, such as buffer zones and the right to farm in these regions. If imposts and regulations are put on those people who for generations have tried to make a living in this magnificent part of South Australia because those imposts and regulations are in the best interests of the community of South Australia, I do not believe that the farmers and landowners in those areas—and I include parts of my own electorate in this case—should

have to bear the brunt of all the costs and the imposts: it needs to be shared over the wider community. It needs to be shared not only over the South Australian community but over the national community.

I highlight another issue with respect to this motion. In the best interests of national land care, sustainable agriculture, the prevention of degradation of our water courses and the prevention of run-off from properties in those catchment areas affecting reservoirs adversely, the Federal Government—irrespective of the colour of that Government—should be more serious in terms of giving true taxation breaks to the people who live in those areas. I cite the example of a property that happens to have a water course, particularly a permanent water course, running through it: it is no longer acceptable to allow stock to drink from that water course. We have cleaned up a lot of those water courses to the point where we have damaged the natural protections, such as reeds and plants which filter and hold together the soil on the banks.

So, what happens? After consultation with communities and interest groups, members of Parliament introduce laws which say to farmers in the Mount Lofty catchment area that they are no longer allowed to run their stock to the water courses. That is fine, but who pays for the cost of fencing off those water courses? Who pays for the cost of putting in place pumps, header tanks, troughs, pads around the troughs and so on? This happens in terms of just one decision that has been made to protect one aspect of the Mount Lofty Ranges or the Fleurieu Peninsula.

Another point which I want to raise and for which I would like the support of the House is the matter of—

*Mr McEwen interjecting:*

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** I would not want to be in silent mode on this matter. I am sure that the member for Gordon would not want to be either, because he keeps telling me in this House that these sorts of imposts are being borne by his rural constituents in the area around Mount Gambier.

To come back to the point that I am highlighting, rural rates is another issue. Clearly, if you own property in the Mount Lofty Ranges or the Fleurieu Peninsula, because you happen to live in almost a peri-urban part of the State today, you find that property values are rising. But that does not mean that your income from those properties is rising: in most cases, particularly because of some of the facts I have highlighted this morning in respect of the imposts and the regulations, in many ways property income in the Mount Lofty Ranges is decreasing. Because property values are increasing and because in a lot of cases there are not true differential rural rates in those hinterland areas around Adelaide, council rates have increased by up to 100 per cent. In fact, the council rates of one of my constituents increased from \$15 000 a year to \$30 000 this year—a 100 per cent increase.

We have to encourage councils right around the Mount Lofty Ranges to be serious about true rural differential rating and to realise that they cannot use primary producers in the Mount Lofty Ranges and the catchment areas as cash cows for other areas. All those primary producers accept that if property values increase they may have to pay more in the way of annual rates, but not the sort of major increases that have occurred in recent times. One way around that is for councils to look at two areas: first, true rural differential rates; and, secondly, bringing down the rate in the dollar, because at the moment we need to be sending the right signals to those people living in the catchment areas of the Mount Lofty

Ranges and the Fleurieu Peninsula. The way to do that, through all tiers of government, is to ensure that we do not further add to the burden of running costs for those properties.

High rainfall country, particularly where stock is being run, is far more subject to land degradation than, say, country in the Mid North, even the Upper South-East, Yorke Peninsula or the West Coast. Further costs are already involved in those areas in managing races, undertaking tree planting and dealing with springs and soakage areas, etc., which do not apply in many other areas. The member for Heysen's motion calls on the Government to introduce a policy to waive the costs associated with the amalgamation of titles within catchments. It is a very important incentive and I would like to see it go further.

I would like to see it also taken up with respect to land tax. In the Mount Lofty Ranges and on the Fleurieu Peninsula a *bona fide* primary producer is generating income and is established, through the Australian Taxation Office, as a sales-tax exempt primary producer—and one cannot get any more *bona fide* that—but if that person decides to buy another property in those areas, particularly in the Willunga Basin, and further develop his or her farming operations, involving in that additional undertaking a spouse who may be out doing a bit of off-farm work, that *bona fide* primary producer is then hit with land tax—yet another impost—which can cost thousands of dollars. That is an absolute outrage.

If we are to be serious about protecting and enhancing the rural regions around Adelaide and capitalising on the obvious diversification opportunities through floriculture, horticulture and more intensive farming practices, we need, in all tiers of government, to get the message across to the bureaucrats and to the Ministers that it is time we looked at supporting these people so that they, in turn, can help support the whole of South Australia. I strongly and proudly support the member for Heysen's motion.

**Mr LEWIS (Hammond):** I support the motion, which has embodied in it—and I say this in due deference and giving credit to the member for Heysen—very noble sentiments. Accordingly, we need to have a policy and laws which recognise the general direction in which the motion would point us as a Parliament and, indeed, as a society. But I suspect that the horse has bolted. One way in which we can certainly catch the animal is to pursue the direction the member for Heysen has suggested, but that will not be sufficient, and let me explain. As it stands at present, much of the land used for primary production in the Mount Lofty Ranges has been for a long time, and still is, used for grazing and/or paddocking animals. Seriously, that is not on, especially where paddocking exceeds the natural capacity of the pasture to support the animals.

Supplementary feeding of horses, cattle—or, indeed, any other quadruped, including sheep—is inappropriate. All we have to do to realise that it is not a future that we can contemplate for those areas in the catchment—and this motion is specifically restricted to those parts of the Mount Lofty Ranges in the water catchment area—is to ensure that we do not subject ourselves to the problems that have confronted the population of the greater metropolitan area of Sydney during the past couple of weeks. There, as all members know, single celled organisms, such as giardia, infested their water. For those members who do not know what giardia looks like, it is very small, and I guess it looks something like a squid. The other organism which infested

their water is the cryptosporidium organism, which will kill people who have depleted immune systems.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** You get that in Sydney.

**Mr LEWIS:** You not only get it in Sydney: I have to tell the member for Heysen that you will get it in the Adelaide Hills from any sample of water you take out of any creek that runs through pasture from its upper catchments in which animals are grazed and where the animals are fed a supplementary diet. The amount of dung on the pasture exceeds the capacity of the biosphere to digest it before a build-up of population of these unicellular organisms to which I refer (types such as giardia and cryptosporidium) occurs. We cannot allow that situation to continue.

In the catchment areas of the Mount Lofty Ranges, dairy farming is dead. Cattle for beef are finished if supplementary feeding is involved and, worst of all the offenders are the horsey farmers—those people who have a hobby farm block and who indulge themselves and their kids by having horses paddocked on that land, where they have to feed those horses almost all of their diet and where those horses do not rely on the pasture for any significant part of their diet. Indeed, it is possible to continue grazing quadrupeds in the Adelaide Hills catchments only if we do not feed them supplements, other than perhaps seasonally—say, in autumn—when there is insufficient feed in the paddock; otherwise, the risk is too great. Even so, the process of eutrophication of the reservoirs into which the water is running—for those of us who care about ecosystems and what makes them tick or what makes them come undone—will still continue. But at the moment, that eutrophication of the reservoirs is occurring at an alarming rate. Within 50 years, all the reservoirs in the Adelaide Hills, at the present rate of increase in animal stocking in those water catchment areas, will be subjected to so much eutrophication that they will be putrid and unfit at any time for human consumption: we will simply have to use the water for irrigation purposes.

*Mr Hanna interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** I am saying that there should be less animal grazing where the carrying capacity is exceeded by the farmer's activities—where the carrying capacity of the pasture is exceeded by the number of animals that are put on it by that farmer. Those animals include horses (the worst offenders), dairy cows (probably the second worst group) and beef cattle (the third worst group). That is why I did not respond to the interjection from the member for Mawson, because I did not want to embarrass him. To extend it beyond the catchments would mean that the dairy farms in which the member for Mawson may have an interest would become illegal if we are to do things on a sustainable basis. I did not want to cause anybody that much angst: I just wanted to draw the matter to the public's attention.

If we want to use the Adelaide Hills as catchment for Adelaide's water, we should be pursuing a separate policy which, over the next 50 years, cuts back on the number of animals, in order to give us breathing space, as it were—and it is really drinking space—and time to get in place a massive storage area for water on the eastern slopes of the Mount Lofty Ranges in the appropriate upper reaches of the Bremer River or the Angas River and sell off the publicly owned land around the reservoirs to people who will use it for irrigated horticulture or for grazing ostrich, emu or whatever.

I make that remark because the quantity of these unicellular organisms that live in the dung of things like wallabies and ratites—that is, emu and ostrich—is significantly reduced on the logarithmic scale to the order of two or three times.

That means they are in the order of 100th to 1 000th less than they are coming from ruminants or other animals like horses which have enlarged caecum and the appendix in which they digest cellulose, whereas that occurs in the compartmentalised stomachs of sheep, goats, cows, and the like.

It is stupid for us as politicians to presume that we can determine policy based on what is popular in the public mind where that popular view is based on ignorance, equal at least to the level of ignorance we may have on the subject. Any policy not based on good science is stupid. It is not just inappropriate or inaccurate, and it will not only fail to address the basic cause but it will hold us up in future when it is reviewed by generations that come after us as inane, inept and unprofessional to say the least. Indeed, ridicule would be an appropriate word to describe it. It is not about touchy, feely, warm and furry because the public want it that way; it is about the necessity to base policies on good science, otherwise we will be ridiculed by posterity.

In this case, the motion, so far as it goes, is noble. Perhaps the motion should contain some recognition of the stupidity of the practices that are currently occurring. Primary production *per se* as the basis upon which we determine what can be done with the land is too broad a set of ideas and industries. It needs to be narrowed down to those types of industries which do not represent a threat. We only have to have a couple of years with odd climatic influences on the pastures of the Adelaide Hills and the water catchment areas—and that could happen any time, not 50 years from now, but next year or the year after—and we will end up with a bigger problem than the problem they have had in Sydney.

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** Not at all. It will be very easy for it to happen, coincidentally may I say to the member for Mawson, regardless of the fact that he is walking around in the Chamber when he contributes to my remarks by his mistaken belief that it will be impossible. He is mistaken. It is very possible; indeed, it is likely. It has always been a worry to me as a foundation member of the Mount Lofty Regional Development Association which was established in 1970, where we tried to draw attention to the necessity for us to protect these catchments. That was 28 years ago when I lived in Athelstone. That is when I recognised the risks that were being posed to the catchment areas because I had worked in third world countries where there were water problems that had affected me. I did not have the levels of resistance of the native populations there.

I am serious about what I have said. I commend the motion put by the member for Heysen as far as it goes and support the belief that there ought to be a reduction in land tax and hope that we understand the need.

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

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Administrative Services):** I take this opportunity to support the motion, as the Minister responsible for its ultimate intent, and also to commend the member for Heysen for his initiative in bringing it to the House. It is fair to say that this is a good example of how private members' time can be properly used. Indeed, members of the Opposition might like to take note of the opportunity that is provided by private members' time to constructively contribute to the process of Government and to put forward constructive suggestions rather than lame motions that might refer to some tenuous connection to a

Federal Government decision in an attempt to somehow ramp it back through the State Government process.

The member for Heysen has indeed used private members' time properly by putting forward in the House dilemmas faced by the important Mount Lofty catchment region and constructively suggesting an option for at least resolution in a small way. The member for Heysen suggests that the Government should introduce a policy of waiving costs associated with the amalgamation of titles where the catchment is one such important incentive. At present, the Real Property Act 1886 provides for the amalgamation or merging together of contiguous allotments to form a new single allotment. Obviously the process is the reverse of dividing land into allotments but without the need to seek planning approval. Obviously the advantage of amalgamation is to provide relief from rates and taxes, which are assessed on separate allotments, into a multiple holding where all allotments are used for a single purpose such as a farm.

Where the land is used as a single holding, it is the Valuer General's present policy to amalgamate multiple titles in the same ownership into one assessment for rating purposes or to apply a notional value, which, effectively, will achieve the same result. I will be careful not to refer to other legislation that is before another place, but members would be aware that the Government is considering opportunities for legislatively enforcing notional values. At present, the landowner has to make application to the Register-General to amalgamate two or more contiguous allotments into a single new allotment. This requires the preparation of a plan for amalgamation by a licensed surveyor or survey drafting firm and the preparation of an application to the Register-General for the deposit of the plan. It is not usual for the plan to be in the form of a certified survey except in rare circumstance.

The current fees for lodgement of a plan of amalgamation to the Land Titles Office at this stage are: first, for a plan of amalgamation, \$388; and, secondly, an application for amalgamation, \$80. Essentially, the proposal of the member for Heysen is that the fees of \$388 and \$80 be waived. The Register-General does not have the regulatory power at present to waive these fees, and the implementation of the member for Heysen's proposal essentially will require an amendment to be made to the real properties fees regulations to waive the fees for amalgamation of contiguous allotments in the Mount Lofty catchment area. The Government is pleased to take on board the suggestion of the member for Heysen and consider implementing a new policy to enable his suggestion to be supported. I take this opportunity again to commend the member for Heysen for his initiative, and I am sure that the residents of the Mount Lofty catchment region, as well as those who have a genuine interest in our water catchment areas, will applaud the suggestion put forward by the member.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop):** I will back up some of the comments that have been made by speakers to this motion and reinforce particularly what the member for Hammond said regarding the organisms cryptosporidium and giardia. I believe that I recently experienced first hand the effects of at least one, if not both, of these organisms, having been in Sydney last week at the Public Works Committee conference. On my return to South Australia I believe that I suffered from drinking the Sydney water, and it caused me some degree of discomfort for a couple of days.

I commend the member for Heysen for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and of the Minister and

suggest that quite a few other initiatives should be taken by Governments not only to ensure the protection of the water resource in the Adelaide Hills and for the city of Adelaide but also to protect the pursuit of agriculture in what has been some of the most productive agricultural land in South Australia. Unfortunately, the growth of the city of Adelaide, greater metropolitan Adelaide and the outlying suburbs, both on the plains and in the Hills, has meant that some of the most productive agricultural land in South Australia is now underneath bricks, mortar and asphalt. That is a great pity, because it has had a detrimental effect on the productive assets of this State. Some of those comments would probably better be addressed at another time, but I certainly lend my support to the motion.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** I take this opportunity to thank all the members who have spoken in support of this motion: my colleagues in Government, for the contribution they have made; the Minister, for his response today; the Opposition members, through the shadow Minister for Environment, for the support that they have given this motion; and the member for MacKillop, for the comments that he has made. This is an important issue. I do not want to go over all the points that I raised in presenting this motion, but it is one that I support very strongly. This motion is about providing incentives. As I have noted on numerous occasions in this place, I believe that people who live in the catchment generally, and particularly those who are land-holders, recognise the responsibilities that we all have now in the management of our resources to ensure that water quality is maintained.

There is still a long way to go. This motion is about maintaining and improving—and I believe that that is absolutely necessary—the water quality coming out of the Mount Lofty catchment. As the members for Mawson and MacKillop have noted, it is a most important resource. Water coming out of the Mount Lofty Ranges is essential for the city of Adelaide and for the metropolitan area; it supplements the supply from the Murray River. Regrettably, we can never be sure when things are going to go dramatically wrong as far as the Murray is concerned, and we need to ensure that the source of water coming from the Mount Lofty Ranges is available for the people of the metropolitan area.

In line with that, I agree with the comments that have been made by my colleagues on this side of the House regarding the state of the water in the reservoirs; as I said in presenting the motion, I have considerable concerns about that issue. It is also about the retention of land for primary production, which is vitally important if we are to maintain and improve water quality in the catchment. It is about the retention of open space and the retention of native vegetation. There are many examples now in the Mount Lofty Ranges generally where there is a need for incentives to be provided to ensure that native vegetation of a high quality is retained.

I particularly wish to thank the Minister for the commitment that he has made in regard to the need for the amendment of legislation and the support that he has provided on the part of Government. That is something I will certainly be following up with him; I was not aware that there would be a need for an amendment to legislation. If that is the case, I will certainly be ensuring that that amendment comes before the House.

In conclusion, in the presentation that I made earlier I referred to the need for a scheme to enable and to support the transfer of titles in the catchment, particularly. Whether that

is referred to as a transfer of titles scheme or relocation of allotments, it is absolutely essential that such a scheme be introduced. I regret that at this stage I am finding considerable opposition from Planning SA to the introduction of such a scheme. It is something to which I am totally committed and towards which I will continue to work. I believe that eventually we will have such a scheme in place to provide yet another incentive in this area of maintaining quality of water and lifestyle in the Mount Lofty Ranges catchment.

Motion carried.

## 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 the Port River in line with its 1997 election promise,

which Mr Venning has moved to amend by leaving out all words after the word 'House' and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

(a) notes that 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 for consideration and public consultation;

(b) notes that 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 that the proposal is related to the decision to allow A Double Road Trains to operate on Grand Junction Road between South and Port Road;

(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 scheme; and

(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.

(Continued from 23 July. Page 1555.)

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** I support the motion moved by my colleague the member for Price and indicate that the Opposition will not support the amendment moved by the member for Schubert. This is a significant issue which affects my community, which certainly affects the community of my colleague and which has an effect on the community of the member for Lee in terms of the heavy vehicle traffic that passes through our three electorates. In most part it affects my electorate because, as all members would be aware, it contains the port of Adelaide. The Outer Harbor container terminal is a tribute to all those involved in the operation at Sea-Land. The movement of containers by road vehicles is a significant issue and one that has caused me some concern in terms of the impact on my electorate and particularly on my constituents.

From the outset I say that this is a very complex and difficult issue and no fault of the drivers of the vehicles in any way, shape or form. Obviously, they have to make best use of the available infrastructure to get containers to Outer Harbor, and the real issue is that the infrastructure we have in the port of Adelaide is simply not adequate or efficient for the proper movement of vehicles.

The Minister has allowed A-doubles to operate along Grand Junction Road into my district. They use the ring route, known as Causeway Road, and swing past at least three or four schools on their way down to the Outer Harbor container terminal. Watching the very large A-doubles come into my district causes me great concern, having driven regularly alongside or behind these trucks. They are very large and significant vehicles. Whilst the drivers are very skilled operators, it has to be a logical conclusion that these sort of vehicles on suburban roads involves a heightened risk when it comes to other users of those roads.

As do all members of this House, I want a most efficient and continually improving port. The simple solution, although complex in dollar terms, is to build a third river crossing in Port Adelaide. We desperately need a bridge at Port Adelaide. It need only be a freight bridge and does not need to be used by ordinary drivers of vehicles. If we are to bring A-doubles into Adelaide, we need proper infrastructure and that would involve the connector from Port Wakefield Road into Wingfield and Gillman that we have now. It is a fine road—and I pay tribute to the former Labor Government for building it. It needs to be extended to the river and we need to take those trucks and rail freight across the river, away from the inner Port Adelaide area and Grand Junction Road and, most importantly from my perspective, away from Causeway Road, Victoria Road in part and other roads. There are at least two primary schools and further down the road another three primary schools all on roads on which these vehicles are travelling.

I hope there are more freight movements in my district because it will mean that our economy is performing better, but I do not want more freight movements in my district if it is to put harm and danger in the way of ordinary citizens in my district as they drop off their kids to school and pick them up and go about their daily functions of shopping and travelling to work. They should not have to do battle with A-double road trains in suburban Port Adelaide. It is not proper, fair or a risk worth taking. I have total confidence in the skilful drivers of these vehicles and it is only because of their skills that these A-double road trains move with a degree of safety. The sensible thing would be to speed up the decision to build the third river crossing so we have a more efficient port and can get the trucks more quickly into the port of Adelaide and Outer Harbor and remove an element of risk that would otherwise exist.

The third river crossing, there is no doubt in my mind, is being stalled for a variety of reasons, doubtless money being the significant reason. The Federal Government has an obligation to assist in the construction of this bridge. The State Government needs to make it a more urgent priority. I was encouraged in the early years of my time in this Parliament that the Minister for Transport, as an advocate of the bridge, would be able to move Cabinet and this issue onto a stage where the bridge would be up and running before the turn of the century. However, despite her enthusiasm for the project, the Minister for Transport is clearly unable to make it a reality at this stage.

I will be corresponding shortly with the Premier on this matter—and I have written many letters to Premiers Olsen and Brown in their various capacities as Minister and Premier (one is never sure which from day to day)—urging the Government to make the third river crossing at Port Adelaide a major project of State significance that is required quickly. It was also part of the Liberal Government's electoral platform at the last election. It made a big issue of this at the last State election and I want it to deliver on a fundamental promise to the people of Port Adelaide.

I have no doubt (and I am told) that the cost savings to the transport companies in being able to rapidly take containers via road transport across the Port River through proper infrastructure would amount to many millions of dollars that would flow back into the businesses of the transport operators and the economy and result in an even more efficient port when it comes to competing with the eastern seaboard. The unseemly sight of trucks going through the inner heart of Port Adelaide is a tragedy. It brings a tear to my eye when I have to wait at the lights at inner Port Adelaide, watching the beautiful City of Port Adelaide clogged with trucks. That is no fault of the truck drivers, as they have to travel along the quickest route between points A and B.

*Mr Wright interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** Not every day. For variety, I change the route into work. We have a beautiful city in Port Adelaide as you, Sir, know from your many trips to the Yacht Squadron. As a former Minister for Urban Development, you know, Sir, that we need to get the trucks out of Port Adelaide to ensure that the vibrant Port of Adelaide is developed. I have no doubt that the trucking community, the Transport Workers Union and everyone else involved in that industry would join with me in urging the Government to build the new bridge, as I suspect they want to get from points A to B more quickly and they become as frustrated as I do, if not more so, in having to navigate inadequate road networks in Port Adelaide.

I know of the frustration of my colleague the member for Price over the issue of A-doubles using Grand Junction Road. That road was simply not built for the volume of trucks we are seeing. Portside Christian School is on a corner of Causeway Road and has had to build a six or seven foot timber fence to insulate the school from the noise. It is a social issue as much as it is an economic and transport issue. Economic development is about getting the right infrastructure. We are lectured often by this Government about the need to improve our economy. We have an opportunity to make a tangible difference and return safety to my community by taking the A-doubles that are causing such dangers off the roads in my area.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I support the amendment moved by the member for Schubert. I note the original motion that the member for Price moved and can understand his feelings on this issue and those of the people who use Grand Junction Road. I use Grand Junction Road quite often in commuting between the metropolitan area and my electorate, so I understand the concern of the member for Price. All of us who use that road, particularly those who live in that area, would appreciate the changes that have been made over some time in terms of signage so that the road trains could start using the road from, I think, 1 March.

There is no doubt that road trains are a potential problem throughout the State, and the electorate of Goyder has had a trial going on for almost a year on road trains on the coast

road from the turn off at Port Wakefield to Port Giles. Certainly, Transport SA has had to undertake some widening in places, but it has not been able to do it all the way and it has mainly been confined to corners. People who live in a place like Pine Point have had some real concerns about the road trains, which are allowed to operate 24 hours a day, particularly at night time, at times when schoolchildren are on the streets getting on to buses, and in holiday time. It is matter that will have to be given further thought down the track.

We need to acknowledge that a lot of our troubles have occurred because of the downturn in the use of railways over many years. It is a great shame that our railways were sold off, and that goes way back to the period of the Dunstan Government. Warnings were given then and a lot of those warnings have come to fruition. It is only since this Government took office that we are starting to see a potential revival in rail that may help to take some heavy road traffic off our roads.

A-doubles carry more than semi-trailers because of their extra length, so their introduction means less heavy vehicle traffic and less vehicle and noise pollution than would otherwise be the case. In addition to the benefit of less traffic, road transport will be able to handle South Australian farm produce and manufactured goods for export more efficiently. In that respect, if we want to stay competitive in the world market, we have to be as efficient as we possibly can in our rural and manufacturing sectors. The A-doubles are able to help accommodate that. It has been estimated that they will lead to savings of more than \$4 million a year to the South Australian community.

I also point out that A-doubles are more technologically advanced road transport vehicles. They are equipped with modern, computerised driving aids, they are quieter, they use less fuel and they are more friendly to the environment than many smaller heavy vehicles. Whilst I acknowledge the concerns of the member for Price, the member for Hart and others, the reality is that the use of A-doubles should lead to a smaller number of heavy vehicles on roads and, whatever the case, the goods will be conveyed more efficiently.

The member for Hart's point about a third bridge over the Port River is taken on board. If the State had not been in its current financial position as a result of the previous Government's financial mismanagement, I am sure that this Government would have gone a long way towards implementing the construction of the third crossing. It is a pity that there is no support by the Opposition in this House for the sale of ETSA, and it is an even greater shame that there is no support by the Labor Party in the Upper House for the sale of ETSA because, if that were to go ahead, projects such as the third crossing over the Port River would come much closer to reality much faster. Perhaps members opposite need to think about that. That would help to get rid of some of the A-doubles on Grand Junction Road, because the member for Hart's proposal makes a lot of sense.

We also need to bear in mind that high quality, low-cost road transport will help local firms compete nationally and internationally and will ensure a brighter future for local jobs and reduce traffic flows, bringing benefits for all South Australians. The construction of the double highway to Port Wakefield has meant that the use of A-doubles on that road does not affect other traffic in the way it would in a single lane situation. Those road trains travelling north to Port Augusta have been trialled for some time and there have been

very few hiccups. Their safety record has been very good, and that is heartening.

As members would appreciate, these trucks need to adhere to strict safety standards, and currently recognised maintenance management schemes include TruckSafe, the South Australian roadworthiness accreditation scheme, and the New South Wales heavy vehicle accreditation scheme. One should not think that A-doubles can simply be put on the road without proper accreditation. For those reasons, I believe that the amendments moved by the member for Schubert recognise the importance of the efficient movement of our rural and manufacturing produce in this State, and that A-double road trains need to operate on Grand Junction Road between South Road and Port Road.

Let us hope that the Labor Party changes its mind on the sale of ETSA so that the debt can be reduced by many billions of dollars and, therefore, the request that was put forward by the member for Hart can come closer to fruition to help solve the potential problem caused by road trains in that area.

**Ms KEY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### **ADELAIDE CROWS FOOTBALL CLUB**

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Venning:

That this House notes the fantastic victory of the Adelaide Crows Football Club in winning the 1997 Australian Football League and congratulates the Coach, Malcolm Blight, Captain Mark Bickley, the players and officials.

(Continued from 4 December. Page 80.)

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** I support this motion. All members should congratulate the Crows and Port Power on their success, not only in 1997 but also for 1998. I want to expand upon the motion and look at the issue of Football Park and the future of the game in this State. I recently contacted Football Park about the availability of season tickets and was informed that there was an 11 year wait to become a category 1 member and an eight year wait to become a category 2 member. On further investigation it became fairly apparent that the cost both of season tickets and of membership at Football Park were extraordinary, to say the least, and beyond the reach of the average working family on a regular basis.

The cost of a seat on any Saturday is approximately \$22. It is quite easy for a family to spend \$150, or more, when one takes into account buying food, etc. Even if you can get in to see a game, it is very expensive, and it is simply getting to the point where it is difficult for many people to attend. There are 38 000 Port Power season ticket holders and 23 500 Crows season ticket holders, totalling approximately 61 000. There is very strong demand to attend AFL games at Football Park. For example, it would not surprise me that at this weekend's game involving both the Crows and Port Power, were the seating capacity to be available, 100 000 South Australians would turn up to see the game. It would be an extraordinary number.

It should lead this House to consider what is happening at Football Park and what the future holds. The stadium accommodates 47 000 seats but, at a sell-out, it is quite normal for there to be present only 42 000 to 43 000 people. There is a 15 per cent rate of no-shows, even at a sell-out. Seat management is costing Football Park and the SANFL hundreds of thousands of dollars per year. In fact, if there are

4 000 to 5 000 vacant seats, even at a sell-out, at approximately \$23 dollars a seat it could be costing the SANFL and Football Park up to \$2.3 million a year in lost ticket sales as a result of not optimising the full seating capacity of Football Park.

Surely a sell-out should mean that every one of the 47 000 seats is paid for and occupied. Most games are sold out within three to five days, and even games involving Port Power, being the newest arrival in the AFL, are selling out quite quickly, particularly when a prominent AFL team is also involved. It is really a matter of demand and supply, and it raises concerns on my part and on the part of many of my constituents that the restriction and constraint on the number of seats may be pushing up the price of tickets. If more seats were available there may be scope for reducing ticket prices.

Perhaps the SANFL has no interest in expanding the seating capacity because if seats are selling out, anyway, the money is coming in and the prices are higher, whereas if more seats were available perhaps there would be downward pressure on prices and no gross increase in income. Are the football fans of South Australia paying for the limited number of seats available a price that is more than they should be paying? I raise that as an issue to be considered. Football these days is a big business. I understand that the AFL receives most of the proceeds from ticket sales and the television rights and that Football Park receives money from memberships and the supporting income from food and merchandising sales.

The SANFL is doing a good job in distributing much of this income to the sport, particularly to the junior league and to young people involved in the sport. For example, I understand that up to \$405 000 per year is passed on to each SANFL club from Football Park proceeds, and that is after deducting \$500 000 for operating costs to run the park. Football Park is quite a valuable asset; it cost around \$7 million to \$8 million to build, but its replacement value could be anything from \$65 million to \$70 million. The SANFL did a good job in spending \$20 million recently in upgrading the facilities at Football Park, and the State Government should be commended for providing \$3 million for the super screen, which now provides an excellent add-on value to the game.

I am informed that Football Park has tied to it a \$14 million debt which the SANFL hopes to reduce to approximately \$7 million within the next five years. In essence, things seem to be in reasonable financial shape, which raises the question: who should pay for additional seating capacity? An extra 5 000 seats is clearly needed. A number of games now—in fact, it is becoming more the norm—are sold out and 5 000 more seats would quickly be occupied and achieving revenue. The AFL is building a 54 000 capacity stadium at Docklands in Victoria, and the Western Australian Government has recently contributed \$30 million towards a major upgrade and increase in capacity at the Subiaco stadium.

Taxpayers are already paying a lot for their football through admission charges at the gates. Should the taxpayer again be asked to pay a further subsidy so that the extra 5 000 seats can be provided? I would argue that, if the game is able to fund the provision of those 5 000 seats, it would be a very good investment in the sport and a very good signal to the supporters of the sport who, after all, are paying their way to enable the sport to continue as the great institution that it is in this State. Not until every avenue has been explored for

self-funding of the additional 5 000 seats should the taxpayer be asked to tip in.

As I mentioned earlier, anything up to \$2.3 million is currently being lost in ticket sales as a consequence of not optimising seating capacity during sell-out games. If the cost of these 5 000 seats, which I am advised would be approximately \$10 million, is to be funded by the SANFL, then perhaps through better optimising the present seating capacity that money could be raised within five years or so, and the new work commenced.

It is a wonderful sport. The argument that the taxpayer-funded contribution of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium should be repeated at Football Park has some merit, except that Australian Rules is a much more commercially successful game in this country. Unfortunately, Australian Rules is highly unlikely ever to become an Olympic sport or a widely played international sport warranting the sort of investment that has been made at Hindmarsh in order to attract Olympic Games events. I put to the SANFL that there is an urgent need to look at providing another 5 000 seats at Football Park. Ordinary South Australians love their footy. They want to go and see the Crows and Port Power play at Football Park. South Australia needs to find a way to make that investment happen: first, by fully optimising the present seating capacity; and, secondly, by looking at avenues to rebuild Football Park so that the additional 5 000 seats can be created. We can do it better, and I think it behoves us to give it our best shot.

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** I also congratulate the Crows on their amazing achievement at the end of last year, and I hope that South Australia repeats this achievement—although I would prefer to see the Power doing it. I rise on this motion to follow the remarks of the member for Waite about the facilities available at Football Park. I wish to address two matters in particular. The first is that, as far as I am concerned, I would like to see more cover at Football Park—I get drowned on a regular basis. I believe that the facilities at Football Park are deserving of Olympic events. The facilities at Football Park are such that they could be used so that many more South Australians can enjoy Olympic soccer than can possibly be the case at Hindmarsh.

The amount of expenditure that would be required to bring Football Park up to the standard necessary for Olympic events appears to be far less than what is required at Hindmarsh. The difficulty—and one of the complaints of the Public Works Committee in relation to Hindmarsh—is that we have been presented with inadequate evidence—in fact, no evidence—about exploration of alternative venues for the playing of Olympic soccer. We have been presented with no evidence that tells us that we could not have Olympic soccer at Football Park.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Ms THOMPSON:** I have been there also. I saw Australia play Argentina at Football Park, and it was very warm—much warmer than at Hindmarsh. One of the advantages of Football Park that makes it more accessible for Olympic soccer than has been the case in the past is the new scoreboard, which enables us to have both the large feeling of crowd participation as well as the ability to see accurately just what is happening on the touch line through the provision of the scoreboard. The acoustic system needs upgrading and, in terms of a legacy from the Olympic events, improvement of the field surface at Football Park is needed. That, together with improvement of the acoustic system, will leave a legacy for football of all sorts in South Australia.



The other issue that I want to raise in relation to the scoreboard is the method of its funding. This really points to issues of funding for sporting facilities of all forms throughout the State. A lot of money is being thrown at Hindmarsh, with no strings attached. We have no idea of the amount of money that will have to follow in order to keep that facility in reasonable condition. Meanwhile, soccer in the suburbs is crying out for small amounts of money to bring their fields of play up to standard. Soccer in the suburbs does not necessarily want to see nearly \$20 million additional spent on soccer at Hindmarsh: they want soccer money to be spent on them.

In relation to the matter of the scoreboard, the arrangements for its funding (which I do not believe were very clear at the time of the election) are such that the Government has provided the scoreboard, as I understand it, in return for \$3 million worth of advertisements promoting State Government policy. The Government will have to do a lot of advertising promoting ETSA to convince most of the people I hear at the football that the ETSA sale is a good thing. I believe that we need to look more closely at whether or not buying a scoreboard in return for advertisements is a suitable method of Government funding. For me, it fits into the whole issue of the extent to which taxpayers' funds are being used to sell Government initiatives, with no balance of payments—there is no balance of money available to put an opposing point of view.

It is one thing using taxpayers' funds to inform people about the risks of drink driving and speeding; it is another thing to use taxpayers' funds to promote Government initiatives which are of a Party political nature. And it is particularly offensive when I have to watch that silly rubbish of Government promotion in the middle of an exciting Power game—I do manage to make sure that it does not distract me by looking the other way the whole time. However, it is an issue that we need to deal with in terms of the ethics that are involved in the use of Government money, both in the sporting arena and in terms of advertising in general.

In this motion, we originally started off by congratulating the Crows—and I wish to re-emphasise my delight in that wonderful performance in October last year. I do not anticipate that the Crows will repeat that performance too often, although I will be very happy if they do it this year, because it looks as though it is not yet the Power's time. However, I am sure that the Power will do it for six years in a row very soon. I would also like to see this Parliament think very clearly about the way in which we direct money towards the upgrading of sporting facilities and, in particular, I would like us to query why we are not maximising the opportunities for South Australians to enjoy Olympic soccer through the use of a venue that we already have, rather than focusing money on a venue where there is no indication whatsoever that it will ever be fully utilised.

The Hindmarsh stadium as it is has not yet been fully utilised by increasing the number of seats. We will have to spend a massive amount of money in order to do that. We have no evidence that soccer in South Australia will be promoted, and we have no evidence that we will get one international team of any standing playing at Hindmarsh. International teams of any standing want to play where they can get the most spectators, and I am confident that Soccer Australia will want international teams to play where it can get the most returns. That means that, if an international team comes to South Australia, the chances are very high that it will use Football Park.

We are competing for international matches against the MCG, with its 110 000 seating capacity; the Docklands, with 52 000; the Gabba and the facilities in Queensland of 40 000; and the Sydney football stadium, with 52 000. How can we compete for limited international soccer matches in this country with a stadium with a seating capacity of only 15 000? We cannot. The only way in which we will have international soccer in South Australia is by upgrading Football Park, spending money wisely and judiciously, and using the rest of the money available on soccer in the suburbs—and I would welcome much of it in the south, thank you very much—so that we can use the limited money available for sporting facilities in a wise way, instead of just deciding, 'This is a good idea so this is what I will do, and maybe there will be some votes in it.' We have to look at that whole issue of how we spend our money on sporting facilities, what strings should be attached and whether payment for Government advertising is an appropriate way of making a grant to a sporting code.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the next speaker, I draw members' attention back to the text of the motion that is being debated and remind members that they will have another opportunity, in the noting of the seventieth report of the Public Works Committee, if they wish to explore this area of expenditure at Hindmarsh stadium.

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I also wish to congratulate the Adelaide Crows for their fantastic victory last year.

**Mr Foley:** It was a year ago, and you are still celebrating.

**Mr SCALZI:** Yes, we are still celebrating, because it was a great success for South Australia. I am not as great a follower of football as I am of soccer, but I wish to make a small contribution because of the importance of that victory for South Australia. My son goes to see the Crows play regularly, including travelling to Victoria to do so. Although I might not follow the Crows, I know how important they are to my family and to South Australia. It was a fantastic victory. I understand the member for Waite's comments about the need to upgrade the stadium and provide more seating at Football Park. I congratulate the league on the \$20 million spent to do that already. However, I am also concerned about the comments of the member for Reynell. Here we are with a motion about football, but we get an indirect free kick about soccer.

**Mr FOLEY:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The member for Hartley is defying your ruling when you directed that, if members wanted to discuss the soccer issue, there is an appropriate motion later in the Notice Paper. I simply ask that members respect your ruling.

**The SPEAKER:** I have to uphold the point of order. It being private members' time, I gave some latitude to the member for Reynell. As I did a moment ago, I draw the attention of members to the motion before the Chair, which is to congratulate the Crows.

**Mr SCALZI:** I do not wish to comment at length about the report by the Public Works Committee, because that has been dealt with adequately, and members have had the opportunity to make their contribution. I am concerned that people continue to confuse the two codes of football, and that is a different matter from my comment on the Public Works Committee. I know that people like to play political football, but at least they should get the code right. I believe that the member for Reynell today, at every opportunity, had a go at Hindmarsh Stadium. I am not concerned about the Public

Works Committee report on Hindmarsh Stadium; I am concerned about the damage it is doing to soccer.

As I explained in my earlier comments, I do not follow football to the same extent as I follow soccer but, as a proud South Australian, I was overjoyed at the victory by the Crows, and all of us should be. In fact, if the member for Hart recalls—

**Mr Foley:** I wasn't overjoyed.

**Mr SCALZI:** No. If he recalls when Port Adelaide was admitted to the national league, I stood up and congratulated Port Adelaide, because I am a proud South Australian. This is not about having a go at soccer. The member for Reynell says she has been to soccer matches. I was going to Hindmarsh Stadium long before they had any suitable grandstand. In fact—

**Mr FOLEY:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I am extremely concerned that the member continues to ignore your ruling. He is now talking about a matter not related to this motion. I ask that he return to the motion.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order. The member for Hartley has been very careful not to get involved in any matter which is in the motion to note the Public Works Committee report. A considerable amount of latitude has been given to both sides on this debate. I bring members back to the text of the debate which is a congratulatory message to the Crows. I think it would be better for the House if we stuck to the content of the motion.

**Mr SCALZI:** Mr Speaker, an indirect free kick is one thing, but wanting a penalty really takes the cake! I have been to football matches at Football Park and Norwood, just as I have been to soccer matches at Hindmarsh Stadium. Soccer is a very important game for South Australians. We forget that Adelaide City is the champion soccer team in Australia. We should be proud of that. I went to Football Park to watch a soccer match when Juventus came here after the 1982 World Cup, and—

**Mr FOLEY:** Again I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, as to relevance. We are debating a motion congratulating the Crows. We are now hearing about Adelaide City and West Adelaide.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I do not believe there is a point of order. I suggest to the member for Hartley that he recognises the content of the motion.

**Mr SCALZI:** All I am trying to say is that Football Park is a great football stadium, and it should be supported as such, but there is a difference between Football Park and a soccer stadium, and they should not be confused. That is all I am saying.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr SCALZI:** The member for Reynell suggests that we should play soccer at Football Park. However, as a soccer supporter and a football supporter, I find the two incomprehensible. Maybe it is because of my height, but I cannot see soccer matches properly at Football Park.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr SCALZI:** I am saying: do not take every opportunity in this place to have a go at soccer because of one Public Works Committee report. It is true that soccer has to be supported in the suburbs. I agree with the member for Reynell that it has to be supported in the suburbs and has to be supported in my area as well, but that is a different issue. You need a stadium as a flagship, like you have for football. Football Park is a great stadium, and you need a great stadium for soccer as well. But that is a different issue.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mawson will take his seat.

**Mr SCALZI:** The member for Hart refers to irrelevance, but what does he do? He continually talks about things that are way off. I want better facilities for all sports, including football.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr SCALZI:** It is one thing to support the elite teams but the real message, if we support sport, is to increase the participation and contribution at all levels.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr SCALZI:** Going back to the motion, although it was a long time ago, it is something that we will remember for a very long time.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**Mr SCALZI:** How great it was last year to defeat the Victorians. I look forward to the days when Port Adelaide gets the premiership as well. I will stand here and congratulate them as well. I hope that the member for Hart will be able to appreciate it once he gets over his celebrations. I commend the honourable member for bringing this motion before the House. It has been a long time coming.

**Mr WRIGHT (Lee):** I will not talk about soccer or the Hindmarsh Stadium, but I will do justice to the motion of the member for Schubert. However, I would like to move an amendment to the motion. I move:

After the words 'and officials' add the words ', and acknowledges an outstanding season by Port Power in its inaugural year in the Australian Football League'.

The AFL is certainly big business. It has become very big business in South Australia and we as a State are all the better for the contribution made by the Crows in the past seven years—1998 being their eighth season—as part of the AFL. In addition, we are also all the better now that Port Power has become the second South Australian team in the AFL. I commend the member for Schubert for moving this motion. I am somewhat disappointed that it has taken so long to reach this stage and I hope in all sincerity, particularly in terms of the integrity of the motion, that we vote on it today and give it the due acknowledgment it deserves.

Undoubtedly, irrespective of football affiliations, we were very much excited and encouraged by the outstanding contribution made by the Crows last year. For them to strike gold in their seventh season in the AFL was certainly a fabulous achievement. All sporting followers—and, for that matter, non-sporting people—would have been genuinely excited about their winning the AFL premiership in their seventh season. It is an outstanding contribution for a new team to be able to do that in its embryonic stages, and we should not underestimate the benefits that a premiership brings not only in an economic sense but in a goodwill sense. Naturally, we wish both the Crows and Port Power every success for the remainder of this season and, hopefully, well may one of them do it again in season 1998.

Accordingly, the member for Schubert has struck the right words in drawing to the attention of the House the outstanding contribution of Malcolm Blight as the coach of the Crows. I say rather confidently that, if it had not been for Malcolm Blight coaching the Crows, we would not have won in season 1997. All South Australians and all Australian sporting followers would very much appreciate and be pleased to see him finally striking gold as a coach, consider-

ing his contribution as a player in the South Australian National Football League and the AFL and as a coach. He has coached three teams in the VFL/AFL. Certainly amongst football followers it is well-known that Malcolm Blight previously took Geelong to the Grand Final three times but was unsuccessful each time, and therefore for him to be finally successful as the winning coach is well deserved.

I extend my congratulations, first, to all the players who contributed to the outstanding performances throughout the season which climaxed in the Crows making the finals and ultimately taking out the premiership and, secondly, to all the other people involved at club level. Primarily we see the players on the field, but let us not forget the battlers who are involved at club level and who largely give their services on a voluntary basis, the trainers and the associated people who attend all the training sessions on a regular basis. The season pretty well takes up 12 months of the year, although I know there is a six week period during which all clubs must have a rest period. I offer my congratulations to all the people who are behind the scenes and who are very much involved in ensuring that the players hit the field on a regular basis, as well as to the administrators of the club. Obviously, this was a joint effort and it was a fantastic effort, and naturally all South Australians join the member for Schubert in congratulating the Crows on their outstanding performance.

I propose to amend the motion because we should also acknowledge the contribution of Port Power in its first season. One would imagine that the first season in the AFL would be the most demanding of all, and for Port Power to win 10½ games in its first season—and ably led by John Cahill—is an outstanding contribution. It shows a commitment not only to its supporters but also to all South Australians who follow or take an interest in the AFL. They missed out on making the final eight in their first season only by the slimmest of margins, which was a wonderful performance, and we should acknowledge that. I also wish them well as they progress towards the finals in season 1998.

We should also acknowledge the South Australian National Football League, because it is, in the main, the training ground for many of the players who reach this level. I know that both clubs also draw players from all other States around Australia but, unless the South Australian National Football League is healthy and strong and has a vibrant competition, we as a State will be much sadder for it. I acknowledge that, in a traditional sense, the South Australian National Football League has been able to continue to ensure that we have a healthy, vibrant, strong competition, despite the fact that many of our footballers have left the South Australian National Football League and have joined the Crows, Port Power or another AFL team. It augers well for the future of football in South Australia.

In addition, I acknowledge the vital role of Football Park. It is wonderful that a screen has now been erected and it is something for which football supporters have been waiting for a long time. Anything that we can do to improve the conditions of the stadium for the spectators is to be welcomed and is something that we certainly should support. Quite seriously, we must always be mindful that, whether it be football or whatever sport, the spectators help put on the show: if the spectators do not attend, we have a problem. We need to ensure, at least in Australia, that, when we recognise and give support to sport, irrespective of the sport—whether football, soccer, netball or whatever—we cater for the spectators by giving them top class facilities. It is those people who go through the gate every week and spend the

dollars who ensure that this sport, which a lot of people love so much, is healthy and strong. It is essential that we ensure the future of the grassroots of football.

In conclusion, the member for Schubert deserves recognition for moving this motion and I congratulate him for doing so. It warrants our support. I am sure that we will support this motion and the amendment.

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

**Mr CONDOUS (Colton):** I am absolutely amazed that we are sitting here four weeks before the commencement of the 1998 finals series discussing the winner of the 1997 series. It just goes to show how the system operates in this place when we are so far behind the times. Further, I am disappointed that the member for Reynell should raise the matter of soccer when it had absolutely nothing to do with the motion before us today. That is in poor taste when we are trying to acknowledge the first team from South Australia to bring an AFL flag to this State.

I want to make one little contribution today, having played a lot of football in my youth and having seen at least 1 000 matches of football at all levels, because I sit there every Friday night—I must admit that I am a football junkie and on the weekend probably watch at least four games on telly as well as going out to see a game—and I ask myself, 'How much more can Australian young men improve to play the game of Aussie rules football?' The speed and the skills that are being displayed today by 650 young Australian men who make up the 42 man squad for each of the 16 teams is just beyond belief.

I have watched all codes of football in the United States, in New Zealand and here, and there is no doubt that there is not a more exciting game of football played than our Australian Rules. My mate the member for Hartley has to listen to this: I get absolutely bored to death watching soccer. I see no excitement in going along for 19 minutes and seeing the ball going back and forward with no-one scoring anything. They all say, 'What a magnificent game', but no-one put in a goal at all. With Australian Rules football, you can be six goals in front with 10 minutes to go and still lose the game. The old saying that you have never won it till the fat lady sings is quite correct.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr CONDOUS:** The fat man sings as well; it is quite correct. But I want to pay tribute to the 650 young men who have had the ability to reach the highest pinnacle of Australian Rules football, the AFL squads, because I am absolutely amazed at the speed with which the game is played today, the accuracy of the handballing and foot passing, the accuracy of kicking for goals and the high marking that goes with it. I must congratulate Australian youth, because I believe that we will see a continual improvement in the game. I just cannot believe how they can improve any more, but I did say that five years ago, and now in 1998 I am watching the game being played at the best level I have ever seen. Let us acknowledge today this great game of ours, which is our own game here in Australia and which I think is the most exciting code of football played in the world today.

**Ms BREUER (Giles):** I support this motion, which would be surprising to most people who know me personally, because I am not known for my sporting achievements. In fact, every time I think about exercise I sit down until I get over it! But I want to talk about the passion the Crows

football team inspires in South Australians, as well as the passion inspired by other football teams. I am not a Crows supporter personally; I support Port Power. However, I am prepared to concede that the Crows inspire passion in their supporters.

I recently had the opportunity to attend the birthday party of an 80 year old Whyalla man called Don Winton, who has contributed greatly to the Whyalla community for something like 45 years. He established the Whyalla Players, of which I am proud to be part, and that is where my sporting ability lies—cavorting around stages. I have belly danced in front of 2 000 people.

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms BREUER:** Not long ago.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms BREUER:** Don Winton established the Whyalla Players 42 or 43 years ago, and it continues to be a vibrant part of our community. He was Editor of the *Whyalla News* for many years; he helped to establish the Middleback Theatre in Whyalla and a maritime museum in Whyalla, and he has been a member of numerous sporting communities in Whyalla over the years. He has taken part in hundreds of tribunals dealing with basketball, football and the racing industry, and he is a life member of a number of those organisations. He has also travelled widely throughout the world, has been involved in a wide range of activities and has made outstanding contributions to the arts, the business community and the sporting community in Whyalla. We love him dearly and are very proud of him.

But the reason I refer to him when talking about the Crows is that this great man expressed before his birthday that his one ambition in life was to go to a Crows match before he died. I thought that this was quite amazing, given his background. Why would anyone want to go and sit in the cold at a football match, listen to people scream and watch a few fellows kick a ball around a field? However, it was his ambition in life to attend a Crows match. I was lucky to be able to obtain some passes for him, and he will attend the Crows match on 22 August, which he is very happy and proud to do. While I personally cannot understand what all this hype is about football or any other sport, I believe that it does play a major part in our State and in our country, and I congratulate the Crows and all those others who inspire passion in people in South Australia.

**Mrs MAYWALD (Chaffey):** My contribution will be very brief. I support the motion and commend the member for Schubert for moving it. However, I am a little miffed that we are debating this motion nine months after the event and only four weeks before the next finals series begins. The moment is past, and congratulations should be given at the appropriate time, which I believe was nine months ago. I am sure that we all did that individually, but I commend the member for Schubert for putting on the record that the Parliament also commends the Crows.

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** I thank all members for their participation in and support for this motion. I also support and accept the amendment moved by the member for Lee. I did not include that part because, when I moved the original motion, it was with the euphoria of a Grand Final, and I did not believe that Port Power needed to be mentioned at the time. However, I also need to declare my interest in being a Port Power supporter; I have been one for a long time. But I believe that the moment belonged to the Crows, and I am

the first one to say that I am a proud South Australian and, when Port Power is out of the running, I am quite happy to swing my allegiance from Port Power to the Crows.

I wonder whether the member for Hart can reciprocate: he shakes his head. I have difficulty accepting that, because I will back a South Australian team in front of any Victorian team, any Western Australian team or any other, come to that and, if the Power is not there, I am with the Crows. In the finals series last year I was as excited as any Crows supporter with the successes they had to get to the Grand Final and to win. I wore a Crows tie for six weeks. It was hard to take, but I was very proud. I have it in the cupboard and, come the finals series, I have no doubt I will wear it again. But the derby is on Sunday and I will be supporting Port Power.

I am very pleased that the competition has inspired such interest, particularly with the introduction of Port Power last year. Certainly, it had a very successful season, and I congratulate the member for Lee for moving the amendment, which I accept. But I am a proud South Australian and proud of our footballers. Irrespective of which team reaches the finals, I will support it and will not let my dogged loyalty to Port Power cloud my vision.

I was disappointed that soccer seemed to creep into the debate. I was disappointed that the member for Reynell introduced the subject of soccer. I have told some of my colleagues what a good speaker the member for Reynell is and to look out for her in future because she has very good delivery and usually speaks a lot of commonsense, but I must say that in this instance I am afraid she ruined her speech by its content. Members must speak on the relevant subject, and I thought that the member for Reynell brought in a red herring that I knew would draw plenty of other speakers from this side, as it did, and it took the focus away from the intent of the motion.

The member for Giles eclipsed the debate with her belly dancing routine. I am battling to upstage that and would like to ask the member for Giles: will she do her routine if Port Power wins on Sunday? I am sure it would be a notable experience. I look forward to the derby on Sunday. I know that it is a sell-out and that the member for Hart will be there pushing, as well as many other Port supporters in this place. I know that it will be a very good match. To some South Australians, the derby on Sunday is probably more important than the AFL Grand Final.

I note that the member for Peake has just walked into the House wearing his Port Power scarf—no show without punch! It is disappointing to see many people unable to get tickets when the Football Park venue is full. As to the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium and the money we are spending there, I put on the record once and for all that I am not in favour of that additional expenditure, and I leave it at that. I look forward to the derby on Sunday.

I am sorry that this motion has taken so long to get here. That is a problem with this House. These things seem to hang on the Notice Paper. When I moved this motion the State was euphoric with this victory. It was a great thing for the State, and the team did South Australia proud. As to the forthcoming Port Power and Crows match this weekend, may the best team win and, as long as South Australia is up there, I will support them.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

## REPUBLIC

The Legislative Council informed the House of Assembly that it had passed the following resolution to which it desired the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

1. That Australia should become a Republic with an Australian citizen as Head of State;
2. That following a national referendum to be held in 1999, and if passed by the required majority, this Council is of the opinion that South Australia should also adopt republican structures and that the South Australian Government should initiate a process to decide what changes would need to be made in South Australia; and
3. That the concurrence of the House of Assembly to this motion be requested.

## PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT (APPOINTMENT OF AUDITOR-GENERAL AND REPORTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

## VALUATION OF LAND (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference, to be held in the Plaza Room at 3.30 p.m. today.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services):** I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council agreeing to the time and place appointed by it.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I move:

That the sittings of the House be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the Bill.

Motion carried.

## WATERFRONT REFORM

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Clarke:

That this 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,

which Mr Meier had moved to amend by leaving out all words after 'House' and inserting in lieu thereof:

(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.

(Continued from 23 July. Page 1559.)

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** I speak in opposition to this motion today. I will deal with paragraph (a) of the original

motion first, relating to the Australian Defence Forces and past serving members. Why indeed cannot they do this? They are past members of the Australian Defence Forces.

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr VENNING:** I have not said whether or not I am in favour of it. These are past members of the forces and have every right to do this.

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Peake will come to order.

**Mr VENNING:** It has been and still is a free country. It has not been proven that the Federal Government has supported it. It may have known about it, but we do not know that it supported it. Mr Reith never said that he supported the training of these men in Dubai. It is a free country: what is wrong with it? People can do as they wish, so long as they have broken no Australian law. It may not be seen as politically acceptable to many sectors of the community, but the people concerned broke no law. This is what makes Australia the country it is—not a socialist country that members opposite would like to see.

Referring to paragraph (b) of the motion relating to the so-called conspiracy between Patricks and the Farmers Federation, I declare my interest as a member of the Farmers Federation. I was proud of its involvement in this dispute. It is not proven that the Government supported this action, either. As a member of the Farmers Federation I support that organisation's involvement, as the whole mess on the waterfront had to be addressed, and every member opposite knows that. The situation that existed could not be tolerated any further as it was crippling the nation, putting us at a distinct disadvantage to other competitive nations, which have their waterfronts in order. We were coming way down the list in relation to waterfront efficiency.

I have been personally involved in the inefficiencies on the wharves as I have imported machinery over the years from overseas. Because I did not conform to so-called demands of various people on the waterfront I have had machinery vandalised. In one instance several years ago I bought a specialist machine on the east coast of America, and through the efficiency of the United States wharves it was here before I realised, arriving in Australia within seven weeks of the day I ordered it, which is an extremely good record.

Because it arrived before I realised, it was on the Australian wharf and the so-called 'payola' had not been paid to certain people, so the machine was damaged. In fact, a fork lift was stuck right through it and the unloading auger was bent right off the machine. That angered me. It was not a deliberate attempt by me to upset anybody in particular: I would have paid it had I realised it was here, whilst not acknowledging that that is the correct thing to do. However, that is what happened, and I was angry, particularly as it occurred during harvest time. The machine had to be built up in a hurry, repaired from second-hand parts, and we got it operating.

The Patrick action was confrontationist, but what else could that organisation do? It tried every other avenue but to no avail. The union, with Mr Coombs and his cronies, blocked every reasonable proposition made by Patrick. This is a debate we could have all day, but that is what I feel, knowing that not everybody in this dispute was squeaky clean. It is not unusual that in any confrontation things are said and done that we regret, but it was necessary to have this confrontation to bring this ridiculous situation to a head.

What happened has in some ways justified the action. No wonder the Pauline Hansons of the world get support from disillusioned people. The union lends itself to pushing people to the One Nation Party, which is another thing that politicians have not addressed over the years, and that has made people very cross.

The previous Federal Labor Government threw \$430 million at the waterfront problem, and the restructuring resulted in some redundancies. Those workers were re-hired and did not have to repay the redundancy. The previous Federal Labor Government spent \$430 million of taxpayers' money to resolve the problem to no effect at all. Previous Governments knew about the problem—we all did—which had been going on for years. We have to address it because our overseas competitors have addressed theirs. Benchmarks have been set and we have to be somewhere near them at least.

I represent a country region which depends greatly on exports. Indeed, Australia is a net exporting country, and we rely on the efficiency of the waterfront, particularly for delivering perishable foods, and we produce so much of that. We need to have the best waterfront work practices possible. If members opposite criticise the action that has been taken, I will accept that criticism, but they must come up with an alternative because we have to address it. I believe that we have to go further than the current situation. It is better but it is not good enough by any measure, and I am happy to hear what members opposite would do to improve efficiency on the waterfront.

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** I want to hear from the member for Peake and others. If they support the current situation, I want to hear that. If they do not agree with it, I want to hear what they are going to do about it. I oppose the motion.

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** As a representative of the port of Adelaide, it is appropriate that I make a contribution. I have within my electorate the most efficient, productive, world's best practice benchmark port in Australia, and that is the port of Adelaide, Outer Harbor and the Sea-Land terminal. The nonsense that went on at Webb Dock was a disgrace and a blight on this nation's industrial history. I ask members to think back to the statements made at the time. It is probably appropriate that we are debating this today because I understand that Peter Reith foreshadowed this morning an announcement that the issue has been settled.

There will be fewer workers in Patrick's stevedoring operation than there were at the beginning of the dispute. However, the Maritime Union of Australia will remain the main waterfront union. I read on the front page of the *Financial Review* only two days ago, I think it was Monday or Tuesday and I wish I had the copy here, that shippers, that is, the people who use the port facilities in this nation, are not expecting shipping costs to drop, and that is because the savings made by Patrick and Corrigan are going exactly where the union said they would, namely, into their hip pocket, that is, into the profitability of the company. That is not the Labor Party or John Coombs saying that: it is the shippers/users groups, the blighters who want to get shipping costs down, the people who want to be able to handle cargo at a lower cost. They cannot, because the greedy stevedores of this nation such as Patrick are pocketing the savings.

I am no industrial genius, others on my side are a lot better, but what do you think will happen in a couple of years time when they sit down for the next round of negotiations

with the union and say, 'We want to make some savings because we want a more efficient port'? What do you think the trade unions were saying when they saw where the last round of blood, sweat and tears went—straight into the pocket of Corrigan and his corporate high-flying friends?

The behaviour of Reith, Corrigan and Patrick stevedores has been well documented, but what has not received enough prominence was the disgraceful attitude of this pathetic Government—the pathetic Minister for Government Enterprises (the member for Adelaide) and the pathetic Transport Minister (Ms Laidlaw in the other House), as well as the pathetic reaction of this Premier. They could not get in line quickly enough with Corrigan, Peter Reith and John Howard to cheer the activity at Webb Dock. In doing so they were openly critical and dismissive of the port of Adelaide and of the operations of Sea-Land. That operation cost the taxpayers of this State roughly \$8 million to remove the previous operators, P&O, because they were hopeless. The former Labor Government brought in Sea-Land with the full support of the Chamber of Commerce.

Container rates have nearly doubled in that port and, at the height of the Webb Dock dispute, they were pushing over 30 containers an hour. What did they get for that? What did they get for being the most efficient, productive and world's best practice benchmark port in Australia? They got a big load of criticism from this Government. I heard Minister Armitage and Minister Laidlaw on the radio and I saw them on television. They supported Webb Dock, they were critical of Captain Andy Andrews and the team down at Sea-Land, people whom I am proud to represent in this Parliament.

I have had a bit to do with Sea-Land over the years. I have watched the way that company has operated and I am proud to see it operating in Adelaide. That is not to say that it is the world's best employer, but it treats its workers with a degree of respect. Surprise, surprise! What happens when you treat your work force with respect? You get productivity. Sea-Land's productivity is going into lower shipping costs. It is not going back to America in the way of dividends to shareholders. It is being reinvested into the port of Adelaide to make it an even greater port.

What penalty did Sea-Land get with the full backing of Premier Olsen and Minister Armitage? They got a sleazy bloody deal to slug every container leaving Adelaide \$6 or \$7 a container to pay for the redundancies—for that sleazy deal—allowing Corrigan to have other people pay his redundancies. The port of Adelaide was penalised, having to pay \$6 or \$7 a container, so that Corrigan could offload his workers in other States through a sleazy deal. Yet the Premier of this State, the Transport Minister and the Minister responsible for the Ports Corporation applauded it. The State Government was happy to see an increased charge for the port of Adelaide, it was happy to see the cost of our exports go up, and it was happy to see the cost of container freight out of this State increase just so that their ideological friends in Canberra and at Webb Dock in Melbourne could feel good about themselves. That is a damn disgrace, and for this Government to roll over, stand aside and applaud what occurred is a disgrace.

Never again will a Transport Minister or a Premier of this State who wears the colours of the Liberal Party be able to stand in this place publicly or have the cheek to drive down Victoria Road to Sea-Land, because they have no moral right as a Government to hold Sea-Land up as an example. We will do that, the MUA will do that, the company will do that, but

this Government walked away from Sea-Land. Make no mistake about it, Captain Andy Andrews and Sea-Land know exactly where this Government stood when their viability was threatened. For a Government, which makes much about economic development and about making this a cost effective place to invest in and develop our exports, to have penalised and damaged Sea-Land's reputation in the way it did is a disgrace.

Minister Laidlaw and Minister Armitage should hang their head in shame. They have absolutely no right to preside over the port of Adelaide. One has only to ask the people at the Ports Corporation, the people who have battled day in and day out to improve that port, how they felt when Minister Armitage backed Webb Dock and the sleazy, grubby deals of Corrigan. What about the hypocrisy of Minister Armitage? Four weeks before the dispute at Webb Dock erupted, Minister Armitage gave permission for Rick Newlyn from the MUA to travel with Captain Andy Andrews of Sea-Land to Japan to promote the port of Adelaide as the gateway to Australia. Four weeks before the dispute it was being lauded as a brilliant port: four weeks later it was being kicked in the teeth and Sea-Land was being penalised.

It was a disgraceful, grubby episode and this Liberal Government deserted not only Sea-Land but also the workers of my electorate, the workers at the wharves of Port Adelaide, who have busted their gut to fight the ports of the eastern seaboard and make it the best port in Australia.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

### PORK PRODUCTS

A petition signed by 47 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to amend labelling laws as they relate to pork products to include the country of origin was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

### STATE HERITAGE

A petition signed by one resident of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to investigate the actions of the State Heritage Branch and alleged misrepresentation of a Federal report relating to the South Adelaide creche was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

### COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** South Australians recognise the vital role that the Country Fire Service plays in saving lives and property. There are 18 000 CFS volunteers who perform a magnificent job year in and year out. No-one should take their efforts for granted. This Government certainly does not, which is why we have taken action to free the CFS of a \$13 million debt—a debt which has been a burden on the volunteer service for too long. Members will recall the tragic events of the 1983 Ash Wednesday bushfire. In the aftermath,

the Coroner recommended an upgrading of its fire appliances and communications.

Regrettably, the previous Labor Government failed to provide adequate funding and instead plunged the CFS into debt. Between 1986 and 1993 the CFS borrowed some \$15 million to pay for fire appliances, communications, computing facilities and building construction. Interest repayments and principle reduction have been costing over \$2 million annually—money which would have been better spent on vehicles, equipment and protective clothing and on protecting South Australia and its assets. The debt still remains at around \$13 million and would continue to be a drain on the service for many years to come.

In the 1998-99 budget, the State Government announced that it would step in and free the CFS from the imposition of this debt. Under the present funding arrangements for the CFS, 50 per cent of the service's budget comes from the State Government and 50 per cent from a levy on business and personal property and insurance policies. Therefore to clear the \$13 million debt, \$6.5 million should come from the Government and \$6.5 million from the insurance industry. Under the CFS Act the insurance industry independently decides how to fund its budget requirements. The Insurance Council of Australia has now advised of the best way to reach this target, and its recommendations have been noted by the Government.

The Insurance Council has recommended to its members that a one-off premium surcharge of around \$6 per insurance policy be introduced. It will apply only to those policies which currently attract a fire services levy. The fee will cease on 30 June next year before the proposed emergency services levy is due to commence. In applying the surcharge it must be remembered that people living in the city benefit from the CFS. When city people are involved in road accidents or rescues which occur in country areas, it is often the CFS that rescues them. City people enjoy the Adelaide Hills and the parks around the State which are protected by CFS volunteers, and there are many occasions when the CFS is called to incidents in outer suburban areas of Adelaide. (One example is Sunday night's fire at the Port Stanvac Oil Refinery where a number of fire crews were from the CFS.)

The Country Fire Service needs our support—it deserves our support—and I am pleased that this modest funding measure will give it this support. All South Australians enjoy the benefits and reassurance of knowing the CFS is there in times of need. Freeing the debt burden, which has been slung around the neck of the CFS for so long, is a major boost for this service, and I am proud that this Government has had the foresight to do something about it.

## QUESTION TIME

### UNEMPLOYMENT

**Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** In light of today's rise in South Australia's official unemployment rate to 10.3 per cent compared with 8.3 per cent nationally, will the Minister for Employment reassure the House that the State will in fact meet the Premier's goal, as follows:

I want to see South Australia's employment/unemployment reach the national average by the turn of the century.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** Politics is a very unpredictable profession, but the one thing that is more predictable than

anything I have known over many years is the predicability of the Labor Party in knocking everything that this Government does. We have acknowledged that employment in South Australia is the top priority of this Government. The employment figures released today contain some disappointing aspects. However, members can bet their boots that this Labor Opposition would never acknowledge the positive aspects of these employment figures.

For the second consecutive month full-time employment has increased, this time by 5 000, which comes on the back of last month's figures which were up by 3 200. We know that there is still a way to go, but I would think that, at some stage in the future, this Opposition ought to try to find some positive and optimistic things to say about what this Government is doing. We have a \$100 million employment package. We are aiming to meet the Premier's goal. We believe that, with all the economic indicators that are currently showing in this State, it is about time you lot got real.

### ELECTRICITY, PRIVATISATION

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** Will the Premier inform the House of further consumer protections which will be put in place as a result of the sale of ETSA and Optima?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** We have already outlined in detail to the House the protection which we will put in place to consumers as a result of a privatised industry. These include the establishment of an electricity Ombudsman and an Industry Regulator. We will go one step further. Power customers will receive automatic reductions to their quarterly power bills any time their power supply fails to meet an industry code which gives guaranteed service levels. For the first time in South Australia, electricity users will have a customer service charter backed by strict industry codes.

When we announced the sale of ETSA and Optima, we also made an absolute commitment that customer service would not be compromised, and we are delivering on that commitment. If a power supplier is more than 15 minutes late for a service appointment at a customer's home or business, a telephone call of apology is to be made and \$20 will be automatically taken off the next account. For any new supply connection, for every day late to meet the agreed time, \$50 is automatically taken off the customer's next account to a maximum of \$250. The first person to report a broken street light is given a fix-by date. If the date is not kept, that person will have \$10 taken off their next quarterly account.

It is obvious that we are committed to ensuring that customer rights are protected and that service delivery is of the highest possible standard, and these measures ensure that that commitment is delivered.

### EXECUTIVE SALARIES

**Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** After today's rise in South Australia's unemployment rate to 10.3 per cent, will the Premier now announce a review of his Government's pay structure for executive bureaucrats so that more taxpayers' money can be used for job creation and economic development? Media reports today state that the six new electricity bosses will receive more than \$1 million a year in salaries, while the outgoing ETSA CEO will receive a pay-out of \$250 000. The SA Water CEO will receive \$230 000 this year. The spending on executive pays in SA Water has risen by almost \$1 million since 1995, with a rise in the number of SA Water executives on more than \$100 000

from seven to 12. The Auditor-General's Report for 1996 showed that there were 240 executive public servants on more than \$100 000 a year, excluding those in the Courts Authority and Government business enterprises.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The Deputy Leader overlooked the fact that after the last election the Government restructured the public sector. It put in place the Senior Management Council and reduced the number of CEOs to 10 to look after those restructured Government departments. And what the Deputy Leader did not indicate to the House is that there has been a saving of, I believe, over \$1 million per annum in that restructuring process: that is what is ignored.

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

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** And, as per the interjection from the Minister for Government Enterprises, it was only a few years ago that, in fact, the EWS was costing us \$40 million a year: we were putting in \$40 million a year. That has been turned around, and it is now contributing to the provision of essential services. Importantly—and specifically in reply to the Deputy Leader about job creation programs and the investment of taxpayers' dollars for job creation—we have just announced in the budget a package of \$100 million, the largest job creation employment package ever put together in this State. Its task is to tackle the unacceptably high levels of unemployment in South Australia and, importantly, it is targeting youth unemployment levels.

We are attempting to provide job skills training for young people through that program which, over the next two years, will create 2 400 jobs for young people, after a training period of a year. Over the past four years, the track record for programs that we have been running in this State, programs in consultation and cooperation with the Federal Government—and the former Minister for Youth and Employment put this in place here in South Australia—is a 70 per cent success rate for young people undertaking a year of training in Government enterprises. At the end of that year's training they either obtained a job in the public sector or in the private sector. We are grafting that success rate onto this new program.

In addition, to overcome the age profile within the public sector, which has been distorted because of our downsizing and the former Government's downsizing in the public sector—both Governments pursued that course, and we have had an imbalance in the age profile in the public sector—over the next three years we will employ 600 graduates (200 each year), our brightest young people, in the public sector, to be the managers of the future in the next decade and the next millennium. So, planning for the future for the public sector to create—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I will not talk about the day-to-day job losses when the Leader was Minister for Employment. Was it 34 or 68 a day? I forget what the figures were. However, every day a large number of people lost their jobs when the Leader was Minister for Employment in the last Administration. But that is not relevant: the public of South Australia are interested only in the future. I ask the Deputy Leader to at least give the Government credit for savings that it has put in place—savings that have been redirected to programs such as the \$100 million job generation creation program.

*The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:*

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



## ELECTRICITY, PRIVATISATION

**The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg):** Will the Premier comment on the Tasmanian Treasury's analysis of a report prepared by Professor John Quiggin for the ALP in Tasmania? The report is about the State's Hydro-electric Corporation. Will the Premier advise whether this has any implications for the arguments mounted by the Opposition in South Australia against the sale of electricity assets?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I thank the member for Bragg for the question, because it is very important. We have seen Professor John Quiggin brought into South Australia. This is where the relevance is to South Australia in this major policy debate that we are having at the moment. Professor Quiggin, of James Cook University, prepared material for the Labor Party in the current Tasmanian election campaign which claimed that Tasmania could be better off by \$40 million per year by keeping its electricity assets, the Hydro-electric Corporation, in State hands rather than selling it. His analysis has been a major part of the ALP's financial platform in that campaign in Tasmania.

According to the *Australian* this morning, the Tasmanian Treasury has found Professor Quiggin's analysis 'unrealistic'. The Treasury says that he used flawed assumptions—that is a surprise!—which 'grossly exaggerated' earnings predicted for the HEC. Professor Quiggin's so-called study conveniently ignored large amounts of the capital expenditure that the HEC will need to undertake in the next 10 years—so, it did not take into account any refurbishment, upgrades or maintenance. As a result, his estimates of earnings before interest and tax were wildly inaccurate. The report goes on to state that, rather than being \$40 million a year better off by retaining the HEC, the Tasmanian budget would, in fact, be \$20 million a year worse off. That is what the Treasury analysis has found: a \$60 million variation—from a \$40 million advantage to a \$20 million disadvantage. That amounts to the staggering difference, over 10 years, of \$688 million.

The question of Professor Quiggin's credibility on asset sales issues, especially involving electricity assets, ought to be of considerable interest to those in this State who oppose the sale of ETSA and Optima. Members will recall that he provided a very similar so-called analysis of electricity privatisation in South Australia—an analysis which was equally flawed but which has been drawn on extensively by both members opposite and the Democrats to justify their stance on the sale. It indulges in some very selective quoting of statistics about the experience with electricity privatisation elsewhere and avoids mentioning highly relevant and positive outcomes in Victoria and other places, and it is based on self-serving and highly suspect assumptions.

For example, Professor Quiggin assumed that ETSA's revenue and profit would remain at recent levels—that is what he said about us. We know that the Auditor-General, and countless others, have repeatedly made the point that, with the advent of the national electricity market, this simply will not be so. I have indicated to the House that 27 companies will join the national electricity market on 15 November (if the start up date is not shifted by NEMMCO again) and 17 per cent of the revenue can be shifted to any supplier—17 per cent of the revenue on 15 November can be shifted. If you take that revenue off the top, you then impact against the dividend flow, and if you impact against the dividend flow you take away the value of the asset.

Professor Quiggin also assumed that interest rates throughout the analysis period would remain around the current historically low levels. So, he is saying that, over the next 10 years, interest rates will remain at the levels of today. I do not know many people who are prepared to take that punt and that prediction in the future. He assumed that there would be no benefit obtained by moving the risk of capital expansion away from Government. So, Government has to borrow for capital expansion. There is a risk associated with that, but that is not factored into the data.

In short, Professor Quiggin's report in South Australia—as the Government pointed out at the time—was carefully intended to produce a result pre-defined from an ideological, anti-privatisation viewpoint and certainly not from an objective analysis. He was brought in from James Cook University to produce a result that suits the purpose. It was not objective—he produced a result to suit the purpose. It is interesting that the Labor Party around the country seems to have a close working relationship with Professor Quiggin.

It is no surprise to find that Professor Quiggin has produced this similarly ideologically driven misrepresentation of the situation in Tasmania. Nor is it a surprise, I might add, that he has turned up producing material for the ALP in an election campaign. This further example of Professor Quiggin's flawed analysis of asset sales issues and his undisguised political sympathies in putting them forward should be of great interest to those who have drawn on his South Australian work to argue against the electricity sales process here. The Leader, in particular, might do some reflecting, given his extensive quoting from Professor Quiggin in this House on 26 May. The point is that Professor Quiggin and his analysis are totally flawed.

## MOTOROLA

**Mr CONLON (Elder):** Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Mawson and the member for Waite!

**Mr CONLON:** Throw him out.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not need assistance from the member for Elder.

**Mr CONLON:** Did the Premier seek advice from the Auditor-General about the deal he made as then Industry Minister to designate Motorola the sole supplier of radio equipment for the whole of Government communication network following the Auditor-General's 1995 Annual Report which criticised the deal as illegally contravening the State Supply Act? The Auditor-General in his 1995 report is critical of the flouting of the State Supply Act in the Motorola deal. The Auditor states:

... a pre-emptive communication was made with a party external to Government without the procedures of the State Supply Act having been complied with before that communication was made.

The Auditor also said that this deal would 'ordinarily require an open tender process' and that 'ignorance of the law does not excuse an act that contravenes it'.

**Mr Foley:** Oh, Premier!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Well may the member for Hart try—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Oh, yes. There is one point I want to pick up. The member for Elder is pretty selective in how he frames his questions. I took the liberty of reviewing the framing of the question yesterday, and it is very interest-

ing because, in posing a question yesterday, the member for Elder attributed a quote to me that is not my quote.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Yes, you attributed a quote to me that is not my quote so, if you are going to raise questions in this House, do it straight; do not misinterpret; and do not reinvent history. That is what the member for Elder did yesterday. If you are going to quote from *Hansard*, do it accurately. Moving on in relation to the Auditor-General's Report—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I was asked a specific question: did I refer it to the Auditor-General, or something. I have no idea in 1994-95 whether I did or I did not, but I will go back and attempt to find out for the honourable member whether I did. I make the point that there was no agreement entered into with Motorola until, I think, 22 November 1996. That is clearly the point that the honourable member does not want to take on board.

### BASIC SKILLS TEST

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** Will the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training provide any further signs of community support for the success of this year's basic skills test?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** I am very pleased to say that clearly the community supports the basic skills test. There were some figures in the paper this morning, but I would like to report to the Parliament that the figures I am about to quote are those that are sent in by school principals from each primary school around the State. In fact, we are told that 95.3 per cent sat the test. Only 4.7 per cent of students were withdrawn from the test by their parents, and that report comes from more than 70 per cent of schools that had reported in by 12 o'clock today. So, 95.3 per cent means a massive 27 242 primary school year 3 and year 5 students.

Regarding those identified by the tests who have performed in the lower band, the \$2 million funded by the Government in the 1998-99 budget will be put in that direction. Only 4.7 per cent of the students were withdrawn from the basic skills test by parents, and those withdrawals are down from 18.5 per cent in 1995 to 4.7 per cent this year. The *Advertiser* this morning refers to "Test protests 'fizzle'". The massive 95.3 per cent supporting the test includes 3.3 per cent of students exempted by principals and 4.3 per cent absent on the day. Let us just look at the 4.3 per cent absent on the day. On an average school day, some 7 per cent of students are absent because of illness.

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

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** Exactly. As the member for Adelaide says, 3 per cent got out of their sick beds to do the test. It indicates even further the overwhelming community support for the basic skills test.

### MOTOROLA

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** My question is directed to the Premier.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** It is a very serious question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Members on my right will just settle down.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr FOLEY:** I can understand why the Premier—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member will ask his question or I will have leave taken away from him.

*The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:*

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

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

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

**Mr FOLEY:** Why did the Premier, as then Industry Minister, fail to provide details of his offer to Motorola to designate it the sole supplier of equipment for the whole of Government radio network contract to Parliament's Industries Development Committee, given that the Treasurer has now confirmed that the offer was part of Motorola's incentive package to establish its software centre in Adelaide? The assistance package developed by the Economic Development Authority to attract Motorola to Adelaide was provided to Parliament's Industries Development Committee for official parliamentary approval. This incentive package did not include the Premier's offer to Motorola—

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr FOLEY:**—for the Government's whole of Government—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr FOLEY:**—communications network deal.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I caution the member for deliberately trying to shout down the Chair.

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I seek your guidance. It is my understanding that the Industries Development Committee is not a committee of this Parliament. It is a committee of the Minister of the day.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** I understand that it is not a committee of the Parliament: it is a committee of the Minister. Its proceedings have always been treated by all sides of this House in the utmost confidence except, of course, for one glaring breach.

*Members interjecting:*

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The House will come to order! I do not uphold the point of order. I will give the member for Hart the opportunity to complete the question, albeit he was shouting against the Chair. If members like to keep up that practice, I will start naming them. There is a habit that has crept in here for members who delight in continuing their conversation after the Chair has called them to order. It is a tradition in this place that they be named, and the Chair will start doing that if that habit continues.

**Mr FOLEY:** I apologise, Sir. I did not deliberately mean to do that. The explanation was that the assistance package developed—

**Mr MEIER:** On a point of order, Sir, the explanation has already been given.

**The SPEAKER:** The Chair asked for the completion of the explanation. Because of the behaviour of the Chamber, the Chair was not even able to hear the explanation.

**Mr FOLEY:** Thank you, sir, for your protection. The assistance package developed by the Economic Development

Authority to attract Motorola to Adelaide was provided to Parliament's Industries Development Committee for official parliamentary approval. This package did not include the Premier's offer to Motorola of the whole of Government communications network deal: it was not there.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Once again, we have an Opposition that takes one component and ignores another—paints a picture on one section but does not include the other, which is the qualification, in this instance, subject to normal commercial requirements. As I have just told the House, no arrangements were put in place with Motorola until the end of 1996 and no contract has yet been entered into in relation to the Government radio network contract. I point out to the House that at the moment we have announced a preferred tenderer upon which we will now proceed with contract close. No contract has been signed with the GRNC and associated suppliers. The point is that we will now contract close, and that is what the Minister is now looking after.

### EMPLOYMENT

**Mr LEWIS (Hammond):** My question is directed to the Minister for Employment and it follows the questions asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. To what factors does the Minister attribute the rise in full-time jobs in South Australia in the context of the recently released employment figures?

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I confess to this House that on occasions, being an Employment Minister, one feels intense frustration, because there are so many good economic indicators around. The Premier has outlined them to this House on a number of occasions and I will take the liberty of outlining some of them now because, at some stage, some of those additional factors will have to start coming through into our economy. I remind the House of, and outline to the member for Hammond, the announcements over recent weeks of 800 jobs at Optus, 100 at CB Automatic, 400 additional jobs at Westpac and 200 jobs in the past couple of days at Schlumberger. Members should add those to the very significant economic indicators which are showing how well South Australia as a State is now going. For example, we have retail trade up above the national average, new car registrations up significantly, building approvals operating well and strong performance in exports.

In addition, we have the ANZ survey up 14 per cent over July last year, the DEETYA skilled vacancies up over the same time frame and yesterday's announcement of the Morgan and Banks index showing positive hiring intentions for nearly 20 per cent of South Australian firms. As I said, it is very frustrating that some of these figures are not coming through at a faster rate. However, the \$100 million employment package announced by the Premier in the budget earlier is starting to show some good signs with some of the employment packages that have been announced.

I remind the House that the Federal Labor colleague of some of our friends opposite has said recently that Labor's remedy for unemployment is more job programs, more training and more retraining. I outline to the House and remind members that that is exactly the formula that this Government is taking and I believe, as I said earlier, that the Opposition, in particular, ought to start joining with the Government in showing a bit of confidence and optimism for the future.

### MOTOROLA

**Mr CONLON (Elder):** My question is directed to the Premier. Given that Motorola's Astro Smartzone is the technology chosen for the Government's communications network and is only manufactured by Motorola, a company that conducts no manufacturing in Australia, has the State Government conducted an assessment of the impact of this technology on local radio suppliers? In a *Business Review Weekly* article by the Premier's special adviser, Alex Kennedy, in December 1996, the head of the Government's Information Services, Ray Dundon, is quoted as saying that Motorola's Smartzone technology is only manufactured by Motorola and is not compatible with other systems. Mr Dundon said that this committed the Government to using Motorola parts and equipment exclusively. The article states that two of the four companies that missed out on tendering for this contract were also prepared to manufacture in South Australia.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** If the member for Elder wanted to know about Astro Smartzone technology, all he had to do was ask for a briefing. Yesterday in this House I gave the member for Elder—or any other member of the Labor Party who wants it—an open invitation for a briefing. I even mentioned yesterday that the member for Elder, if he wanted to know something about Smartzone technology, could ask for a briefing and we would be happy to provide it. The writer, Alex Kennedy, must be an incredible font of all wisdom, because Astro Smartzone technology could only be tested in February of this year as Astro Smartzone technology is new technology. It has only just been introduced into the United States and it has given us a chance to test it. 'Astro' is a trademark name, as is 'Smartzone', and the Astro Smartzone system employs a sophisticated technique known as 'group based trunking', which allows agencies effectively to share the one network.

South Australian Government agencies will be able to benefit from features not functionally available previously until this new technology became available to the world. We believe that these features can be tailored individually for each agency to meet diverse communication requirements. Obviously, it is important to us to enable emergency services such as police, fire and ambulance to use the network and still receive the highest priority in times of crisis and, as digital technology is employed, the risk of communications and emergency service organisations being monitored by unauthorised personnel is also reduced significantly. This system offers further levels of security through encryption.

That becomes particularly important to Government, because, as I advised the House yesterday, ultimately the network will carry three types of communication medium—voice, data and paging—and, if data information is to be transmitted, it is absolutely essential that it can be transmitted in encrypted form. I would have thought that that is something the member for Elder would applaud.

By using Astro Smartzone, agencies we will be able to communicate in many ways. They will be able to operate any mix they desire of analog and digital radios, or indeed totally digital, and it will be up to each individual agency using the network to work with the successful tenderers to determine their needs. The other advantage of using Astro Smartzone technology is that agencies will not be forced to purchase technology that is too sophisticated for their requirements. Indeed, if some of the existing analog systems are suitable for their purposes, they will be able to use that in conjunction

with this new technology. If the member for Elder wants to know any more about that technology, I am happy to sit him down with people who will be able to answer every question that he has: all he needs to do is ask for the briefing and I will be happy to ensure that it is provided.

### PRIMARY INDUSTRIES RESEARCH

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** It would have to be pretty simple for you to understand. Will the Deputy Premier outline to the House what changes have been made in running research and development components of the primary industry and resources department? I understand that the Deputy Premier has announced a new board to set up directions for research and development in the primary industry sector.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** You could not ask a question unless you commented.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I thank the member for Stuart for the important question and I certainly know of his interests in research and changes in technology, and he well and truly—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I must say that the member for Stuart is an excellent farmer, a great adopter of new technologies and a very keen follower of the changes of technology as they come about.

The Government has implemented a new initiative to further increase the State's primary industries research and development capability and the focus. At present, the State Government invests \$9.3 million in R&D relevant to primary industries, and we use that to leverage external competitive funding of \$12.7 million to address the industry's information and technology needs and opportunities. I have announced the establishment of a new board to assist in maximising returns from the R&D investment we make. The major functions of that board will include advising on directions for primary industries R&D within the State; the oversight of research priority setting; assisting in commercialising outcomes and identifying opportunities for partnerships. Obviously, that can lead to the reinvestment of funds.

Also, the board will need to identify new sources of funding and expertise and to evaluate the programs we have had against the outcomes. The board will be known as the South Australian Primary Industries Research and Development Board, and will be headed initially by Mr Andrew Thomas, who has particular experience with sheep and wool, especially with the Michell company, and who is extremely well known and respected throughout rural South Australia. Other people on the board will come from the horticultural industry, the fishing industry, food production and research, and will include the Executive Director of SARDI and the Chief Executive of PIRSA.

The board has a wide range of experience and knowledge and, no doubt, will assist in making sure that State funds are invested in those areas of the production sector where we can get the greatest return. Having an independent board with mainly business and industry representation to oversee R&D will ensure that there is a business focus to the State's investment in R&D within primary industries and that outcomes are worth while to industry as well as to the whole community. This prioritisation process will build upon the

successes achieved to date, where the application of technology by primary producers has resulted in increased productivity. With that increased productivity comes increased returns and increases in employment in rural South Australia, a major goal of this Government.

### MOTOROLA

**Mr CONLON (Elder):** Was the Minister for Administrative Services and for Information Services aware when he supplied information to the Treasurer in July this year that the now Premier had offered Motorola a deal to become the designated supplier of radio equipment for the whole of Government network, conditional on Motorola's establishing its software centre in Adelaide? Was he aware that it conflicted directly with the now Premier's statement to this House in September 1994? Did you get him by accident or on purpose?

**The SPEAKER:** That is comment.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** Companies such as Motorola would have to be pretty disappointed on reading the sorts of rubbish being thrown around this Chamber by the member for Elder. I will be happy to come back to the House with some instances a bit later, but we have heard today a series of serious, deliberate misquotes by the member for Elder. We have heard him tell this Chamber that the Auditor-General noted in his 1995 report that Motorola had received some sort of deal contrary to the State Supply Act. The Auditor-General's Report does not say that at all, and I will be happy to bring back to this House the exact reference that the member for Elder has used and prove to the House that it does not mention Motorola.

The member for Elder in his previous question to me claimed that Alex Kennedy, in her article in the *Business Review Weekly*, had spoken about Astro Smartzone. The article to which the honourable member is referring, if it is the same as the one I have in my hand, is dated 2 December 1996, headed 'South Australia in a tender trap'. I have just read it again, and there is no mention at all of 'Astro Smartzone' in that article. If the honourable member reflects on my answer, I indicated that both the words 'Astro' and 'Smartzone' are trademark names. There is no mention of those two words together, nor is there any mention of the word 'Astro' in this paper, so let me put that on the record.

I do not think there is any reason for me to labour the point further: I look forward to coming back with the previous statements the honourable member has made and sharing with the House exactly where the member for Elder seems to have misled it.

### WATER MANAGEMENT

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop):** Will the Minister for Environment and Heritage place an immediate moratorium upon the issuing of further water licences in the South-East until the release of the draft report of Messrs Baxter and Cox, and will she give the House an undertaking that, subsequent to that release, any new licences will only be issued based on water allocation plans developed in conjunction with their report? Messrs Baxter and Cox have been employed as consultants by the Government to look into the issue of water allocations in the South-East. Last Friday I met with those two gentlemen and was given a briefing on their proposed draft report, expected to be released either this week or next. I understand that they will be making recommendations that

could have a significant effect upon the way in which water licence applications are assessed.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** I thank the honourable member for his question about such an important matter. Members of this House have come to realise just how important and complex the water issues in the South-East have become. The Minister has also come to realise just how important and how complex they are. That was one of the reasons why these world renowned water resource experts were sent to the South-East to give an independent assessment of all the complexities involved, particularly those related to water allocations. The member for MacKillop is quite right: Mr Baxter and Mr Cox have almost completed that report, and in the past week they have been giving briefings to me and to members of the Parliament who have been interested in this issue.

The resource material that will now come from their assessment will be handed both to me and to the water catchment board that now resides within the South-East catchment area. The aim of this assessment is to provide an analysis of all the complexities of the water issues in the South-East. That report will then be utilised by the water catchment board in its own assessments for putting together the water allocations for the South-East. The report is very much needed and, obviously, because of the reputation of these two gentlemen, it is expected to be well understood and well accepted by the people of the South-East. Unfortunately, I cannot say to the honourable member that I will place a moratorium at the moment, because the decisions on water allocations will be made by the catchment board during the next year.

However, understanding that the member for MacKillop has had a constant interest in the complexities of the issues in the South-East, I presume that he has a very specific reason for asking his question, perhaps related to a constituent or to several constituents in the area. If that is the case and if the member for MacKillop is prepared to provide me with the background to this question, I will be quite happy to take up that issue on his behalf to see whether there is a means of alleviating his concerns.

#### DENTAL PROGRAMS

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services. Following the scrapping of the \$10 million Commonwealth dental scheme that increased the number of people on waiting lists to 80 000 and the average waiting time to two years, will the Minister assure the House that State funding for dental programs is not being cut by \$1.2 million?

The Opposition has a document signed by the Director of Statewide Dental Services that says the Government has cut over \$1.2 million from the dental service budget this financial year. There are now 80 000 people on waiting lists for treatment such as fillings and 10 000 people waiting for dentures, and lists are increasing by up to 2 000 people a month. The Opposition has been advised that a cut of \$1.2 million will mean the further axing of 10 dentists and dental assistants and add 5 000 people to the lists in the next 12 months, increasing the total to 109 000 people waiting for treatment.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I assure the honourable member and the House that we have under way at present a review of the dental service with the objective of increasing the number of people being treated. I have indicated publicly

and in this House that the waiting times are unacceptable, particularly when the Federal Government cut the \$10 million dental scheme for the States.

*Ms Stevens interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I assure the honourable member that we have a fundamental review of the whole dental service under way at present, with the objective of ascertaining how we can substantially increase the number of people receiving treatment. We need to do that because, once the Federal Government cut out its \$10 million, we found that the waiting lists had blown out to the point where there are now about 90 000 people waiting an average of 24 months for dental treatment. I find that unacceptable and that is why I have asked for the review. When the review is completed and we have worked out exactly how we will achieve this increase in activity level, I will bring back a report to the House.

#### HOSPITALS FUNDING

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** Now that the Prime Minister has announced details of the Medicare funding agreement, will the Minister for Human Services indicate to this House what the changes in funding will do in terms of spending in hospitals in South Australia?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I am able to report to the House that the Federal Government has made a revised offer to the States for the Medicare agreement. It has increased the base funding under that offer for all the States across Australia—a total for the whole of Australia of \$200 million a year—which will be indexed into the base and will increase fairly substantially over the period; so it is an additional \$1 100 million over the five years of the agreement. It highlights that the fight the States undertook in getting additional funding for public hospitals throughout Australia has now been successful. I am sure that this Parliament would be pleased with the fact that we have now secured for South Australia an additional \$24.4 million this year. That is made up of \$17.4 million as additional base funding that will go into each year and be indexed for South Australia and, on top of that, another \$7 million to tackle waiting lists.

The increase in funding will go a significant way towards tackling the number of additional people who came through our public hospitals during the past year. We have had a substantial increase in that number, simply because of the drop out in private health insurance, which now amounts to an extra 87 000 people since the last Medicare agreement was signed and which has put enormous pressure on the public hospitals in this State. We all know that and, even though the State Government is now handling an additional 30 000 people through the public hospital system, and although as a State Government we put in an extra \$77 million into the hospital system last year, we are still finding that we cannot cope with the additional demand.

The additional money secured will go a fair way towards meeting the increased demand on our public hospital system. However, I warn the Parliament that it still falls short of what actually occurred during the past year. It is difficult at this stage to put an exact figure on how far short, but we could be at least 2.5 per cent short of the number of people who walked through the hospital doors during 1997-98. That means that our public hospital system will still be under enormous pressure, and we are trying more effectively to manage that.

We have taken Professor Brendan Kearney from the Royal Adelaide Hospital and put him in charge of all major public hospitals in South Australia because the Royal Adelaide Hospital has done it better than most in terms of managing demand and in the past year has even made a small profit. By taking the techniques used at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, we will be able to expand those techniques to other hospitals and, hopefully, produce the same sort of performance in those hospitals.

I again pay tribute to hospital staffs for the way they have been able to manage the additional unbudgeted demand that has come through the door, particularly in the past 12 months and especially in the past two or three months, following a unique situation that has arisen involving not only the fall out from private health insurance but also the normal winter ills and the flu virus, which has placed a huge demand on the public hospital system.

Under the proposal there is also potentially some benefit involving the gold card used by war veterans. About 4 000 to 5 000 South Australians who do not currently have a gold card will now have one and will have the choice either of using a public hospital, where we receive payment, or going to a private hospital, where they obviously reduce the demand on the public hospital system. I hope that the people concerned fully exercise the choice they have under the gold card. It is an enormous benefit that the Federal Government has handed out. I hope that people use that gold card in many cases to exercise their choice of hospitals. In particular I recommend the Daw Park Repatriation Hospital—an excellent hospital that has specialised in rehabilitation for veterans who fought to help protect the shores of Australia.

It was important that the States took up the fight for the additional funding. Even though it still falls short of what we would ideally like to receive, it is a significant step towards ensuring that we have more funds to provide in public hospitals the health care we so badly need.

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** Will the Minister for Human Services now provide the increased funds required to cover the shortfall that exists in hospital funding following the signing of the Commonwealth offer by the Premier? The day before yesterday in this House the Minister said that the offer that has subsequently been accepted by the Premier fell short of what is needed to operate our hospitals. Earlier this year he told the Senate inquiry that Commonwealth funding shortfalls has meant the rationing of funds, serious mistakes being made in our hospitals, patients being discharged early or not being admitted at all, a crisis in our emergency sections and third rate health care.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** It is a pity the honourable member did not bother to listen to what I just said. First, I indicated that, if we compare the additional funds with the former Medicare agreement, South Australia this year will receive about \$30.3 million more than it received last year under the Medicare agreement, which was the Medicare agreement signed by the Labor Government. The real problem with the funding up until now has been that the former Labor Government in South Australia did not lock in the condition that, as private health insurance dropped, we should pick up an additional payment from the Federal Government.

*Ms Stevens interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** I know it is embarrassing for the honourable member because it was her former Health Minister—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Elizabeth will contain herself.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** —in this Parliament who failed to sign an adequate clause to make sure we received compensation.

*Ms Stevens interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I caution the member for Elizabeth for continually interjecting after she has been called to order.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** As I pointed out, we are getting from the Federal Government \$30.3 million more this year than we did under last year's agreement, and it is a far better deal that we as a Liberal Government have negotiated than the former Labor Government negotiated with the Federal Labor Government in 1993.

In terms of the additional demand, I point out to the honourable member that, on top of the funding that I have already announced, we will receive money from the new National Development Fund. Under that fund, money will be used to try to keep people out of the public hospital system. Through Health Plus, Care 21, GP Home Link and the new National Development Fund we will try to modify demand within the hospital system. Ultimately the care given to someone in their own home is far more effective than care given in hospital, provided it is of a high medical standard. South Australia has the biggest Health Plus program in Australia, and we are hoping over the next 12 months to start to modify the use of hospital services and therefore reduce the demand on those services. There is one other factor. There is a responsibility on the Federal Government to come out with a far better package in terms of private health insurance.

*Ms Stevens interjecting:*

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** No. I highlight the fact that there is a demand on the Federal Government to come out with a far more effective private health insurance package because the ultimate answer to the pressure on the public hospital system is to have people on private health insurance using the private hospital system, which has a grossly under-utilised capacity. One of the most unfortunate things at present is the imbalance between the over use of the public hospital system and the under use of the private hospital system. We need to make sure that we increase the demand in the private hospital system. Therefore, I renew my call on the Federal Government to come out with an effective package to make sure that we modify the demand and increase the usage of private health insurance in Australia.

## EXPORT EDUCATION

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** Will the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training outline the achievements in export education?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** I would like to report to the House on the education export industry in this State and the excellent work that is being done in our TAFE sector and within our schools. In spite of the Asian economic downturn, our numbers of international students have increased very satisfactorily this year. In term 1, there was an increase of over 15 per cent in international students; in term 2, there was an increase of 9 per cent; and in term 3 there was an increase of 10 per cent. We are currently operating in difficult market conditions.

Vigorous promotion has occurred in China, Thailand and Sri Lanka. In China, for instance, TAFE SA has entered into a five year contract to train managers from the municipality

of Yantie in international trade and economic development. Another two partnerships, one with a hotel in Qingdao—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** I thank the member for Hart. That will deliver an advanced certificate in hospitality. Another partnership with a private school for the delivery of intensive English and a year 10 certificate course is currently being developed. Last week, I attended a function to greet 18 senior Government managers who are currently studying at the Regency Institute of TAFE. This initiative is focused on studies in trade, but discussions with those 18 people concerned future educational possibilities.

This year some 1 000 students will study in South Australia, which relates to an extra \$24 million being injected into the South Australian economy. The first meeting of the Interim Industry Education Council has taken place under the chairmanship of Mr Rick Allert, and that council comprises the three universities, the Adelaide City Council, the Department of Industry and Trade, the Department of Education, Training and Employment and the Office of Asian Business. It will provide a unique approach to the State's future marketing of education. The Government is focused and determined to make outcomes from this education council.

---

#### ABORIGINAL ASSISTANCE

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** I wish to correct statements that the member for Wright made yesterday during a grievance debate. The honourable member questioned the Government's commitment to assisting Aboriginal people within this State. She threw down challenges and she certainly questioned our ethics. It was negative, it misrepresented the Government's genuine attempts to support a group of Aboriginal artists, and it demeaned those Aboriginal people supporting them.

Contrary to the assertions of the member for Wright, this Government is doing a great deal to assist Aboriginal people, and I am glad that the honourable member raised the issue of the Salisbury Women's Art Group. Again contrary to the statements of the honourable member, the Government has assisted this group in many different ways. The House may recall that the group received training through our excellent TAFE system, an educational system which provides excellent entry level courses for Aboriginal people. At the start of this year, the Salisbury campus had 114 Aboriginal students in entry level courses, and by July that had increased to 194.

However, the Salisbury Women's Group decided on a new direction: the establishment of a commercially viable business. This group, like many other groups in the community, embarked on the difficult road from vocational education to applying skills they had learned within a business environment. In this task, they have been greatly supported by DOSAA's Aboriginal Economic Development Unit. In early April, the division assisted with the registration of a business name for the group, and I understand that the division paid that cost. The division also sourced a lawyer to assist the group gain legal advice on corporate structure. Through

DOSAA contacts and the decent nature of a congenial Aboriginal lawyer, the Salisbury Women's Art Group received this valuable advice for free.

Additionally, the group was assisted to find funding grants and make application with DOSAA's substantial assistance, with a large degree of success. Through DOSAA, this group has been provided with access to the Federal Government's New Enterprise Initiative Scheme (NEIS), and it is in the process of developing a business plan. Such a plan is essential to long-term success in small business.

The search for accommodation continues, and I have been informed that the group will be meeting with an officer of Salisbury council to that end. Salisbury council and DOSAA continue to work constructively together to be able to resolve this situation. As the member for Wright well knows (and I suspect knew before), the Division of State Aboriginal Affairs has given exceptional assistance to this group and will continue to encourage, support and provide a positive resource which the honourable member in her grievance debate yesterday totally failed to acknowledge. When she uses and ill-uses the forum of this Parliament to misinform the House—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is a point of order.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** —and the public of South Australia, that is a disgrace.

**Mr CLARKE:** The Minister has already finished, but my point of order is that the Minister was straying beyond Standing Order 107 with respect to ministerial statements, which may cover Government policy or public affairs. The Minister was straying into political abuse of a political opponent.

**The SPEAKER:** The point has now passed. The statement has been completed.

#### MOTOROLA

**Mr CONLON (Elder):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation as I claim to have been grievously misrepresented.

Leave granted.

**Mr CONLON:** During Question Time the Minister for Administrative Services suggested that I had misquoted Ray Dundon in an article by Alex Kennedy. I did not do that. I refer to my words, which the Minister will find in *Hansard*. I said:

The head of the Government's Information Services, Ray Dundon, is quoted as saying that Motorola's Smartzone technology is only manufactured by Motorola and is not compatible with other systems.

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

**Mr CONLON:** That is exactly what I said, and if the Minister looks at *Hansard* that is what he will find.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has been given leave.

**Mr CONLON:** I refer to page 28 of the *Business Review Weekly* dated 2 December 1996, as follows:

He also acknowledges the criticism that Motorola's Smartzone technology, which the SA Government will use, is a proprietary standard only manufactured by Motorola and not compatible with other systems.

I am prepared to accept the Minister's apology at any time.

### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

**Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I speak this afternoon about the salary structures of the Government's executive bureaucrats.

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms HURLEY:** Let me get on to this. It is particularly poignant that, on the same day we hear that South Australia's unemployment rate has risen to 10.3 per cent, we also see news of six highly-paid executives being appointed under the new electricity utility restructure. We have seen executive salaries escalate dramatically under this Government, and I just want to compare salaries in other jurisdictions. I refer to an article which appeared in the *Australian* of Friday 31 July 1998. The article, which emanates from Washington, focuses on the salary of Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve.

The article states that members of the Senate Banking Committee are poised to increase Dr Greenspan's pay by 11 per cent, so that the increase would have him paid \$US151 800 a year or \$AUS249 000 a year. If that Bill is passed, the Chairman of the United States Federal Reserve will be paid almost as much as the ETSA CEO in little old South Australia. The article points out, quite rightly, that, on any performance criteria, Alan Greenspan's stewardship of the US economy rates straight As and a bucketful of gold stars—an economy that boasts the lowest inflation and unemployment levels in at least a generation.

Members certainly cannot say the same of the current South Australian economy, yet we are paying our executives far more than the current Chairman of the US Federal Reserve. The article further states:

The Bill would elevate the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board to the top level of the Government's executive pay scale. . . Dr Greenspan is now at level two, reserved for deputy Cabinet secretaries, who receive \$US136 700 a year.

All US executives receive less than our outgoing ETSA CEO will be paid. Another article in the *Australian* of the same day refers to the proposed salary rises for Queensland's top bureaucrats. The incoming Labor Premier is proposing a 20 per cent pay rise for Queensland's top bureaucrats. The article states:

The pay increases under consideration would lift the base pay rate for departmental heads from between \$125 000 and \$155 000 to about \$190 000 a year.

Again, that is well below what our Public Service executives receive in South Australia. I understand from statistics that the immigration outflow from South Australia is mostly attributable to people going to Queensland. Obviously, the pay salaries are not keeping people in South Australia. South Australia's economy is in far worse shape than Queensland's economy, yet we are told by this Government that we need to keep up those sorts of executive salaries in order to attract top bureaucrats to this State. What we have seen elsewhere is that, under privatisation and corporatisation, it is the fat cats who do really well.

We have seen SA Water's charges increase 25 per cent, so the ordinary people of South Australia are paying these huge pay rises for our top bureaucrats. The Opposition

believes that that is totally unacceptable and calls on the Government to freeze the salaries of these highly paid executives until we see some real improvement in this State's economy. The Minister for Employment listed a set of figures which she purports show improvement in the State's economy, and indeed there may be some improvement off very low bases, but she should talk to those South Australians who are suffering from an economy still very much bumping on the bottom.

South Australia's unemployment rates are now neck and neck with Tasmania, and we have a Premier who said that we would reach the national standard by the turn of the century. That now looks extremely unlikely. Our unemployment rate is now 10.3 per cent, compared to the national standard of 8.3 per cent.

**Mr LEWIS (Hammond):** The last time I was able to address the House during a grievance debate I drew attention to the detrimental consequences of young people, or any others for that matter, using marijuana and amphetamines as part of the total spectrum of drugs that are abused in the course of so-called 'recreational use' in our society. Anyone, young people or others, who experiments with drugs is stupid. No-one, when they set out on the first occasion on which they use drugs, ever imagines that they will become an addict, or that they will become the victim of some disease that arises as a consequence of it.

But, nonetheless, that is where all addicts and all people who suffer those horrible deaths come from: the first step in experimentation. Again, let me state: that is stupid. Let me also state that the people who think that it is smart, sensible or compassionate to go soft on drugs and people who abuse them and, more particularly, those who peddle them, are not only dopey but also stupid and culpable to an even greater degree. The notes from which I spoke on this subject on the previous occasion, as are these notes, were prepared by my youngest stepdaughter, Cheryl Davidson, and I acknowledge the work which she did in that respect during the recent semester break.

I have pointed out that marijuana and amphetamines are two of those types of drugs. In respect of amphetamines, I omitted to mention that users may suddenly become violent for no apparent reason. I want to pass on now to that category called hallucinogens. They are drugs which change the way people perceive the world in which they live. They affect all the senses and cause hallucinations: seeing or hearing things that do not exist. They can distort a person's thinking, sense of time and emotions and produce feelings of unreality. The effects of LSD, or acid trips, begin within half an hour of taking the drug and are at their strongest in three to five hours, and they can last 12 hours or more.

The immediate effect is to see things in a distorted way or to see things which do not exist. The person usually knows that what they are seeing is not real; however, there is also a distortion of sounds, smells, touch and taste. There is an immediate intense sensory experience: brighter colours and sharper sounds that people think are happening. There is a mixing of the senses in that some people think that they can hear colours or that they can see sounds. They have a distorted sense of time. Minutes seem to pass as slowly as hours; they relive old events; they have a distorted sense of space; and they have a distorted body image—feeling as if they are floating or perhaps being pulled down by excessive G-forces. They find a distortion between the boundaries of self and surroundings. Often they do not see themselves as



separate but part of those surroundings. They are changed in their thoughts: they have intense thoughts that can border on excitement headaches, with enormous swings in emotion from intense happiness to deep brooding. It is a madness.

A number of physical effects also accompany that. They are mild to moderate in strength and include numbness; muscle weakness; twitching; dilated pupils; shaking; poor coordination; nausea; vomiting; increased heartbeat; increased blood pressure; increased body temperature and sweating, and sometimes alternating chills and shivering; and abnormally rapid deep breathing.

The long-term effects are very disturbing—more disturbing even than the immediate effects—because there is the continuing potential for a so-called flashback experience, which is a spontaneous and unpredictable recurrence of the drug experience. That can occur days, weeks or even years after the drug has been last taken. It usually lasts a minute or two but can last for some considerable time, and involves always some kind of visual hallucination—mostly seeing shapes and patterns that do not exist. Imagine driving down the road when you are suddenly hit by a flashback! They can be sparked off by the use of other drugs, by stress, by fatigue or by physical exercise. Regular users are more likely to experience them, but they do not stop when drug abuse stops.

There is some evidence that the heavy use of LSD can impair a user's memory and concentration. Indeed, in all probability, from the literature where this has been focused upon, there is no doubt about that fact. Using LSD may increase the risk of certain people developing severe mental disturbances, and most of the psychiatrists to whom I have spoken over the years say that is an almost certain consequence.

**Mr HILL (Kaurna):** I want to talk about the availability of transport services for people with disabilities in the southern suburbs and also generally in Adelaide. Recently I was contacted by a couple of constituents and their son, who is an electric wheelchair user. They came to see me to talk about their needs and their experiences regarding Access Cabs for transportation in the southern suburbs. They told me of their frustrations with Access Cabs. They find the cabs to be quite good for long journeys—for example, travelling to and from the airport, when there is clear planning and very good booking—but very unreliable for short local journeys, especially after 6 p.m. They cited a number of examples where Access Cabs has either not turned up at all or been very late.

On one occasion, the young man (who is 20 years old) was stranded late at night at Old Noarlunga and had to drive his wheelchair home in the dark across South Road and along Seaford Road to Seaford, a distance of some three or four kilometres. As members can understand, it is very disturbing that a young man in an electric wheelchair should travel over an unsealed footpath at that time of night, and his parents are very anxious about it. They have come to see me about their concerns on many occasions and have offered a number of suggestions to improve transport for people with disabilities in the southern suburbs.

I wrote to the Minister for Disability Services, the Hon. Robert Lawson, about their concerns and provided him with their suggestions. My letter to him was forwarded to the Minister for Transport, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw. It is unfortunate that it was provided to her rather than the Minister for Disability Services, because every time the Transport Department has had any dealings on this issue it

has just forwarded the matter back to the constituents involved. I would like to outline their suggestions and discuss briefly some of the responses from the Minister and request, through Parliament, that she reconsider these matters. I would also like to see the Minister for Disability Services become involved as an advocate for people with disabilities.

It may well be that generally in metropolitan Adelaide Access Cabs works well, but I believe that, on the fringes of the city, particularly in the southern suburbs, there are real problems. One suggestion made by my constituents was that access vouchers, which are provided to people who have the right to use Access Cabs, be used for other service providers. In the case of the young man to whom I refer, there is a hire car operator in Seaford (which is where this young man lives) who has a wheelchair access vehicle and who is just around the corner.

Unfortunately, the young man concerned is not allowed to take his voucher to someone who has an access cab and is prepared to drive him anywhere at short notice: instead, he has to call up Access Cabs and sometimes wait for hours. It seems to be a ridiculous bureaucratic obstruction to stop him from using these cabs. In the northern suburbs there is a private operator, Handi-bus, which accepts access vouchers—although it had the right to do that before Access Cabs came into play, so there is some issue about a grandfather clause. But it would seem to me that, in the case of this particular provider, it would not be unreasonable to allow this person to use access vouchers, because it would certainly help my constituent.

Secondly, my constituents have asked TransAdelaide on 10 occasions to publish a timetable for wheelchair accessible buses in the south. Sadly, the Minister in answer to that suggestion, told me that, of the 52 wheelchair accessible buses being used by the Department of Transport in Adelaide, only three are available through the Lonsdale depot. So, not only was there special treatment prior to the election because of the fact that they were marginal seats but we have now discovered that only very few of the vehicles used in the southern suburbs are accessible to wheelchair users. So, I ask the Minister to provide more vehicles and to provide timetables.

The other suggestion made by my constituents was that Access Cab vouchers be transferred and used in other States. Currently, only Victoria accepts Access Cab vehicle vouchers from South Australia. So, there is clearly an opportunity there for the Minister to become involved and expand the use of those services. In New South Wales, I understand, anyone with an access voucher is allowed a discount of 50 per cent on all journeys and not just a limited number of journeys each year. This would also help people with disabilities, so I ask the Minister to consider that. Finally, I ask the Minister for Disability Services to investigate this matter in a general way.

**Mrs MAYWALD (Chaffey):** I would like to talk about the volumetric wine tax that it is speculated may be proposed in the Federal Government's new tax package.

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mrs MAYWALD:** The National Party in South Australia is an independent body that is affiliated with the National Party federally but not with the Coalition—just to clarify the point.

I am a big supporter of politicians who are prepared to stand up and put their electorate first and foremost, whose commitment is to the people who have elected them first and to the Party second. However, over the past 15 years people

have become very dissatisfied with the two-Party politics that we are seeing at the moment. People are finding that they are not getting grassroots representation and they are very disenchanting with the current system.

In relation to the wine tax, we have seen an enormous amount of opposition to the speculated proposal. Our Premier has stood up and vehemently opposed it, and I support him 100 per cent in that opposition, as does anyone who is involved in or works within the wine industry. I believe that it would be disastrous if this tax was imposed rather than the *ad valorem* tax that is being proposed by the Australian wine industry.

That is why I am really surprised that a press release yesterday by the Premier's office challenged me to stand up and represent my constituents and reject comments by the National Party Leader in Western Australia. I find this a really bizarre statement coming from the Premier's office, given that the National Party Leader in Western Australia is a State Leader and has absolutely no voting powers within the Federal Government in relation to this issue. The Premier said:

I hope for the sake of her constituents that Mrs Maywald does not agree with her Party's Western Australian Leader.

I would like to clarify that. I do not. I support the position of my constituents and of the wine industry generally that there should not be a volumetric tax. The Premier continued:

It is incredible that Mrs Maywald's National Party apparently supports a regressive tax attacking a regional industry success story.

**Mr Conlon:** Who is the Federal Treasurer?

**Mrs MAYWALD:** It is very interesting: it is Mr Costello.

**Mr Conlon:** He's a Liberal.

**Mrs MAYWALD:** He is a Liberal; that is exactly right. Thank you for that. It is quite interesting, because Mr Olsen says that it is my National Party that apparently supports a regressive tax. The Liberal Party federally is part of that Coalition. Mr Costello happens to be a member of the Liberal Party and is one of the Premier's Liberal Party colleagues. What we need in this debate, and what we need to see from South Australia, is a united front against a regressive tax that would jeopardise one of our biggest growth industries in this State.

I quote from a recent article and comments made by Mr Bill Moularedellis, President of the Riverland Wine Makers Association:

It is a blatant attack on our export focused regional wine industry and, as such, the people in the Riverland and the Riverland Wine Makers Association would be forced to muster all possible support to ensure the Federal seat of Wakefield was marginalised over this issue.

Such is the passion and depth of feeling about this particular issue from my electorate. I also strongly oppose it.

The question I have to ask is: what are our Federal Liberal parliamentarians doing about it? What are John Olsen's Federal Liberal Party colleagues doing about it? I know that Neil Andrew has probably put in all the effort that he possibly can, but he is limited by the type of political Party politics in which he operates. Operating in that political Party environment limits the kind of opposition he can have to such a regressive tax and such a move backwards for the people he is supposed to represent. This is what the people of Australia are standing up against: they are saying that the representation is not good enough. That is why we are seeing a push towards an alternative that is prepared to stand up and speak for the people it represents. Whether or not they have the answers is irrelevant. It is a protest vote against the Party

political scene that ties the hands of people who are unable to represent those who have elected them.

I also find it quite interesting that the Premier says that the people in the Riverland know the importance of a campaign of unity. I would ask that he actually listen to his own words and perhaps heed them a little and say, 'We need that unity here in South Australia from all political Parties.'

**Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith):** I would like to read to the House a letter I sent this afternoon to Professor Alan Fels, Chairman of the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission. It reads:

Dear Professor Fels,

I refer you to my letter of 6 May 1998 concerning allegations of price collusion between medical practitioners in the Riverland of South Australia.

In my letter I requested your office to investigate the allegations and to advise me as to whether or not the medical centres concerned were in breach of the Trade Practices Act and, if so, what action, if any, you would undertake to ensure compliance with the law.

I received a letter of acknowledgment of receipt of my letter from your office dated 8 May 1998. Since that time I have spoken with the Enforcement Office of the ACCC on four occasions, they being 1 June, 11 June, 20 July and 5 August 1998. As at the most recent date I was advised that the Enforcement Branch had yet to receive any legal advice from your legal department with respect to the response that the commission received from the lawyers acting for the medical centres concerned.

I am concerned that this matter is now exactly three months old from the date that I first advised your office of my concerns. Whilst I appreciate that the ACCC has a number of matters in hand, I would have thought this issue, which is of fundamental importance, not just to the residents of the Riverland in South Australia but to all country people throughout Australia, would have warranted more speedy attention from your office.

It appears to me that you are very much involved in high profile matters such as tackling the Maritime Union of Australia with respect to allegations over possible breaches by them of the Trade Practices Act with respect to their recent industrial dispute with Patrick Stevedores.

This includes sparing no effort, time or money to investigate the allegations against the MUA which stands in stark contrast with the lack of progress of your handling of my allegations of medical price fixing in the Riverland. Perhaps you are reluctant to tackle Australia's strongest trade union, the Australian Medical Association?

The provision of affordable medical services to regional and rural Australians seems to be very low in your order of priorities. It didn't, for example, take your office three months to try and get legal advice as to whether or not the Maritime Union of Australia was breaching the Trade Practices Act. It would appear that you have a team of lawyers working overtime investigating that matter, whilst at the same time real issues of concern to hundreds of thousands of Australian citizens in regional and rural Australia are put on the slow burner by your office. Perhaps it is not as headline catching for you as tackling the Maritime Union of Australia and John Coombes, their Federal Secretary in particular.

In conclusion, I look forward to finally obtaining the ACCC's views on the matters that I have raised, as quickly as possible, and request that you apply the same diligence to this issue as you have with respect to the MUA.

With best wishes.

That letter was signed by me. The issue of the Riverland Medical Centre is important, because it does not just affect the Riverland itself: it applies across the board in a whole host of country centres. In the Riverland, at Berri and Renmark, there is a Riverland Medical Centre. It is a monopoly. The cost to see a doctor for a standard consultation in May this year was \$30.50. There is no bulk billing except in rare circumstances where you show that you are poverty stricken. If you are not prepared to pay cash up front when you take the service, there is a \$6.50 late fee because of the fact that you are waiting for the Medicare cheque to arrive about a month later. That is \$37 for a standard

consultation fee that we in Adelaide enjoy for \$21 bulk billed through a number of our medical clinics.

We are able to achieve that in Adelaide because there is competition amongst the medical fraternity. There is no such competition in the Riverland. I was in Mount Gambier only last week and I know that a number of constituents down there have raised this issue with the member for Gordon. There is virtually no competition in that city as well, and the cost of medical services is astronomical. It is about time the ACCC spent more time considering the issue of looking after people living in rural Australia where they are being ripped off by the medical fraternity throughout this country. The medical fraternity operating in country centres have a monopoly; they control it very tightly; and they refuse bulk billing facilities to all but the most impecunious members of our society.

Professor Fels is too busy running around the world, getting headlines in the press, beating up on the MUA, for example, trying to sue the pants off the international long-shoremen on the West Coast of America and worrying about Patrick Stevedores to get on with the job of trying to make sure that there is true competition amongst the medical fraternity in Australia, particularly in regional Australia.

**Mr CONDOUS (Colton):** I wish to refer to a valuable piece of land which I believe is not being fully utilised. I refer to that piece of land which currently has all the railway lines on it between the Adelaide Railway Station and the Keswick Railway Station. The other evening after dinner I had the pleasure of walking up to the corner of North Terrace and West Terrace, and on the way back I noted approximately 40 railway lines crossing an area that was just a barren waste.

What we should be looking at doing is putting four lines underground, removing the remaining railway lines completely, and developing a low to medium cost housing estate all the way from Morphett Street to the Keswick Railway Station. Here we are talking about urban consolidation, with the infrastructure costs of continuing the expansion to Willunga in the south and to Gawler in the north, but it seems ludicrous not to utilise this valuable land which on one side has the River Torrens and on the other has the parklands. I am not talking about high rise accommodation but just medium three level residential apartments that people can live in right in the heart of the city.

We should think of the advantages also in terms of the city itself, which would get the benefit from this development. I estimate that some 20 000 people could live along that strip of land which now carries railway tracks—

*Mr Clarke interjecting:*

**Mr CONDOUS:** The contamination aspect is something we would have to look at. When the sports field and the netball centre were developed, we had to determine the extent of contamination of the land. Members should bear in mind also that the servicing of trains was carried out around Mile End and Keswick whereas through this area the trains are only in transit, and I do not think the pollution would be anywhere near as high.

I do not know who owns the land, whether it is the Commonwealth or the State, but I suspect that it would probably be the Commonwealth. I believe that, by selling the land for housing, we would get enough money back to carry out the decontamination process. The wonderful thing about it would be that we could remove all those tracks and create a housing estate and thus allow thousands of people to live within walking distance of the city. It is good logic and it

makes commonsense. It would utilise an area of the parklands where there are not many people, as well as taking much more advantage of the Torrens. It would also stop the spread and the continual infrastructure costs of Government having to install sewerage, stormwater drainage, electricity, roads and all those things.

Having just dealt with the City of Adelaide Bill, both sides of politics recognise the necessity in future to try to attract as much activity as possible to the City of Adelaide to strengthen the city. Therefore, creating a housing estate for 20 000 people less than a kilometre from the city makes an enormous amount of commonsense. I believe that it should be a bipartisan approach. I believe that representatives from all sides of Government, including Independents, should be involved because it is a very important issue. The more we strengthen the City of Adelaide, the more the entire State benefits. As I have said previously, we are a city State. We need to have a city that looks as though it is flourishing and I believe that it is worth looking into this concept.

Therefore, I ask the Minister for Housing to form a committee made up of representatives of this Parliament to look at the development of all that strip of land, which currently is nothing more than steel railway lines and which is not being used by the community at all. I am sure the member for Peake, whose electorate borders the land in question, would rather see a decent housing estate than 40 railway lines, trains and pollution.

---

## POLICE BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had insisted on amendments Nos 2 to 25 and Nos 28 to 35 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I move:

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 2 to 25 and Nos 28 to 35.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs Conlon, Evans, Ingerson, Ms Rankine and Mr Williams.

## WHEAT MARKETING (GRAIN DEDUCTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 3 June. Page 1061.)

**Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** This Bill allows for the deduction of a levy, and this deduction is to go to two sources, the first being a research levy for the South Australian Grain Industry Trust Fund. This levy has been operating in a slightly different form since 1991. There is some need for an expansion of that funding base because of additional crops being brought on stream, and the Bill also expands the definition of crops to include the full range of cereal crops, oil seed crops and pulse crops. The Opposition supports continuing funding for research and improvement of these important grain and cereal industries and would support the restructuring of that levy.

The second facet of that levy is new, and it goes to support the activities of the South Australian Farmers Federation Grains Council. I understand that the requirement for this is the increased time that members, particularly the Chairman, of the council are spending on the business at hand. This is quite understandable in light of the increasing sophistication of the markets, the new regulation and the ongoing involvement of the grain markets. I understand that there is some concern that it is taking too much time away from working farmers without providing adequate compensation for their time and that this additional levy is to provide some compensation for those farmers who are on the Grains Council and who do spend a significant amount of time on that work.

We are aware that the South Australian Farmers Federation is a keen advocate of the levy and at the Grains Council 1998 annual conference Michael Thomas in his executive officer's report stated:

With so much time spent on (Grains) Council work, it is not hard to see that . . . committee members, who are practising farmers, suffer significant financial loss due to the time spent away from the farm. If the council is going to continue to attract people with skills and expertise to work voluntarily on behalf of the membership. . . it is essential that the Chairman and office bearers be reimbursed adequately.

Given those comments from the South Australian Farmers Federation and the obvious need for ongoing crop research so that South Australian farmers can keep in the vanguard of production in the grains area, the Opposition supports this Bill and the restructuring of the levy.

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** I support this Bill and, being a grain grower, declare my interest in this legislation. I have been paying the initial levy for seven years and have been happy to do so. I understand that this Bill provides for further deductions to be made from the sale of all grains now occurring in the State. These funds will be applied for the benefit of the grain industry in South Australia. Two deductions will be involved in this legislation: first, the existing research levy from the South Australian Grain Industry Trust Fund; and, secondly, a levy to support the activities of the Grains Council of the South Australian Farmers Federation as expounded by the Deputy Leader. The research levy has been in place for the past seven years. However, the Grains Council levy is new and is being established by this Bill.

In recent years, the market has demanded a more diverse range of crops with a more diverse range being grown, which has seen additional crops such as oil seeds, pulses and lentils. Now that the State is producing this wider variety of crops, a broader funding base is an essential measure to assist the industry. This Bill now expands the definition of a grain crop in relation to this Act, which now includes the full range of cereal crops, oil seed crops and pulses.

I note that the word 'lentil' does not appear there. I hope that the Minister can say whether it does include lentils, or whether they are classed as a pulse. I presume that they are, but the Minister may want to clarify that. This inclusion of the oil seed and pulse crops is a worthy one, because most farmers use these crops on their farm to achieve the correct crop rotation. One of the greatest single improvements to our productivity and, therefore, to our farm incomes and the State's productivity, has been the recognition and control of crop root diseases. We are very much indebted to the former Department of Agriculture, now PIRSA, and its agronomists, particularly (as I have said before and will say again) Mr Reg

French and the CSIRO's Mr Albert Rivera, who revealed the problem of root diseases and the devastating effect they were having on our production.

By correct rotation and doing the right thing by controlling unwanted grasses, we have seen crop production increase by an average of 50 per cent. The Minister would know, because he was selling me the chemical to keep the weeds out of the crops that were so improved. He did well and so did I!

**Mrs Geraghty:** Did you get a discount?

**Mr VENNING:** I got a very good discount, and he even gave me a Christmas bonus! I want to pay tribute to the agricultural bureaus and particularly to the Advisory Board of Agriculture, which initiated the Right Rotations program, once again funded by this grains levy. I was a member of the advisory board when it came in, and I note that Mr Geoff Arney, a member of the board, was the initial Chairman of Right Rotations. It has been a fantastic success, as the Minister is fully aware. Including a wide range of crops now spreads the levy over total farm produce, so that, as farmers grow all these crops, they all pay the levy. It is an equitable arrangement. Historically, the farmers who grew cereals were the ones who paid the levies. Now every grower pays regardless. It is quite fair.

However, this scheme is voluntary. If a seller does not want to participate, he can notify the Minister in writing, whereupon the money is refunded. I hope that does not happen very often, and I do not think it does currently, since most farmers would fulfil their obligation. But in all spheres of life there is always someone who does not wish to play the game and who will do his own thing. I hope that does not happen very often. This way, everyone pays the levy initially, and if they want it back they have to apply to get it back, so I hope that does not happen. I am pleased that the onus is this way and not the other way around.

Another initiative of this Bill is its consolidation of the authority for levy collections under a single Act and not two Acts, which will avoid duplication and any ambiguity. I support this and any further move by the House that does away with complicated red tape. It ensures that both levies apply and are collected for all grain crops. The new winner, of course, is the Grains Council of the South Australian Farmers Federation, which will now have a reliable funding base to better equip it to represent farmers. As the Deputy Leader said a while ago, practising farmers suffer significant financial losses serving their industry away from the farm. I am fully aware of that, because before I came here I was in the same boat.

If you leave the farm for two or three days at a time, you have to employ people to fill the gap; you cannot just leave. Conferences seemed always to be arranged on the best spraying day, the best reaping day or the best sowing day, so you had to employ someone to take your place. This way, these members will be to some degree compensated for that problem. My only concern is that the amount of the deduction for wheat of a season is decided by the Minister on the advice of a committee of three persons appointed by the Minister, after consultation with the grains section of the South Australian Farmers Federation. I spoke to the Minister about that a minute ago, and for the record—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** He did allay my fears somewhat, but I would like to hear his comment. Is this a case of Caesar taking advice from Caesar's appointees? I believe that only one should be there on a ministerial recommendation, one a Farmers Federation nominee, and one from the national body,

the Grains Research Development Corporation (GRDC) and/or the Agricultural Bureau, nominated via the Advisory Board of Agriculture. I fear that some years down the track—although it may never happen—we could have a hostile Minister belonging to a hostile Government—present company excepted, of course—using this levy to raise revenues not supported by the industry. I would appreciate a comment on that from the Minister. I know that it is not a serious problem, but I always look for the negative and there is usually one somewhere. With that observation, I support this Bill.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** On a point of order, Sir, regarding the member for Schubert's opening remarks declaring his interest as a grain grower, I draw attention to Standing Order 170, which reads:

No member to vote if personally interested. A member may not vote in any division on a question in which the member has direct pecuniary interest, and the vote of a member who has such an interest is disallowed.

**The SPEAKER:** There have been previous rulings on that Standing Order and, unless it can be seen as a direct asset as far as the honourable member is concerned, it does not apply.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier):** I thank members who have spoken on this Bill for their support, and thank those others who have asked questions for clarification over the past couple of weeks. I also thank other members for the immense interest they are actually showing in this Bill. There are two aspects to this Bill, one involving research and development (R&D), and the other involving funding for the South Australian Farmers Federation Grains Council. No doubt, as I pointed out during Question Time, the need for R&D is increasing, largely driven by the opportunities that improved R&D brings by way of greater returns for farmers. Since 1991, when the R&D component was put into the Wheat Marketing Act, there has been a rapid increase in crop tonnages other than wheat and barley, and that makes it very sensible to raise levies across a broader range of crops.

Nowadays we do not see farmers being just wheat or barley growers: they grow a broader range of crops, and it makes enormous agronomic and financial sense to rotate the crop sowing. That is now far better understood and has been adapted at a rate that brings much credit to the grain growers of South Australia. In relation to the Grains Council component, I think that South Australia has been very fortunate over a long period with the amount of leadership we have had in our grains industry. People like Ingles, Lush and Arney have made an enormous contribution to the State in the past, and it is important that we get the very best people to go onto the Grains Council. Certainly, the raising of a levy, which is basically to help share the burden for the significant work that those members do for the industry, is welcome. Across the industry it received overwhelming support when it was put to the AGM of the Grains Council. There is no doubt that the industry is quite happy to share that burden and support that levy. I thank members for their contributions and their support for the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2.

**Mr LEWIS:** When does the Minister believe that the Act might come into operation?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** The idea of putting it through now is to have it operating for the coming harvest.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

**Mr LEWIS:** Does this clause as I read it mean that it will be compulsory for all grain growers, when they sell their grain, to anticipate that the purchaser will deduct from the amount they have paid the seller an amount that is determined by prescription and that this will be a compulsory deduction which the purchaser must take off the price they pay to the seller after agreeing on that price and pay it to the fund and also to the South Australian Farmers Federation?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** To put it in simple terms rather than convoluted wording, both levies contained within the Bill are a compulsory collection but are voluntary in that the grower can ask for a refund. The collection is compulsory, but it is clearly spelt out within the main legislation that any grower who wishes to opt out from having to pay the levy, which will be collected, is able to ask for it back and it will be refunded to them.

**Mr LEWIS:** I am interested in that for two reasons: first, for the reason the Minister has just explained to the Committee, namely, that it is possible for the grower to then seek reimbursement of that amount from both organisations to which it was paid. Notwithstanding whatever philosophical grounds there may be for providing that, and whether we believe that it ought to be compulsory, it is clear to all that that is what we are doing. That is the first point, which is cleared up and accepted by me and the rest of the Committee, if anyone else has an interest in this.

I also refer to what I might have otherwise have said at the second reading stage, had I not otherwise been detained, namely, why do we not tax the grain growers just a little bit so that we can fix up the dog fence? That would solve the problem. At present we have a bloody iniquitous situation where, if you own 1 000 hectares, you have to pay this levy simply because you own land. Why do we charge landowners and not the grain growers? It would make a bit more sense. Dingoes eat as much grain as they eat dirt. It would make about as much sense.

If the South Australian Farmers Federation in its limited wit can come to the conclusion that it is a good idea to deal with the problem related to the research and development of the grain industry and the improvement of productivity in grain production in this State by having a levy of this kind, why in hell cannot the same organisation's members who have livestock do the same thing to protect their livestock from the ravages of dingoes, blowflies, lice and every other parasite and pestilence there may be? It strikes me that the organisation does not have the guts to do anything about it.

It seems that there is an unholy alliance between certain elements in that organisation to make it unfair to people, some of whom who are my constituents and some constituents now of the member for MacKillop. We have a dog problem of our own, as the House will have learnt from me over the past 18 years. Just because we need more land to make our farming enterprises viable, we have to pay this stupid ruddy tax on the land. It is not fair or reasonable because it has nothing to do with whether or not you own livestock. I do not think that it ought to have anything to do with whether or not you grow grain. It would be as rational to tax the landowners so that we could do research and development on grain as it is to tax landowners to do disease control on livestock. After all, dingoes are no different to lice—they are just bigger. The only difference between a dingo and a worm is that the dingo is on the outside: they still eat their guts out.

It is about time the Parliament and the South Australian Farmers Federation got their act together because this law as it stands—the one about which I have been grieving—separate from the structure of the law we propose in this Bill, does not make sense. It is worse than the iniquitous situation we hear from the member for Spence that occurs with the closure of Barton Road. It is more unjust in every respect—at least they have access to North Adelaide. But, if you own land in the Mallee and have a viable farm you will end up paying to control the dogs in the north of the State. It would be cheaper for the mallee farmers to put patrols along the Murray River and shoot the bloody dingoes as they swim across than to pay the levy.

It is a pity we cannot come up with a Bill identical to this one for the livestock industry to deal with Ovine Johnes Disease (OJD) as well as dingoes as they affect sheep, just as we are dealing with other diseases and pests of grain as well as the research and development on the breeding of grain through the levy provided here. At the same time, if we did it for that we could also collect the money SAFF needs for the meat and wool sections and so on. Whilst I commend the Minister for the elegance of this legislation in the way it addresses the problems of the grain industry, and I commend the members of the South Australian Farmers Federation for their sensible proposition to have the legislation drawn up in this form, it is high time we did something about the other iniquitous situation to which I have drawn attention.

**Mr ATKINSON:** On a point of order, Sir, I refer to an unseemly display that is occurring in the Committee at the bench of the member for Peake. Will you, Sir, rule whether displays of that kind are conducive to order in the Chamber?

*The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Minister points out that the display is made of South Australian wool, but it is recognised in the Committee that displays are not permissible. However, I would have thought that even the member for Spence would recognise that today some flexibility could be shown in this area.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I thank the member for Hammond for his contribution. Everyone knew this was an important Bill but they also thought it would be dull and boring. He added quite a bit. I congratulate the honourable member for his ability to draw relevance between the current Bill and the dog fence. He certainly made some good points, although they do not refer directly to what we are discussing in Committee. However, they are good points and in tune with my own discussions with the Farmers Federation about what to do with the problem he raised. I thank him for his comments.

**Mr VENNING:** When the member for Hammond was talking of worms he reminded me of a can of worms associated with this legislation. Is there any consideration of the grain grown and used on a farm in relation to these levies, particularly when some farmers use all their grain on their pig or poultry farms (and some would use a considerable amount of grain)? Some farmers value add on their own grain by milling it and selling it as flour. Do we pick up the levy on the flour? Grain is also used for seed. Has this problem been addressed? It has been raised over the years, and it is a can of worms, but what can the Minister say about that?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** The honourable member is correct in that it has been raised many times, and I refer him to some of the debates, which he has probably heard about. The Commonwealth Government's levies unit has been considered to be extremely heavy handed with respect to the type

of grain that he is talking about. Members will find that, while there might be an equity argument in what the honourable member said as to the amount of money collected on a per tonne basis, the cost of compliance would far outweigh what would be raised. While in principle he is probably correct, as a practical notion it falls over on financial grounds.

**Mr VENNING:** Are lentils covered under the current list of grains?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** The second reading explanation contains a list of grains, but that is not totally comprehensive. The Bill refers to grains as defined in the Commonwealth Act, which has a broader definition which picks up cereals, pulses and oil seeds.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### LIQUOR LICENSING (LICENCE FEES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 June. Page 1016.)

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** This is the third piece of legislation that has resulted from the High Court's decision in respect of liquor licence fees and excise duties. It has been the subject of vigorous debate in another place.

**Mr Atkinson:** Why is that?

**Mr FOLEY:** Because that is where it originated.

**Mr Atkinson:** Why was it vigorous?

**Mr FOLEY:** I do not know; you would have to ask. As we most often do, the Opposition demonstrated yet again a clear, distinct, constructive, agreeable approach to that legislation which saw it pass the Upper House, and I am happy to extend that approach in this Chamber. Where there is nothing of any great controversy, the Opposition is keen to support the Government and facilitate it. As tempting as it may be for me to lock horns with the member for Adelaide or, as my colleague the member for Spence called him, the Lord Chancellor, I do not intend to do so because the Bill does not require that sort of process. We are happy to help and we are happy to assist in making good law.

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** As I understand it, this Bill marks a sorry chapter in Australian constitutional history. It marks the handing over to the Commonwealth pursuant to section 90 of the Constitution the ability to levy franchise fees on liquor in the States. Section 90 of the Constitution prohibits the States levying excise, and I suppose there was good reason for that when the Australian colonies federated, because one did not want State excises used as an impediment to interstate trade. One wanted Australia to become a customs union as a minimum condition of Federation. The High Court interpreted section 90 of the Constitution liberally in favour of the States being able to levy franchise fees on a range of goods, including liquor, tobacco and petrol.

When during the Second World War the Commonwealth effectively removed the ability of States to levy income tax, and that was upheld in the post war uniform tax case, much of the States' revenue base was taken away by the Commonwealth. Now that has gone one step further with the removal of the ability of the States to levy franchise fees on liquor vendors. The interpretation of the High Court which has led to this may be neat and it may be good legal doctrine, but it is most unfortunate for the Federation because now the States

have such an attenuated revenue base that one can hardly say that they are independent of the Federal Government. As I understand it, more than half our funding comes from the Federal Government.

There is very little ability for one State to pursue a different fiscal policy from another, so this is a sad day for the Australian States. One can only hope that, should the Howard Liberal Government be re-elected later this year, its tax package will lead to some restoration of the States' revenue base, some fiscal equality as they say, and I hope also the abolition of that most iniquitous of State taxes, the State payroll tax.

**Mr LEWIS (Hammond):** Had I the opportunity to speak before the member for Spence, who preceded me, I would have said much the same things as he said. The removal of the capacity of the States to levy this tax by the decision of the High Court has struck a blow to the heart of the Federal system of government in this country, unless the Commonwealth Government from time to time, whether Labor, Liberal or anything else, recognises that it will need to provide the tax base for the States to continue to exist. That will not be solved by those people in the republican movement who believe that the solution is to abolish the States. That will simply place an even greater burden on the Commonwealth to raise the revenue necessary and allocate it to the administrations that those on the Left suppose would replace the States. We would be all the poorer for that any way.

What it leaves us with is this useless, redundant shell of liquor licensing, so that premises that sell liquor must be licensed. It is useless and it is redundant and it is about time it was abolished. It serves no relevance whatever to the State in terms of raising revenue, not that that would necessarily have been the case previously. I have long said that the system we ought to use in this State is the same as the system which has been used in the Australian Capital Territory, that is, if you want to sell liquor, it is a matter for you to decide as a retailer.

In the Australian Capital Territory, if there had been taxes on the sale of liquor, they had to accept the responsibility of collecting and providing those taxes if they are the re-sellers, just the same as the legislation we have just passed where grain is involved. I am not a wowsler but I do not see any merit whatever: given that liquor is so readily available, I do not see any reason whatever to retain a premise's licence from which liquor can be sold, and to that extent, I guess, I differ from the member for Spence.

**Mr Atkinson:** You certainly do, you low-down Liberal.

**Mr LEWIS:** You are dead right; I am. There is no point in retaining an expensive bureaucracy that sucks blood out of the revenue of the State and gives nothing in return. It does not prevent alcoholism in any one individual, yet that was the reason why it was first introduced—

**Mr Atkinson:** Don't say that in Dracula's presence.

**Mr LEWIS:** I will say this: it was the same people who won the vote for women who originally were the advocates of this kind of approach to the sale and availability of liquor. They saw the evil of it to people who were poor. But, notwithstanding that, evil or otherwise, it is a fact that, if you want to buy alcohol in this society of ours today in the State of South Australia, you can get it, and you can get it at any hour of the day or night.

There is absolutely no benefit whatever in retaining the system of licensing the outlets. They simply suck revenue out

of the State Treasury. The bureaucrats who must administer it do nothing for the improvement of the general health of the public, and that was the original ground on which licensing of liquor outlets was established. In any case—

*Mr Conlon interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Elder is out of his seat.

**Mr LEWIS:** What we therefore have is a whole lot of bureaucratic nonsense where the people involved in the enterprise must fill in a whole lot of forms so that they can send them back to a whole lot of clerks, who will enter the information they contain onto a computer, and that will keep records which will be absolutely useless. They will not make the rainfall any better in the mallee, they will not improve the fertility in the orange groves of the Riverland, and they will do nothing to ameliorate the numbers of people who suffer mental illness and must be dealt with in the health system: they will simply frustrate those honest business folk in the community who are selling liquor by imposing these burdens of responsibility upon them.

They will not add one iota of additional information to people who want to research the consumption of liquor—alcoholic beverage of any kind. They will add nothing to the knowledge base about that. It is totally and utterly redundant and, notwithstanding the fact that the Minister at the table, on behalf of the Government, sees some purpose in the legislation, when you boil it all down, when you analyse it completely, there is no purpose. It is self-serving; it certainly does not serve me or any of the people I represent.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** I do not often make a contribution in this House but we must listen to the member for Hart waxing on.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** That being the case, you want to be careful, because there is plenty of time this afternoon.

**Mr Conlon:** I am always pleased to hear you, Graham.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** That is good. I do not share most of the views of the member for Hammond in relation to the need for the liquor industry to make a fair contribution to the revenue of the State.

**An honourable member:** You support the member for Spence, though.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I certainly support the views of the member for Spence in relation to the constitutional arrangement which brought this about. I believe that it is quite outrageous that the powers of the State should in any way be restricted in the ability to effectively raise revenue. I have always believed that the narrow interpretation which the bureaucracy and the High Court in recent times have placed on some of these areas is an impediment to the welfare of the people of the State. I am strongly opposed to what has happened. I think Commonwealth Governments have really got to take a good look at themselves if they want the States to provide the services that they are set up to provide. They do it far better than any Commonwealth bureaucracy could ever manage.

They must have access to systems of revenue raising which are fair and reasonable, and I contend that it is fair and reasonable that the liquor industry, which is really a protected industry and which entails many social consequences, make an adequate contribution to the revenue of the State. I see nothing wrong with the State Government's being able to apply a franchise tax.

**Mr Foley:** Unfortunately, the High Court did not agree.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I know, but it is then up to the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, in my view, to legislate and give these powers back to the States.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** No, the Commonwealth could legislate to grant the power back to the States if it were so inclined. Unfortunately, as Sir Lyell McEwin once said to me, give members three weeks in Canberra and they all become centralists. Unfortunately, they seem to be affected by that rarefied air at 25 000 feet and therefore seem to lose touch with reality in these particular matters. I make it very clear that I am concerned about the erosion of the powers of the States. I really believe that the time has come when some commonsense must apply. If the States are to be required to provide adequate health, education and transport facilities, particularly over vast areas of the States that have small populations, we must have a fair system of revenue.

The liquor industry is not an essential industry and people who get involved in it are in a privileged position. They are licensed, they have a monopoly and, therefore, in my view, there is nothing wrong with the State's imposing a tax. There is nothing wrong with that at all, and it has always been a traditional form of revenue raising. I must say to the member for Hammond that it would be the height of irresponsibility not to have some controls on these people because you would then lower both health and general community standards quite considerably and I am not in favour of that at all.

**Mr Atkinson:** Not to mention residential amenity.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** That is right. My former colleague Mr Stephen Baker often used to tell me the difficulties he had with the Edinburgh Hotel and the local residents.

**Mr Atkinson:** A great watering hole; I have been there often.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** However, the conduct of some of the patrons is less than desirable for local residents.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** He was just the poor local member defending them. I will not take up any further time except to say that I have received a number of complaints over the past few months in relation to various changes that have been made to the licensing arrangements. I sincerely hope that those complaints and grievances which my constituents have brought to my attention have been dealt with in a productive and responsible manner, because small country clubs which provide entertainment and enjoyment for people in isolated parts of the State do not need the excessive heavy hand of bureaucracy to descend upon them in an unreasonable and unfair manner. I believe that all those who are within earshot understand what I am talking about. I have brought it to their attention on a number of occasions and I am very happy to continue to do so until a mutually agreeable decision is reached.

**Mr CONLON (Elder):** I support the Bill but not the comments of the member for Stuart. The Bill, as was pointed out, overcomes the difficulties created by the High Court case on, essentially, the application of what are excises. However, I do not have the same difficulty—although I appreciate the difficulties with financing—with the High Court decision. The simple truth is that the Constitution barred States from levying excise fees. For many years the High Court turned a blind eye and allowed what were essentially *ad valorem* taxes

to be applied to a range of goods, including cigarettes and alcohol. It turned a blind eye to those and ruled out others in what was a very unsatisfactory fashion and, after a period of time, decided to change its mind.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr CONLON:** It gets things right. It changed its mind when it said that Australia was not a vacant place when our forebears landed here, and I applaud the High Court for changing its mind, because it was wrong.

*The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:*

**Mr CONLON:** The member for Stuart does not, because he prefers not to see things that he does not want to see.

*The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr CONLON:** The member for Stuart chooses not to see what he does not want to see. He does that on the issue of *terra nullius*, and he also does it on this issue. The truth is that the reason why I do not like the idea of imposing taxes as was done in the past is that, if it were allowed, John Olsen would have a goods and services tax in this State on every item—on every good and every service. Thank goodness that the High Court has not allowed that. I would trust that taxing ability in the hands of a Labor Government but not this Government, which has an emergency services tax, which is a poll tax: it will not tell us how much it will raise and will not give any concessions. I could imagine giving you this power! So, I support this Bill but I certainly do not support the ill-informed comments of the member for Stuart.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises):** I thank members of the House for their erudite contributions regarding the history of Federation and the South Australian taxation system—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:**—I am sure you can—and philosophical treatises about centralised Government and Federal systems, and so on. I note in particular the member for Peake's loud interjection, 'Abolish the States.' Given that he is a member of the State Parliament, he must have either—

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:**—I beg your pardon—made a mistake or maybe he has been doing a bit of early afternoon research into the liquor licensing area. I noted also the contribution from the member for Elder. He talked about taxation in State Government hands. As a member of Cabinet who has sat around attempting to deal with the devastation of the State Bank debt, I can only tremble at the thought of what Messrs Bannon, Rann, Frank Blevins and Co. would have done to State taxation if they had had the power to tax accordingly—

**Mr ATKINSON:** I rise on a point of order, Sir. The Minister has referred to the Leader of the Opposition by his surname. I ask that you instruct him on the correct mode of referring to other members.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order. I think the Minister realises that we need to address members in this place by their position or by their electorate.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** If I mentioned the Leader of the Opposition, I apologise, because I meant to say Arnold. But I meant former Premiers Bannon and Arnold and former Treasurer Blevins *et al.* I was not going to mention that until the matter of a State-based goods and services tax was raised by the member for Elder. So, I thought I would raise it. I am



grateful for the contributions of members and I look forward to an expeditious passage—

**An honourable member:** Who is *et al*?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I look forward to an expeditious passage of this Bill through the Committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 10 passed.

Clause 11.

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

Page 2—

After line 26—Insert the following penalty provision:

Maximum penalty: \$5 000

Expiation fee: \$315.

Lines 27 to 33, and page 3, lines 1 to 13—Leave out section 109B and substitute new section as follows:

Returns

109B. (1) A licensee must, if so required by the Commissioner, lodge returns with the Commissioner containing information the Commissioner requires relating to transactions involving the sale or purchase of liquor or other matters specified by the Commissioner for the purposes of this Act.

(2) If returns are required under subsection (1), they must be lodged at the times, or periodic intervals, specified by the Commissioner.

(3) If a licensee—

(a) fails to lodge a return as required under this section;

or

(b) includes in such a return information that is false or misleading in a material particular, the licensee is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty: \$5 000

Expiation fee: \$315.

This amendment takes into consideration concerns expressed by the wholesale sector of the liquor industry about the need for licensees to provide annual returns, including litreage details, in addition to financial information. The Government has considered those industry submissions and has taken the view that it is not necessary to follow the previous proposal in relation to the provision of that information on an annual basis and that, instead, compliance checks could be undertaken by the office of the Liquor and Gaming Commissioner through strategic audits of licensees' records without the need for all wholesale licensees to provide returns each financial year.

To enable the Commissioner to request financial information to assist with these audits, or for any other investigation of a licensee's operation, a simplified reporting procedure has been proposed which will require a licensee to lodge a return only if required by the Commissioner containing such information and at such times or periodic intervals as the Commissioner specifies. As this provision is much less onerous on the industry and was developed as a result of industry consultation, it is considered appropriate that this amendment replace the original provision in the Bill.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** I am a very quick learner. That is why I will make a very good Treasurer. The Opposition supports the amendments. We support almost anything that is about streamlining Government.

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

**Mr FOLEY:** No, I believe it is always useful to reform processes where possible. However, I must say, particularly before the member for Stuart leaves, that today we have seen the bureaucracy, as it is called, that administers our regulations suffer a most brutal onslaught from Government members. I was somewhat taken aback by the dressing down

and the criticisms and, indeed, the spite in some of the comments from Government members about the staff of the Liquor Licensing Commission. We in the Opposition find that sort of contribution just appalling, and we do not believe that the bureaucracy, as such, should be subjected to such a haranguing and tirade from Government. I do not know what this Government has against the staff of the Liquor Licensing Commissioner, but they have the full support of the Labor Party, at least, and we hope that they continue to regulate and to observe the laws of this State in respect of this issue as well as they have in the past.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Let me say from the outset that I—

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** If the honourable member had any decency, he knows what he would do.

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I note that this amendment involves one of these dreadful expiation fees—of \$315. I do not expect the Minister—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** So did you on a number of occasions and probably, like the honourable member, have grave reservations about it. For the benefit of the honourable member, I have today made representations to Parliamentary Counsel to have private members' legislation drawn up—

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** I rise on a point of order, Sir. Is it customary for members to engage in conversation across the Chamber and ignore the Chair?

**The CHAIRMAN:** There is no point of order, but I suggest that all members, including the member for Peake, take that matter into account on future occasions.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The member for Stuart has the floor.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I share the concerns of the honourable member about these dreadful on-the-spot fines, which in my view are issued with gay abandon.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I note from this amendment that the offence can be expiated by paying a fee of \$315, which in my view is quite substantial. I do not like on-the-spot fines, and I will pursue that matter with great vigour over the next few months.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** The only comment I want to make is that, if any of those small country clubs scattered around South Australia which are providing a few amenities to their members are pinged with one of these \$315 fines, the matter will be raised in here with great vigour until something is done about it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Chair has some difficulty with the drafting of this amendment. I would suggest that we can get around that situation by moving clause 11, page 2, lines 27 to 33, and leave out subsections (1) and (2), which brings about the same result. My advice is that, if we do not do that, it is a matter of the amendment suggesting that words be omitted and then reinstated.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** Given how tolerable you usually are, I am more than prepared to accept the advice of the Chair.

**Mr ATKINSON:** On a point of order, Sir, a few short weeks ago I had a private member's Bill before this House

in which the t's were not crossed nor the i's dotted. My advice was that I was not permitted to move it until such time as I had it written down word perfect in the correct version. Now the Government is being allowed to move an amendment where the amendment is not circulated in the correct form. The Opposition simply will not cooperate with the amendment until such time as it is provided to us in writing in the correct form.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The first thing I would say is that it is not appropriate for the honourable member to be raising a point of order on an issue that has arisen previously.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! My advice is that this is a different issue.

**Mr Atkinson:** No, it is not; it's the same issue.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The change to the amendment suggested by the Chair brings about exactly the same result. There is no change in the purpose of the amendment. It brings about exactly the same result, and I have already indicated that the Chair believes that that is the appropriate way to go about it.

**Mr ATKINSON:** This is a case of the Chair's treating the Government and the Opposition in a different manner, and the Opposition will not tolerate the gross inconsistency in the way our Bills are treated with that of Government Bills. We will simply not support this amendment until it is before us in writing, as the Chair required of me a few short days ago with respect to a private member's Bill, the Evidence (Sexual Offences) Amendment Bill (No. 93).

The ruling of the Chair on the advice of the Clerk was very clear. We could not proceed with the Bill until it was before us in writing. I have been advised by Parliamentary Counsel that at one time it was allowed in this House for a Bill to proceed without the final form of the Bill being in printed form before all members, but I was assured by the Speaker and the Clerk that that was no longer so. I insist that Government Bills be treated in the same fashion as Opposition Bills.

The Opposition has no objection in substance to the Bill before us but, for the sake of form, to ensure that the Opposition is treated in exactly the same manner as the Government, and that like cases are treated alike in this House, we will not cooperate with this amendment and we will divide on it all the way.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I actually understand the point made by the member for Spence. However, I contend that Parliamentary Counsel has done exactly as the Government has asked, and as was expected in this exercise. Whilst I have discussed it with officers at the table, for argument's sake, new section 109B(2) states 'If returns are required under subsection (1)'. New section 109B of the Bill, where we have omitted some areas, states 'If returns are required under subsection (3)'. The bone of contention is that the amendment alleges to take out some words and then re-insert them. I am being informed by the table that that is an error of construction. However, I contend that what we are intending to insert is in fact different from what is in the Bill at the moment. It does exactly what we said we are going to do, that is, simplify matters for liquor licence holders, and I contend that it ought to be allowed to pass as it is—not from the concern of the member for Spence but from the officers at the table. I contend that what Parliamentary Counsel has done is correct.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Can I explain to the Committee again that the outcome of the changes that the Chair is suggesting will be exactly the same. As to the matter raised by the member for Spence regarding the previous situation, the honourable member may wish to take it up with both the Speaker and me—and I am sure the Speaker would be happy to discuss that situation—but the changes—

**Mr ATKINSON:** We will not be taking it up; we just will not forget it!

**The CHAIRMAN:** That is up to the member for Spence.

**Mr ATKINSON:** My question is: is the amendment in the form I have just been handed with handwriting on it what we are now inserting in the Bill?

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair is not inserting anything; it is suggesting that some words be left out. I think the copy that the member for Spence has is identical to the copy that the Chair has, and that is what the Chair is suggesting is the appropriate amendment to bring before the Committee at this time.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** Sir, the Government—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Minister will take his seat.

**Mr ATKINSON:** If that is circulated to all members present, then the Opposition will be happy to proceed but, until it is circulated, the forms I was instructed on with the earlier Bill are not being complied with.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The member for Spence will take his seat.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** Sir, as this is a Government amendment to the Bill which is now being changed, could I ask that I see a copy of what I am being asked to support?

**The CHAIRMAN:** The amendment will be circulated to all members.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Well, I could make a suggestion.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I contend that we are unable to do as this amendment has attempted to do because there would be consequential changes to proposed new section 109B to which we would not be agreeing as part of this amendment. I contend again, Sir, that the amendment drawn up by Parliamentary Counsel, whilst accepting it does exactly the same thing, actually is neater than what we are being asked to do. What I am saying is that, if we do as we are being asked to do—and I understand exactly what the principle is—we are leaving out proposed new subsections (1) and (2) of proposed new section 109B, but that then leaves a number of consequential clauses which we are not altering. Accordingly, I move the amendment as originally proposed by the Government because I think it is neater.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I point out to the Minister that there is nothing consequential in the amendment: it is only in the numbering and that has been done on previous occasions as a clerical result. So, there is no change. The advice that the Chair has received is that this is the appropriate way to deal with this amendment.

**Mr ATKINSON:** I indicate that the Opposition is prepared to support the Government's amendment in the form in which the Government moves it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Chair is not prepared to accept the amendment in the form in which it has been put forward. The Chair once again indicates that it believes that the whole Committee is wanting the end result that the changes will bring in regard to this amendment.

**Mr ATKINSON:** Sir, the Committee is the master of its own destiny. If the Government wants to move the amend-

ment in this way and you contend, Sir, that on a later occasion when it is interpreted it will not achieve what the Government wishes to achieve, then let that be on the Government's head. At the moment the Minister is moving an amendment before the Committee; the Opposition has indicated that it is willing to support it; let us get on with it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I point out to the Committee that this is not unprecedented. The matter has been dealt with on a number of previous occasions in the way the Chair is suggesting. Again, the Chair indicates that a previous ruling has indicated quite clearly that it is not appropriate for amendments to be put as has been suggested by the Minister. I would have thought that we were all looking for the same end result and that would be achieved appropriately by the suggestion that the Chair has put forward to the Committee.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

### POLICE BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to grant a conference as requested by the House of Assembly. The Legislative Council named the hour of 11.30 a.m. on Tuesday 11 August 1998 to receive the managers on behalf of the House of Assembly at the Plaza Room on the first floor of the Legislative Council.

### STATUTES AMENDMENT (YOUNG OFFENDERS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 3 June. Page 1068.)

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** The Opposition has studied the Bill most carefully and has no objection to it. The Bill deals with offenders in the age range 10 to 18, with most of its provisions applying to the cusp of childhood and adulthood, namely the age of 17 and 18. It is important to remember the glossary of this debate: youths are sentenced to detention in training centres and adults are sentenced to imprisonment in prison. Although the Bill allows some adult offenders to be detained in training centres and some youth offenders to be imprisoned in a prison, one of our objectives must be to keep youths out of prison where they might be influenced, for the worse, by the older lags.

It is common enough for a youth to be convicted of a criminal offence, serve time in a training centre, then offend again after turning 18 in the training centre, or offend again after turning 18 but when still liable for a term of detention in a training centre, such as when on home detention. The question is then: where is the time to be served? The Bill gives the court discretion to make its own judgment. The House should remember that it is also possible for a youth to serve a term of imprisonment if he were sentenced aged 17 as an adult, owing to his offence or his record being heinous. A youth may also serve time in a prison if he were transferred from a training centre to a prison because he was uncontrollable in the training centre, had assaulted staff or fellow trainees, had incited others at the training centre to cause a disturbance, or escaped or attempted to escape from the training centre.

Part 2 of the Bill amends the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act to apply the law on non-parole periods to those youths serving time in a prison. It also says that, if the youth has been sentenced to life imprisonment and is being sentenced for another crime, the question of a suitable non-parole period goes back to the court that imposed the life term. Clause 6 in

part 2 provides that, if a youth is in prison should he have defaulted on a community service order, his detention for default will be served in prison and, if he has served a term of imprisonment but is now out, his default detention may be ordered by the court to be served in prison. If a youth is in prison he is subject to the Correctional Services Act.

The scheme of clause 6 is repeated in clauses 7 (order for detention), 11 (sentence to detention), and 15 (remand) of the Bill. Clause 8 makes clear that part 2 applies to youths detained in prison whether before or after the commencement of the Act. Part 3 of the Bill amends the Summary Procedures Act to facilitate a person charged with an adult offence being remanded to a training centre if he or she is currently remanded in a prison. To transfer a person on remand from a prison to a training centre, an application of the Chief Executive of the Department of Human Services is needed. Once a court has made a decision about remand in a prison or a training centre, an application to review that decision may be made only if materially new facts or circumstances can be put before the court.

Part 4 of the Bill amends the Young Offenders Act. Section 15 of the principal Act is about keeping youths refused bail out of prison, if possible, but clause 10 now denies the benefit of remand in a training centre to youths who are already in prison. Clause 11 provides that if a youth is already in prison he will serve any sentence of detention in prison, and if he has previously been in prison he may be sentenced to imprisonment instead of detention, at the court's discretion. Clauses 12 and 13 appear to be redrafting for the purposes of neatness, rather than substance. Clause 14 applies the existing section on transfers between training centres or from a training centre to prison to those youths on remand.

Clause 15 provides that, where a person detained in a training centre is then charged with an offence occurring after he turned 18 and was remanded in prison, should he then not be sentenced to imprisonment for the adult offence he must be returned to a training centre to serve the remainder of the youth sentence. His period on remand in prison counts against his period of detention in the training centre. The last part of the final clause applies non-parole periods to detention in a training centre, provided that reference to the Parole Board is read as a reference to the Training Centre Review Board. Under existing section 63(8) of the Young Offenders Act, any person transferred to prison under the Act may have his case reviewed by the board and, if so minded, the board may order his release. Now, once a non-parole period is set, the board may conditionally release the prisoner, whereas before the release was unconditional.

**The Hon. G.M. Gunn:** Bring back the birch!

**Mr ATKINSON:** That is not a question before the House at this time. With those remarks, the Opposition supports the Bill.

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** I will not take up much time, but I do want to talk briefly, first, to recognise the fact that yesterday the Attorney-General was able to announce a decrease in youth crime, something that we should also note in this place and commend all those who were involved, as well as the children. I point out that, while there is much community fear about youth crime, only 5 per cent of young people ever offend, and 65 per cent of that 5 per cent never reoffend. We have a wonderful crop of young people and should be doing our best to help them. However, some of them have a lot of problems, and we should be doing everything we can to keep them out of gaol.

We might not have a need for some of the measures we have just been talking about if we focused more attention on methods to keep young people out of gaol and, to go back further than that, most importantly, to stop them from offending. In the context of talking about young people in gaol, I draw the House's attention to a program that, unfortunately, no longer has funding—a program that was designed to keep young people out of gaol. This is the Risky Business program, which was administered by OARS at Christies Beach. The sum of \$15 000 was obtained through Community Benefit SA for a scheme to address the needs of 40 young people who were seen as being at serious risk of ending up in gaol.

It identified people in the following areas to receive assistance: those who have been offending; those involved in drug and alcohol misuse; those who have a lack of interpersonal skills and self esteem; and where there is a problem with their education and recreation and in their personal relationships. The aim was to have significant positive outcomes for children at risk of not coping in each one of those areas.

We are fortunate that OARS was able to commission an extensive evaluation of the Risky Business youth program by Anna Vallejo and Associates. So, we have solid information about the outcome of this program, and I wish to share some of it with the House. In the area of anticipated outcomes, the first one being a reduction in offending, it was reported that only one of the group was known to continue their offending behaviour during the program and also in the three months following it.

The next aim was a reduction in drug and alcohol misuse. The information was limited, but it was reported that seven of the participants were using drugs and one participant was now considering non-use of drugs as a result of information provided regarding their detrimental effects. The evaluation noted that there needs to be more emphasis on how drug and alcohol misuse affects individuals and the community. It was also not clear in looking at the evaluation as to how much use or abuse of drugs and alcohol there was. There was need for a lot more attention in that area.

In the area of interpersonal skills and self-esteem there was clear evidence that there had been an increase in levels of self-esteem and interpersonal skills. Most work in the area indicates that criminal activity is closely related to lack of self-esteem and interpersonal skills. The judgment on whether there had been an improvement was made both by the family of the offender as well as the offender themselves (or 'the program participant' would be a better term to use). The fact that the family was able clearly to see an improvement in self-esteem and interpersonal skills is something to be greatly applauded.

In relation to school retention and interest in recreation, from the information provided all except one of the participants remained in the education system, and the one participant who did not remain in the education system had the support of her parents. Her parents commented that the fact that she was away from peer group pressure in the education system and was now on the path to work was in that instance a positive outcome.

The analysis of the data indicated that the majority of participants had improved their attitude to education. About half had demonstrated an increased interest in sports and hobbies, although it was significant that the young women who participated in the program had not improved much in that area. In terms of interpersonal relationships, it was clear

from the information provided by leaders that the majority of participants had made significant improvements in their personal relationships. It was concluded that this outcome was achieved.

The methods used to achieve those outcomes included meetings once a week—separate ones for girls and boys—for a whole school term. There were structured activities, information sessions and group discussions during that time to enable the participants to see a different way of living and, in particular, to focus on constructive recreation instead of the destructive recreation that we encounter too often through vandalism and other forms of crime and abuse that lead to young people ending up in gaol.

The strange priorities we have in Government, particularly the priorities of this Government, are demonstrated by the fact that it no longer funds \$15 000 per term to produce those positive outcomes for 40 young people, when it will consider, quite appropriately, the extra funding required to keep young people in gaols and training centres. We should be directing our money to prevention first rather than having to worry about building bigger gaols, more training centres or changing the conditions for detention of young people.

The destructive activities of some young people is something that the Minister for Employment, Training and Education and I are currently working on in relation to gross vandalism at one of the small schools in my electorate at the moment. A group of young people aged between 14 and 24 years about six nights out of seven in a week find that the only thing that entertains them is to go to a primary school, smear faeces and urine over the murals produced by the children and around the facilities they will use and to leave vomit and other excreta around the place so that the grounds-person has to come in every morning to clean up so that the place is not offensive for the children. That indicates that there is a sad and serious need for us to support programs such as Risky Business to give these young people a better outlook on themselves and on life and to help them develop a constructive living pattern as well as help them keep out of gaol. I support the Bill but also consider that we need to focus more time and money on the prevention activities rather than on the end of the sad road.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** I will make one or two brief comments. My concern is that for too long many constituents in my electorate have had to put up—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** There is nothing you can do about it—nothing. My constituents have had to put up with vandals who have no regard for the rights and personal property or the enjoyment thereof of others for too long. They think it is their right to terrorise and vandalise neighbourhoods.

**Mr Atkinson:** That is because you took away people's self-defence rights.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** No, we have not. I am firmly of the view that the time has long since passed when we need further legislation similar to what they have in New South Wales to give the police power to deal with these elements in the community that think it is their right to break into elderly people's homes, smash down their fences, break their windows, use their gardens as toilets and terrorise them all night.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I am of the view that measures such as this may be necessary, but at the end of the day we

have to take action to ensure that these young offenders clearly understand their responsibilities and that the very young ones are not used by older members of their groups terrorising the community so they can avoid detention or arrest. The police have a difficult role in trying to protect the welfare of—

**Ms Rankine:** It is getting more difficult as they get their cars ripped off them.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** When the honourable member has finished her tirade, I will continue. Every time I have raised this matter I seem to be subject to sniping and nonsense from members opposite. The time has come when groups in the community have to take responsibility for their communities. It is no good these people claiming they are under privileged and that they have difficulties. We accept that, but it does not give them any right to ignore and terrorise elderly people. Only this morning an elderly lady rang me and told me how she had been treated by these groups who live in a house alongside her—

*Ms Rankine interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Call the police all the time? The housing authorities have some responsibility to make sure that, when they put groups into houses in ordinary neighbourhoods, those people have the skills to live with other people. Ordinary citizens should not have to put up with vandals smashing houses, throwing stones, vandalising motor cars and other things. I raise these issues because I believe that they are very important, and I intend to bring to Parliament in the near future legislation that I talked about some 12 months ago to give police power to take these young people home to their parents.

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** All I can say to the honourable member who has never had a headache is that he is like a proper—all mouth and no brain. I conclude my remarks at that point.

**Mr CONLON (Elder):** I did not intend to speak in this debate until I heard some of the rubbish offered by the member for Stuart. As shadow Minister for Police, I say to the honourable member that he should not come into this House and cry crocodile tears for the victims of crime. Yesterday I was told that, because of the \$4 million that the Government has cut out of the police budget, five vacancies in major crime will not be filled, but I hope that is not correct. The honourable member should not come into this House and cry crocodile tears for the victims of crime and then cut the operational budget of the police. Do not be such a hypocrite.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises):** I am grateful for all contributions. As I said on the last Bill, I look forward to an expeditious passage through the Committee stage.

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

### LIQUOR LICENSING (LICENCE FEES) AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee (resumed on motion).  
(Continued from page 1741.)

Clause 11.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I understand that an amendment in the Minister's name has been circulated as 74(2). Is it the wish of the Minister to proceed with that amendment?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** Yes, Sir, it is. The Government indicates that it intends to move the amendment that is now in my name and, in so doing, it also indicates that it is surprised that this has been a requirement of the Government. We understand that the amendment that is now to be moved in my name achieves what the previous amendment in my name attempted to achieve. In identifying to the Committee what we are intending to move now, I signal that we are doing so because I am sure that, after a week of heated debate, everyone would like to leave. I have already asked my staff and Parliamentary Counsel to provide for me previous examples where the amendment which the Government intended to move originally has eventually been passed. If that is not the case, I would be most interested to learn. However, in the interest of timeliness, I move:

Page 2, lines 27 to 33—Leave out subsections (1) and (2).

Page 3, line 8—Leave out the words 'by or'.

**Mr ATKINSON:** The Opposition will support what the Government proposes to do. Having said that, I found the procedures of debate of this Bill quite extraordinary, when the Government wanted to move an amendment and you, Sir, virtually of your own motion, adjourned the matter and refused to proceed with an amendment which had the unanimous support of the Committee. I will also be interested in the outcome of the Minister's investigations. In the interests of expediting the Bill, we will acquiesce in the amendments that the Government has moved.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The decision that the Chair has made in this matter is definitely in line with previous rulings. The Minister has indicated that he is seeking further information on that. The Chair will also seek further information as far as that matter is concerned.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (12 to 14) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### ADJOURNMENT

At 5.34 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 18 August at 2 p.m.

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 4 August 1998

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

#### EDUCATION COMMITTEES

138. **Ms WHITE:**

1. How many formal and informal committees exist within the Department of Education, Training and Employment?
2. What are their names?
3. What are their terms of reference?
4. When were they formed?
5. When are their objectives expected to be achieved?
6. What are their membership and service costs for 1997-98 and what are their budgeted costs for 1998-99?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** The Department of Education, Training and Employment uses a wide range of consultative procedures to ensure that the policies and programs developed and implemented are those which will produce the best outcomes for the department's clients.

Close scrutiny of committees, working parties, taskforces and other groupings has accompanied the formation and subsequent development of the department as a responsive, flexible Government agency.

The department's committee structures are currently being reviewed. The review will establish a uniform nomenclature for the department and include protocols for the establishment and operation of any new committees to ensure that the department's priorities are met in an effective and efficient manner, minimising overlap and duplication.

Committees are defined in the attached listing as groupings with terms of reference, line accountability and established protocols. The information in the listing is tendered on the understanding that the review will provide more complete information.

It is important to acknowledge that, while the listing includes 22 committees at the time of preparation, the department is flexible in its approach to the formation and disbanding of committees in response to real needs.

Working parties, reference groups, taskforces and the like are formed for specific purposes with more limited life-spans. Their membership may change as different expertise is brought to bear on the matter in hand and they will meet as required. For example at the field level numerous school curriculum working parties are formed.

While these groups are not considered to fall within the scope of the question, it is acknowledged that a uniform, appropriate nomenclature is difficult to apply across a large agency and that some of these groupings may be locally referred to as "committees". While not limiting the capacity for staff at all levels to meet and consult as required, the review will ensure that true committees are established in a controlled manner.

The costs shown for the listed committees are the additional direct service costs identified where such an identification is possible. In many cases there are no such direct costs. Committee members' salaries are not factored in as membership of the committee forms part of the requirements of the staff members' positions and the requirements may vary greatly.

Department of Education, Training and Employment—Committees

Forum	Terms of Reference	Formed	Timeline for Achievement of Objectives	1997-98 Costs	1998-9 Budgeted Costs
Executive Policy and Priorities Advisory Council (EPPAC)	In draft. Will include broad strategic issues for the whole department.	April 1998	Ongoing	nil	
Field Management Committee (FMC)	In draft. Will support integrated service provision.	April 1998	Ongoing	nil	
State Office Coordination Committee (SOCC)	In draft. Will support the Department's administrative functions.	April 1998	Ongoing	nil	
Employment and Youth Committee (EYC)	In draft. Will support the Government's employment and youth strategies.	April 1998	Ongoing	nil	
Executive Budget Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare plans for resource acquisition and allocation for each finance period and recommend accordingly to the Chief Executive.</li> <li>• Provide advice on long term resource planning strategies. Monitor of budget and program outcomes for the Department and for individual units and initiate corrective action where necessary.</li> <li>• Facilitate best practice resource management throughout the Department.</li> <li>• Plan the financial aspects of Departmental change processes, and recommend reallocation of resources where necessary.</li> </ul>	May 1998	Ongoing	Nil	Nil

Department of Education, Training and Employment—Committees

Forum	Terms of Reference	Formed	Timeline for Achievement of Objectives	1997-98 Costs	1998-9 Budgeted Costs
Executive Budget Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan and assist the introduction of accrual accounting into the Department's operations.</li> <li>Oversee implementation of the Government's financial management and budget reform agenda.</li> </ul>	May 1998	Ongoing	Nil	Nil
Executive IT Steering Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the IT policy framework and IT policies, standards and guidelines for the Department.</li> <li>Develop and maintain a Corporate Strategic IT Plan.</li> <li>Prioritise and approve funding bids for major strategic IT projects, that is, projects which impact across the whole Department and/or projects exceeding \$0.5m or 6 months duration.</li> <li>Establish and monitor progress of major strategic IT projects.</li> <li>Ensure coordination across IT projects.</li> <li>Initiate, where required, whole of department IT projects.</li> <li>Initiate Post Implementation Reviews and Benefits Realisation Reviews of major strategic IT projects.</li> </ul>	March 1998	Ongoing	Nil	Nil
Audit Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide advice to the Chief Executive to improve management practice and reporting processes.</li> <li>Ensure the establishment and maintenance of an appropriate internal control framework.</li> </ul>	25 August 1995	Ongoing	\$5 000	\$5 000
Interim State OHS&W Consultative Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify and prioritise OHS&amp;W issues, and develop objectives, goals and strategies to deal with them.</li> <li>Consider issues referred to it by the Department's Executive Forums or sub groups, and provide recommendations and relevant reports in response to these issues.</li> <li>Review and monitor the effectiveness of current policies and develop new policies that will meet identified needs and ensure compliance with legislation.</li> <li>Assist in the resolution of OHS&amp;W issues that will have significance for future Departmental policies and procedures, and issues referred to it by sub groups.</li> <li>Monitor and review issues associated with the rehabilitation of injured employees.</li> </ul>	16 December 1994	Ongoing	\$3 500 (estimated)	\$3 500

## Department of Education, Training and Employment—Committees

Forum	Terms of Reference	Formed	Timeline for Achievement of Objectives	1997-98 Costs	1998-9 Budgeted Costs
Systems Personnel Advisory Committee	To provide advice to the Director Human Resources on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· long term personnel strategic planning;</li> <li>· major policy development;</li> <li>· operational matters;</li> <li>· establishment of working parties to develop discussion papers on specific issues.</li> </ul>	1992 (from an earlier committee)	Ongoing	\$400	\$400
Women in the Department of Education, Training and Employment Steering Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Recently formed to replace the former Women in DECS Steering Committee.</li> <li>· Terms of reference of this newly formed committee will be agreed to at the first meeting on 26 June 1998. [The former Women in DECS Steering Committee implemented a range of initiatives aimed at supporting women from all cultural backgrounds and employment categories to achieve their full potential in the organisation as part of a professional development strategy.]</li> </ul>	Women in DECS Steering Committee—September 1995 Women in Department of Education, Training and Employment Steering Committee—June 1998	Ongoing	\$1 500	To be negotiated with relevant Directors once new terms of reference have been approved.
Enterprise Agreement Implementation Group	Implement the DECS Enterprise Agreement 1996, in particular Clause 9.	26 February 1997	December 1998	There are no service costs specifically incurred by this working party other than printing of agendas, minutes and relevant documents	
School Loans Advisory Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· As specified in Section 86 Education Act, 1972.</li> <li>· Investigate and advise the Minister upon any application for his approval of the borrowing of moneys by a council under this Part and upon such other matters as the Minister may think fit to refer to the Committee for advice.</li> </ul>	1972	Ongoing		\$1 500 to cover travel costs of members based outside of metropolitan Adelaide.
Management Accountants Group Information Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Develop policy in the area of financial management.</li> <li>· Establish department wide practices for consistent application, information sharing and professional development.</li> </ul>	October 1995	Ongoing	Nil	Nil
Facility Network	The original Facility Managers Network of DETAFE became the Facility Network. Terms of reference of original committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provide a forum for a joint approach in dealing with organisation wide facilities management issues, the sharing of information and strategies related to facilities management within the Department.</li> <li>· Provide a coordinated and unified approach to the implementation of the Department's asset management policies and procedures.</li> </ul>	November 1996	Ongoing—re-viewed annually	Nil	Nil



Department of Education, Training and Employment—Committees

Forum	Terms of Reference	Formed	Timeline for Achievement of Objectives	1997-98 Costs	1998-9 Budgeted Costs
Facility Network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide advice, assistance and recommendations to the Director's Group, Corporate Services and/or Executive Director, TAFE SA on facilities management issues.</li> <li>Support and promote the professional development of network members.</li> </ul>	November 1996	Ongoing—re-viewed annually	Nil	Nil
Enterprise Agreement Working Party (Clause 9.2.3)	Monitor and review implementation of the Enterprise Agreement for Information Technology Help Desk and EDSAS.	June 1997	Objectives expected to be achieved as per Terms of Reference	No service costs	Nil
Interagency Communication Network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilitate cooperation, communication and collaboration between the Department of Industry and the Trade and the Department of Education, Training and Employment on agency activities, policies and directions relating to employment and economic development.</li> <li>Provide advice to the Chief Executives of the Department of Industry and Trade and the Department of Education, Training and Employment on the implementation of joint initiatives to address issues of mutual interest and concern.</li> <li>Recommend ways in which areas of duplication in economic development and employment related policy and program initiatives undertaken by the Department of Industry and Trade and the Department of Education, Training and Employment can be resolved.</li> </ul>	Formalised in July 1997	Ongoing.		N/A. Funds sought as required for individual initiatives.
Employment SA Best Practice Steering Committee	Oversee quality initiatives within Employment SA.	June 1997 (sub groups formed at various times as required)	Ongoing		N/A
Decision Making Steering Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Manage, develop and monitor processes for communication and decision making in Operations.</li> <li>Develop and implement meeting and operations days' processes based on the principles and values for information sharing, planning, debate, discussion and decision making in whole of operations forums.</li> <li>Ensure appropriate participation of personnel from other groups within the Department and from outside the Department in consultation, discussion, development and implementation of policy recommendations.</li> <li>Determine appropriate consultation networks for the consideration of discussion papers etc.</li> </ul>	March 1998	Ongoing	Nil	Nil

## Department of Education, Training and Employment—Committees

Forum	Terms of Reference	Formed	Timeline for Achievement of Objectives	1997-98 Costs	1998-9 Budgeted Costs
Decision Making Steering Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Manage the process for the identification of issues, including those from Executive Directors, Groups of Districts and individuals, for action and the limiting of those issues to manageable proportions at any one time.</li> <li>· Determine the agenda of Operations Days and Conferences so as to maximise participation of all members.</li> <li>· Develop with consultation the Educational Leadership learning program and integrate that program when appropriate with the business/information/issues agenda program.</li> </ul>	March 1998	Ongoing	Nil	Nil
Operations Budget Committee	Management of the finances of the Operations Group.	August 1997	Ongoing	Nil	Nil
TAFE SA Executive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provide leadership in the development of a shared vision for TAFE institutes.</li> <li>· Establish directions, priorities for the statewide public provision of vocational education and training (VET).</li> <li>· Contribute to the development of National and State VET policy.</li> <li>· Evaluate and respond to VET policy initiatives developed and National and State levels.</li> <li>· Approve policies, structures and procedures which enhance:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the collaborative nature of the TAFE SA network of institutes</li> <li>2. the quality and productivity of TAFE SA products and services</li> </ol> </li> <li>· Ensure a cohesive and consistent response to Departmental policies and priorities.</li> </ul>	1996 under the former DETAFE and confirmed with structure of DETE in May 1998	Ongoing. Objectives will be derived from Departmental and TAFE SA strategic plans.	Membership and service costs absorbed in salaries and other operating costs of TAFE SA	N/A
Monitoring Student Achievement Reference Committee	Provide a consultative forum for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Basic Skills Tests collection of statewide data on students' profiles levels</li> <li>· implementation of statements and profiles</li> <li>· broad issues on assessment and reporting.</li> </ul>	March 1997	Ongoing	\$2 000	\$2 000
READY, SET, GO Management Committee	Manage, coordinate and monitor the 'Ready, Set, Go' Program including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· quality of process and outcomes of programs \$11.8 million budget;</li> <li>· accountability and evaluation processes.</li> </ul>	March 1997	December 1999	Costs associated with country members' attendance.	Costs associated with country members' attendance.

Department of Education, Training and Employment—Committees

Forum	Terms of Reference	Formed	Timeline for Achievement of Objectives	1997-98 Costs	1998-9 Budgeted Costs
Early Years Strategy Steering Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinate the management of the Early Years Strategy including planning, implementation and evaluation.</li> <li>Provide advice about future directions of the Strategy to the Chief Executive and the Minister.</li> <li>Report on the Strategy on a quarterly basis to the Minister.</li> <li>Ensure communication about, and promotion of, the Strategy and its elements occurs within the Department and to key stakeholders.</li> </ul>	1998		\$1000	\$1500

**ACCESS CABS**

143. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Why are Access Cabs only available to people with a permanent disabilities and is it intended to extend this service to people with short-term disabilities?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** The Minister for Transport and Urban Planning has provided the following information.

Access Cabs can be booked by anyone. However, the conditions of licence attached to accessible taxis require the taxis to give priority to bookings by persons with disabilities made through the Access Cabs centralised booking service.

The priority of bookings depends on whether the nature of the disability is such that the person can only use an Access Cab rather than a general taxi. Persons who have a short-term disability can use an accessible taxi, subject to the availability of taxis undertaking priority bookings. Because of the size of the taxis and the specialised training of the drivers, the taxis are ideal for use by any person who has a disability, whether permanent or short-term.

The South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme (TSS) vouchers are only available to persons who have permanent disabilities which prevents them from using public transport and restricts their transport options to general taxis or accessible taxis. The TSS was established in 1987 based on physical mobility criteria.

From July 1997 to May 1998, the Government, through the TSS, provided \$4.8 million in support to its members. There are 19 756 active members of the Scheme and approximately 98 new members are admitted to the Scheme each week.

**EDUCATION FUNDING**

151. **Ms WHITE:**

1. Why are schools now required to meet the costs of acquiring file servers under the new arrangements for EDS to supply and service EDSAS systems?

2. Given the decisions to freeze school grants for three years, what impact will the cost of EDSAS have on school operating costs?

3. Does DETE monitor charges made by EDS to schools and, if not, why not?

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

1. Schools are not now required to meet the costs of acquiring file servers under the new arrangements for EDS to supply and service EDSAS ie administration systems. If, however, schools choose to upgrade their systems for their own additional purposes over and above the agreed funded levels they are required to fund the difference in cost.

2. EDSAS is an integrated school administrative system. Over the next three years it is anticipated that there will be no change in the impact of the operation of EDSAS on school operating costs.

In addition, all schools are being provided with upgraded school administration workstations at no cost to them through the Computers Plus program.

3. The department has implemented central systems to monitor all charges for EDS services.

**SOUTH ROAD PRIMARY SCHOOL**

153. **Mr CONLON:**

1. What is the stage of negotiations for the sale of South Road Primary School to the Baptist Church, and has a sale price been agreed and, if so, what is the price?

2. For what purpose does the church propose to use the property and is the sale contingent upon any subdivision or change of purpose of any or all of the land?

3. Were open tenders called for the sale of the school and, if not, why not and what other process was used for the sale?

4. What is the Government valuation of the property and was an independent valuation of the property obtained prior to sale and if so, what is independent valuation?

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

1. Contracts have been forwarded to the Edwardstown Baptist Church for execution. A purchase price has been agreed, however, this information is not able to be released as settlement has not yet occurred and it is therefore a matter of commercial confidentiality. Settlement is expected to occur in November 1998.

2. It is understood that a portion of the site will be used for educational purposes while the remainder will be subdivided into housing blocks however it is considered more appropriate that the Edwardstown Baptist Church should make any further comments in regard to the future use of the property. The sale of the property is not contingent upon any subdivision or change of purpose of any or all of the land.

3. Open tenders were not called for the sale of the property as there were legal complications arising from the existence of a joint use Licence Deed between the Minister and the church.

Negotiations occurred on behalf of the Department of Education, Training and Employment by the Department for Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs to effect the sale of the Edwardstown Baptist Church within the existing legal parameters.

4. The initial Government valuation of the site in May 1997 was \$745 000, however the final purchase price was a result of protracted negotiations between the purchaser and the Department for Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs. It is understood that the purchaser received independent valuation advice.

**HOME INVASIONS**

154. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** How many incidents of home invasion were reported to the South Australian Police Department in 1997 and for the first half of 1998?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I am advised by the Police that the term 'home invasion' is not referred to in South Australian Statutes, therefore the offence of committing a 'home invasion' does not exist.

In the absence of a definition, statistics are available and are supplied below, of incidents whereby a break and entry on a premises has occurred, together with an offence against the person. These include assaults, rape and sexual assaults.

1996-1997	144
1997-1998	136

**SCHOOL FEES**

157. **Ms WHITE:** Will the Government be capping compulsory school fees over the next three years?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** The Materials and Services Charge Regulation (107A) tabled in Parliament on 28 May 1998 sets the maximum legally enforceable school fee at \$154 for primary students and \$205 for secondary students. While the Regulation sets a maximum amount, the charge is set at each individual site through a consultative process with the Principal and School Council. Schools are able to set the charge at any level below or above this amount, however, any Charge above the maximum limit set by the schedule in the Regulation is voluntary.

The charge is set at a level deemed necessary to achieve the specific outcomes and priorities of each individual site. It would

therefore be inappropriate to centrally cap the charge over the next three years.

**SCHOOL TEACHERS**

196. **Ms WHITE:** Does the Minister support the development of a National professional teaching standards and registration body as proposed in the Report of the Senate Inquiry: 'A Class Act, 1998' and, if so, what steps are being taken towards this end?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** The Government's support for the existing Teachers Registration Board of South Australia is an indication of its commitment towards the concept of teacher registration. However, I am advised that the report 'A Class Act' is still being considered by the Commonwealth Government. Until a firm position is resolved and the final powers of such a board determined, I wish to reserve my position on the matter.