HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 26 November 1998

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

CONSTITUTION (CITIZENSHIP) AMENDMENT BILL

Mr SCALZI (Hartley) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act. Read a first time.

Mr SCALZI: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is not a Bill which concerns the general public; it is a Bill which concerns only members of the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council of the State Parliament of South Australia. A few years ago, I happened to go back to the place at which I was born in Campania and I visited the excavations at Pompeii. Some members might be aware that the University of Adelaide has contributed quite considerably to the work in Pompeii. As a former history and ancient history teacher, I was very much interested to see the excavations. At the gate, I was asked by the officer 'Are you an Italian?' and I said 'No'. Upon hearing that I spoke English, he said, 'British?' and I said 'No'. He then said, 'What are you?' and I said, 'I am an Australian.' He said, 'In that case, could you please give me an extra 2 000 lire?'

I had to pay the extra 2 000 lire, or thereabouts—I forget the exact amount—because an Australian is not part of the European Economic Community and is not a British subject and therefore does not enjoy the privileges of a European or a British subject. I was happy to pay the extra money because I am an Australian. I am privileged to be an Australian, and I am even more privileged to be a member of this place.

As I said earlier, this Bill refers only to the 47 members of the House of Assembly and the 22 members of the Legislative Council; it will apply, if it is enacted, only to the 69 members of the State Parliament. It will not apply to the general public. This Bill is not an attack on multiculturalism, as some of my critics have said, but in fact, if we stop to think, in reality it is a measure to promote multiculturalism. There is a difference between multiculturalism, which all members support regardless of Parties, and the promotion of multi citizenship and having more than one passport.

The aim of multiculturalism is to accept people regardless of background, to share with each other and to promote one community. Being a member of Parliament and holding dual citizenship, I believe, is a different matter altogether. I have no problems with the average citizen who does not hold public office and who does not represent the public interest having dual citizenship or an extra passport, but I do have problems with a member of Parliament so doing.

The Bill provides for members to renounce within 14 days of the announcement of the next State election their foreign citizenship. As I said, it applies to House of Assembly members and Legislative Council members, and obviously it will apply to any candidate seeking to be a member of Parliament. It does not prevent anyone from being a member of Parliament but simply requires them to make a commitment to Australian citizenship first and foremost. Perhaps, a simple paragraph could be inserted by the Electoral Commission that simply states that an individual seeking office must renounce any other citizenship.

This Bill does not affect legally the status of present members—and I want to make that clear. I do not judge present members. It does not disqualify any member, regardless of background, from holding office—and it should not. The aim is to promote Australian citizenship. This Bill is consistent with my motion to waive the citizenship fee, which was passed earlier in this place and supported by the member for Lee. On that occasion, I wrote to the Federal Minister and I moved a motion in this House to provide that anyone who had been in Australia for 20 years or more and who wanted to become an Australian citizen would have the citizenship fee waived. I believe that would ensure that more people participated in and contributed to the centenary of federation.

There are 750 000 permanent residents in Australia who are not Australian citizens, which is three-quarters of a million people out of a population of 18 million. I believe that is a problem. It is also consistent with my position of 5 May 1994 when I contributed in this place to debate on the Statutes Amendment (Constitution and Members Register of Interests) Bill. On that occasion, I said that I had no difficulty in addressing the legal problems in relation to the register but that I had some difficulty with what that Bill would do to the value of Australian citizenship. My commitment to citizenship goes back a long time, and I refer to what I said in *Hansard* on that occasion, as follows:

> I understand the Bill's purpose fully, and I fully support the legal position. It makes one's position clear. What concerns me is that, in making the legal position clear, are we weakening the value of Australian citizenship in the moral sense? What concerns me as a member of Parliament is that, in trying to ensure that nothing is taken away from members as individuals, in the eyes of some people we might be taking something away from the value of Australian citizenship by holding dual citizenship, a foreign passport or both. As a member of Parliament I cannot morally justify travelling on any other passport but an Australian passport, but that is not to say that I am not proud of my place of birth or my background. I cannot justify holding other citizenship. I am saying this as a member of Parliament. If I did that, I would consider that I had undervalued my commitment to my Australian citizenship. I feel strongly about this issue because I became a citizen out of choice.

That is what I said in 1994. It is consistent with Federal legislation. We are all aware that, if we were members of Parliament in Canberra, many of us would have some difficulties, because the Constitution does not allow Federal members to hold dual citizenship. Some members in this place would be disqualified from holding Federal office. Members would all be aware of the Cleary case and the present Heather Hill case, who is now known as the Senator from Queensland who represents two nations.

It is quite clear from an article of 21 November that One Nation has admitted that senator elect Heather Hill has not renounced her British citizenship, which makes her ineligible to take her seat. We should not have these inconsistencies between the Federal legislation and the State legislation. My Bill aims to clear that up and make clear the commitment of members of this State Parliament to Australian citizenship. We cannot have two laws—one in Canberra and one in South Australia—for members of Parliament. It is inconsistent and incongruent and it must be dealt with, and this Bill does that.

There are members in both the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council who have dual citizenship. As I said, this Bill does not disqualify them from holding office now but asks that they make a clear commitment to Australian citizenship at the next election, that is, within 14 days of the

announcement of the next State election. Members on both side sides of the House have held dual citizenship; for example, the former member for McKillop, the Hon. Dale Baker, who was also Leader of the Opposition at one stage, had dual citizenship. We are also aware that the present Leader of the Opposition, on 5 May 1994, interjected during the member for Spence's speech and said that he held three citizenships. As I said, I do not wish to judge any present honourable member, but it is a problem when our law is inconsistent with the Federal law and that we have a Leader of the Opposition who has more than one citizenship.

Ms Hurley: Why is that a problem?

Mr SCALZI: I sit on this side of the House and often hear the present Leader of the Opposition say that we should not placate foreigners. The Leader may be talking about United Water and that it might involve British interests in the form of Thames Water and CGC in France. He should not have a conflict of interest but, if he has dual citizenship, he represents that country as well. Let us be consistent.

As I said earlier, in Australia at present 750 000 permanent residents are not Australian citizens. That is 750 000 people out of a population of 18 million. It is not all their fault, because before 1984 if you were a British subject after three months you could get on the electoral roll and you could vote at State and Federal elections. That was prior to 1984, and a lot of people were caught in that. We should make an effort, as I said in my motion earlier this year, to encourage people to become Australian citizens. However, at present we have the farce that a person who is not an Australian citizen can vote in an election, be elected to council, or be elected as mayor and officiate at an Australian citizenship ceremony. Something is wrong with the present law and we have to deal with it.

As we move towards the year 2000 and the centenary of federation, we should make an effort—and this applies to all members on both sides of the House—to promote Australian citizenship. I was pleased when the member for Lee supported my motion earlier this year, and I trust that members opposite will do likewise and support this Bill. As members of Parliament, we can show leadership in valuing Australian citizenship. We cannot celebrate the centenary of federation without encouraging those people to become Australian citizens. As I said earlier, this Bill does not and will not disadvantage the general public.

The other day one of my cousins said, 'Joe, this is an attack on peoples' freedom.' I said, 'It doesn't concern you; it has nothing to do with the general public.' In fact, if people hold dual citizenship, there is no problem. It concerns only those members of Parliament who have a public duty to represent the people of South Australia. That is what it does. It does not affect the general public.

Members interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: I know members opposite are complaining; perhaps a few of them hold dual citizenship. They need not worry about it; they can hold onto their dual citizenship until the next election. All they will have to do is simply say, 'I renounce my foreign citizenship.' There is no problem; no-one is disqualified from holding office. It does not pick on anyone personally. If you have a problem today, that is your problem. It is not my problem. I am not attacking anybody's legal position today. I am saying as Australians and as members of Parliament our commitment to Australian citizenship should be beyond question. The present law does not allow—

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

Mr SCALZI: Mr Speaker, I seek leave to extend my time.

Leave granted.

Mr SCALZI: As I said, the commitment should be to Australian citizenship, and that should be foremost. If I were still an Italian citizen when I went to Naples in 1996 and organised a meeting to form a university agreement between the University of Naples and the University of South Australia, which country would I represent? Often we talk about conflict of interest, about people holding shares, chairmanships, and so on, but we as members of Parliament do not mention our allegiance to other citizenships. We have to put in a pecuniary interest return stating what we owe, what we own and to whom we belong. As members of Parliament, our commitment to Australian citizenship should be beyond question. Other countries do not allow dual citizenship and, as I said earlier, I have no problem with that. It is only members of Parliament, those of you who want to criticise me for being anti-multiculturalism. Yesterday, I took a group—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: I welcome the interjection of the member for Spence, because on 5 May 1994 the member for Spence said that, if his constituents asked him to give up his Irish passport, he would. I encourage the constituents of Spence to write to the member for Spence and ask him to renounce his Irish passport and put Australia first.

Mr Atkinson: Not one has asked.

Mr SCALZI: I suggest that, after today, a few letters might come in your mail. Yesterday, I had the privilege of taking—

Mr Conlon interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: The member for Elder interjects. Perhaps he also is worried about giving up his Irish passport.

Members interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: In response to the interjection of the member for Hart, I might not have been born here, but I can demonstrate today that I have a true commitment to Australian citizenship and this country. I ask members on both sides of the House to do likewise. This is not a Party issue: it is about showing commitment to Australian citizenship. It is not a Party political matter. I will be very disappointed if members opposite cannot exercise their conscience on this issue.

Mr Foley: Pauline Hanson—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: The member for Hart refers to Pauline Hanson and One Nation, and two nations. I was the first member of this place to criticise Pauline Hanson, so do not bring Pauline Hanson into this debate. Bruce Stoebner of Colorado told me yesterday that in the United States you cannot have dual citizenship, let alone stand for Congress. If you were not born in the United States, you cannot become President. This country is a great democracy: it does not put any obstacle in the way of any member or citizen. Regardless of where they were born, they can stand for the highest office. We should value our democracy and our citizenship.

Mr Conlon: What makes you an Australian citizen?

Mr SCALZI: I did not become an Australian citizen until I was 21. It was my choice, and I made a commitment and—

Mr Conlon: What part of the Constitution makes you a citizen?

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

Mr SCALZI: Commitment. This is about a member's commitment to citizenship. It does not raise any other question. It is about putting their commitment beyond question.

Mr Conlon interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: Members opposite can interject as much as they like. I have been consistent on this issue, and I will remain consistent. I will now refer to a little experience that I had at Heathrow Airport in 1996 when I was transferring to Gatwick. There were three queues: a queue for the British; a queue for the European Economic Community; and a queue for aliens. Guess which queue I joined with an Australian passport?

Mr Foley: The others.

Mr SCALZI: The aliens; the others. If I had remained an Italian citizen, I could have gone half way between the British and the alien queues. I do not mind waiting an extra 10 minutes because I am proud to be an Australian citizen. Some members want to hold onto their citizenship of birth so that they will not have to wait in a queue for an extra 10 minutes. It is a privilege and an honour to be a member of Parliament. If I have to wait for 10 or 20 minutes or pay an extra 2 000 lire in Pompeii, I will do so.

Members interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: I will do it for the next years: it is a privilege. I will let the constituents of Hartley and the public in general judge me. With the privileges that members of Parliament have, I do not think it is too much to ask to give up a little bit of time waiting in a queue because of Australian citizenship. I gave up my Italian citizenship, and I was proud to do that, because it is an honour and a privilege to be a member of Parliament, especially when one considers that I was not born here. The Australian community not only has accepted me as one of their own but have put me in a position where I can influence decisions in this State.

Mr Foley: What influence do you have?

Mr SCALZI: I do not know why the honourable member interjects. We are all equal members in this place, and I suggest we have equal influence.

Mr Atkinson: What about the people who don't know about the citizenship entitlement under a foreign law?

Mr SCALZI: I think the member for Spence was not here earlier. This Bill has nothing to do with the general public. If you as a member of Parliament does not know that you are entitled to other citizenship, I suggest that you have a difficulty with being a member of this place. You should know what you are entitled to.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: I do not understand that interjection: it is beyond me. The member for Spence says, 'What if you don't know?' I will conclude my remarks. In reality, Australia is a mosaic, of which we are all a part. Without vision, we only have colour and texture; without colour and texture, we have no picture; without commitment, the mosaic becomes a collage—a collage that is ready to fall apart in difficult times. Without commitment especially by the nation's leaders and members of this place, we have no foundation for the future of Australia, because we need a vision that promotes diversity, regardless of where we come from, and we must put it together in one community. I commend the Bill to the House. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

The measure will come into operation 14 days after the day on which the House of Assembly is next dissolved, or next expires, after assent.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 17—Vacation of seat in Council

This clause amends section 17 of the Act. Subsection (2) of that section currently provides that the seat of a member of the Legislative Council is not vacated because the member acquires or uses a foreign passport or travel document. This subsection will be repealed and replaced with a provision to the effect that a person who is the subject or citizen of a foreign state or power, or who is under an acknowledgment of allegiance to a foreign state or power, is incapable of being chosen or sitting as a member of the Legislative Council. This provision can be compared with section 44*(i)* of the *Commonwealth Constitution Act*. New subsection (3) will provide that subsection (2) does not apply to a person who has taken reasonable steps to renounce any foreign nationality or citizenship, or any foreign allegiance. This approach is consistent with various judgments of the High Court in *Sykes v Cleary*.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 31—Vacation of seat in Assembly

This clause amends section 31 of the Act for members of the House of Assembly, in the same manner as the amendments to section 17 of the Act.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I want to say in opposing—

The SPEAKER: Order! This is a Bill. Under Standing Order 238(3), the debate can only be adjourned.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: So in adjourning this squalid attempt to get One Nation votes—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot make a—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —I—

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member: One Nation's friend.

The SPEAKER: Can I just—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: He questioned my allegiance to this country.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. Rann: I will sort him out later.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The—

Mr SCALZI: Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I bring the Leader back to the matter before the Chair. Does the Leader wish to adjourn the debate?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I did say that I was adjourning the debate.

The Hon. M.D. RANN secured the adjournment of the debate.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

Mr Condous: I am proud to be Australian.

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

Mr Condous interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is early in the morning to start naming members. I insist that the House come to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Hart for interjecting after the House had been called to order.

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I also warn the member for Hartley.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I also warn the member for Spence.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not opposed to doing it a second time.

WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION (MENTAL INCAPACITY) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

Ms KEY (Hanson): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill has had a considerable history, particularly since 1992. From my reading of *Hansard*, it seems that a number of issues have been misrepresented in this House regarding psychiatric and psychological disabilities. My contribution this morning will be brief. I believe that the matter of inequity is very clear with respect to this issue and, although copious time has been spent in trying to ensure that workers realise their rights under the workers' compensation system in South Australia, I would like to make a few points.

When the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Bill was introduced in this House in February 1986, the Hon. Frank Blevins enunciated a number of principles with regard to the vision for the workers' compensation system in South Australia. One of the points that he made was that the Government's proposals were geared to removing inequities by providing a fair level of long-term income security to injured workers. Unfortunately, since 1986, as a result of amendments, the WorkCover Bill has become a very different proposition for injured workers from that which was thought to be a fair and equitable system in the mid 1980s.

In relation to this matter, much time has been spent by my colleague the member for Ross Smith and, in the Legislative Council, the Hon. Ron Roberts and the Hon. Terry Roberts pointing out the different inequities of mental illness (psychiatric and psychological illness) as opposed to physical illness and injury. Many examples have been used, and I know from speaking to members on this side that a number of constituents are trying to survive under the present WorkCover system. They come into our offices to seek assistance, and many of them do not understand why the current position is that, if someone is suffering from a psychological or mental illness, they will not be treated in the same way as if they were suffering from a physical illness.

I remember, from my experience as an industrial advocate in the early 1980s, when people were discovering that there was such a thing as repetition strain injury, and a number of workers were suffering in quite a severe way from that injury. It took two years of campaigning on a national level to ensure that people realised that, although you may not be able to see the injury—for example, repetition strain injury, tennis elbow, tenosynovitis, carpal tunnel and the like—it was real and was quite often associated with work or repetitive movements. As I said, we had to have a very strenuous campaign to ensure that people—particularly in the workplace but also generally—realised that not only was this a real injury but that it was something that needed to be addressed, and that it was something that could be prevented. I am pleased to say that now, all this time down the track, people in the workplace, and generally, realise that repetition strain injury is a problem and that it can be prevented. A lot of steps have been taken to try to aid that prevention.

Unfortunately, despite what I would see as a progressive position in the area of workers' compensation with respect to some injuries, we still do not seem to have come to terms with the fact that people who suffer from a mental illness of some sort arising from their work should be compensated. We also treat them in a different manner, especially with regard to their access to a lump sum payment because, I believe that, basically, we do not understand that this is, in fact, a real problem in our community. It is very easy to see an injury if someone has a broken leg or has had their fingers severed or has physical disabilities, but it is very difficult, especially for people who are not trained—which, I would argue, would apply to most of us in this House, with maybe a couple of exceptions—to give a proper assessment of a worker who is suffering from a mental illness of one sort or another. And I ask the question why, in 1998, we are discriminating against people with these disabilities.

There have been a number of test cases in this area, and I am sad to report that most of the decisions that have been handed down have not been in favour of workers with a psychiatric illness. In his address to Parliament in 1994, the member for Ross Smith discussed a test case in this area of a person named Elizabeth Hann, a dental assistant, who had developed depression—a recognised psychiatric illness—arising from her employment. We have also in recent times read in the media of a number of people who, at their workplace—whether it be a service station, a bank, a shop or any place where there is money or drugs—have been held up with guns, broken bottles, syringes, knives and a whole lot of other threatening devices. Should that worker suffer from a psychiatric or mental illness of a permanent nature arising from that situation, under our current WorkCover Act they are not eligible for a lump sum payment. Had they been hit over the head, jabbed with a bottle or injected with a syringe and there was some sort of obvious physical damage, they would be eligible, if they had a permanent incapacity, for a lump sum payment. To me, it seems basic commonsense that people who suffer from a disability that may not be obvious in some instances should not suffer this discrimination.

I now refer to the provisions that are available under the different workers' compensation jurisdictions in Australia. South Australia, unfortunately, has a lesser provision for workers with a mental disability or psychiatric impairment. If you happen to be a Commonwealth worker covered by what is called the Comcare system, or if you work for the defence industry and you are covered by the Defence Act 1903, you have a good opportunity, if you have a permanent impairment and you can prove, or support, that it is associated with your work, to be paid out under what is called 'A guide to assessment of a degree of permanent impairment'. There are guidelines for both Comcare and also people who are seafarers covered under the Sea Care provision to obtain compensation. There is a threshold level, which is that there will be no award below 10 per cent assessed impairment, with an exception for fingers, toes, taste and smell. So, in that case, there is a threshold but it is of 10 per cent. At least the mental impairment is recognised under that legislation.

If you are a worker in Victoria who suffers from a mental disability or impairment, there is provision for injury: $300 000 for impairment of 80 per cent or more (pre-injury 12 November 1997). To be 80 per cent impaired, as members would understand, would mean that you had a very serious disability—and that also includes physical and psychiatric

injuries. In Victoria, the threshold level is 30 per cent whole person impairment (psychiatric injuries and illness). Again, in Victoria, the injury and impairment is assessed under American Medical Association guidelines. At the moment, the edition that is being looked at is from 1 September 1998, and it has been modified to take account of Australian best practice in evaluation of psychiatric and hearing impairments. It is also used for new impairment benefits.

If the total loss of injury payment is not less than under the old table of maims, with allowance for pain and suffering, and if the injury is identified as having occurred before November 1997, the old table of maims applies. Many of us who have been advocates in the workers' compensation area have heard severe criticisms of the maims table, and we refer to it colloquially as 'the meat table'. Basically, the meat table tells you that, if you have a certain percentage of disability that has been identified and confirmed by various medical practitioners, you will have an associated amount paid to you based on that disability. Although this appears to me to be a very unscientific way of doing business, that is the system we have been using. I have my reservations, as do other advocates in the workers compensation area, but that is the system to which we have agreed.

Unfortunately, New South Wales does not have a very good record with regard to psychiatric and mental illness. It is of great concern to me that, for reasons I am yet to discover, that State takes a very poor position in this area with regard to compensation. Even though we have in South Australia a table of maims based on medical opinion, or medically assessed under the American Medical Association Guide, disability involving psychiatric impairment is not listed in the third schedule of our Workers Compensation Act. It is a disgrace that we have not come to terms with this inequity in our system and that we continue to discriminate in the lump sum area of workers compensation against people who have this disability.

Western Australia has a provision for workers with a psychological or mental disability, and it does not have a threshold. In Western Australia, a worker is medically assessed using the Assessment of Disability Guide, published by the Western Australian Branch of the Australian Medical Association. If you are a worker in Queensland, a guide is also available, and you are assessed in accordance with the AMA Guide (Fourth Edition). Psychological and psychiatric injuries are assessed by a medical assessment tribunal, and industrial deafness injuries are assessed by an audiologist. If as a result of an assessment a worker is entitled to lump sum compensation, the amount of that compensation is calculated as per schedule 2 of the WorkCover Queensland Regulation 1997, having regard to the worker's degree of permanent impairment and the table of injuries.

Tasmania also uses the maims table, and, like Queensland, there is no threshold with regard to the level of impairment. However, in that State I understand that mental impairment is included as a disability in their system. The Northern Territory considers various types of disability and, again, uses the American Medical Association Guide. There is no award below 5 per cent for whole person impairment: 5 to 9 per cent, with two per cent of the maximum, and a sliding scale (which I will not go into here) looks at more than 84 per cent of the maximum amount, which is connected to average weekly earnings over two years. So, there is a more complicated system in the Northern Territory. Having worked in that jurisdiction as a WorkCover advocate, I have to say that their whole system is extremely difficult for anyone to follow—unless you specialise as a lawyer, particularly a barrister, in this area.

Needless to say, again, a number of successful cases have been brought to bear involving lump sum payments for workers in the Northern Territory who are covered under the Territory legislation in the area of mental incapacity. In the other Territory, the ACT, no threshold or assessment methodology is prescribed. The amount calculated is within the reference of the maims table and, again, my understanding is that mental illness and incapacity is recognised as a disability under that scheme.

Mr McEWEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

HEROIN TRIAL

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hamilton-Smith:

That this House establish a select committee to investigate whether the Government should conduct a scientific, medical trial to determine if the provision of injectable heroin as part of a program of rehabilitation improves the community's ability to attract and retain into abstinence treatment drug misusers who are committing crimes, at risk of transmitting HIV or at risk of death or serious injury as a consequence of their abuse.

(Continued from 19 November. Page 316.)

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I rise in support of the member for Waite's motion that, essentially, this House establish a select committee to investigate whether the Government should conduct a heroin trial. In terms of the problem of illicit drugs in our community, clearly, we have a problem and we are not winning in finding a solution that works. To justify that comment, I point out that this problem exists not just in Australia but world wide. Everywhere across the globe people are grappling with the fact that what is presently being tried is not solving the problem. I refer to Dr Robert Marks and to chapter 11 of his book *Drug Policy: Fact and Fiction* where he says:

When one adds up the total cost of drug law enforcement, including police, customs, prisons, courts, legal aid and the enforcement costs of the National Crime Authority and adds them to the production loss, property crime losses, defensive costs against theft and social security payments, a calculated, conservative estimate of $1.7 billion is spent annually in Australia [in relation to illicit drugs].

Just think what we could do with $1.7 billion for health, education and other programs. In December 1992 the Executive Director of the United Nations International Drug Control Program, Georgio Giocomelli, said:

Based on the estimated crop production, manufacture, processing and distribution of illicit drugs, in relation to the gross turnover of the armaments and the petroleum industry, the illicit drug industry rates as the second largest industry in the world.

In 1992 the International Narcotics Control Board said:

The International Narcotics Control Board details illicit drug activity in all countries and notes increased activity in almost all.

In his contribution the member for Waite mentioned that in South Australia we have an estimated 20 000 heroin users, 5 000 of whom are dependent. Only 1 800 of those people are involved in treatment programs such as methadone maintenance or naltrexone. The honourable member also noted that in 1997 there were 34 heroin-related deaths in South Australia; in 1996, 32; in 1995, 38; and that heroin-related deaths account for the majority of drug-related deaths in our State. So, this is a worldwide problem of which we have our share. Clearly, what is happening now is not fixing the problem, and we need to look at other ways of doing this.

We are doing some things. I am not saying that we are not doing anything in relation to this: we are actually doing a lot of things. I shall refer to the Ministerial Drug Council on Drug Strategy that met in July 1997 and put on the record some of its agenda items and some of the agreements arising from that Ministerial Council. In doing so I acknowledge the role of the former South Australian Minister for Health, who I know strongly supported these measures. The Ministerial—

The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: We agree on some things. I thought you would be impressed, but I actually—

The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: Well, I actually mean it. I quote the outcome of the Ministerial Council's meeting in July 1997, as follows:

> Endorses a comprehensive, integrated approach to deal with the problems of use of illicit drugs including heroin in Australia, involving a balance between supply and demand reduction strategies.
>
> Agrees on the need for a national strategic approach to illicit drugs, including heroin, including primary prevention, with secondary and tertiary initiatives to minimise harm to individual users and the general community.
>
> Endorses a concerted national effort to develop a broad range of effective and evidence based treatment options for people who are opioid dependent, as outlined in the Report of the Subcommittee of the Controlled Availability of Opioids.
>
> Notes that the controlled availability of heroin is only one of a range of possible treatment modalities for heroin dependence, and is unlikely to be more than a minor component of that range of options.
>
> Notes proposals for research and evaluation of the cost effectiveness of different treatment modalities, involving maintenance treatment, withdrawal treatment and relapse prevention including. . .

A number of non-heroin trials are already occurring in Victoria, New South Wales, here in South Australia and also in the Australian Capital Territory. The Ministerial Council on Drugs Strategy continued:

> Notes the Commonwealth will continue to contribute to trials and to the coordination and evaluation of a suite of different treatment modalities to ensure a concerted national effort in the development of treatment options.

It then went on to talk about the heroin trial, which was supported by Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania and New South Wales. As we now know, the heroin trial undertaken by the Ministerial Council on Drug Strategy, which consisted of Health Ministers, Police Ministers and Attorneys-General from each State, Territory and the Commonwealth, did not proceed and was actually suspended by the Prime Minister shortly after this agreement came forward. However, the point is that in other places in the world people are proceeding along the lines of investigating this particular way of dealing with the problem. Heroin trials are now proceeding in the Netherlands and are under serious consideration in Luxembourg, Denmark, Spain and Canada. Frankfurt and Hamburg have taken the Federal Government of Germany to the High Court so that they can proceed with a heroin trial. Innovative policy is now being established in many European countries.

This matter is about investigating whether we should go it alone here in South Australia on a heroin trial and investigate all the issues involved in this matter. In spite of its wide social and economic implications and impact, drug abuse is essentially a health issue. As with any other health issue, we need to investigate all possible avenues of treatment. The investigation of this select committee would cover one avenue of treatment, and this is nothing to fear, stemming, as it does, from a decision to take action in a considered and rational way by investigating one aspect of a range of possible solutions to a problem presenting huge costs to our community for which we have no solution at present. I urge members to support the motion.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): I support the motion with enormous conviction, and I thank the member for Waite for focusing the attention of the Chamber once again on this matter, which has enormous social consequence. The whole matter of drug addiction for many people is a frightening topic. It is easily understood why it might be frightening, because thankfully it is out of the realm of most people's experience. However, I have been continually struck by just how often the effects of drug abuse actually touch members of society who are offended and frightened by it.

In saying this, I do not mean only those people who are actually drug abusers, whose children are drug abusers or whose parents are drug abusers: I obviously refer also to those people who are often the victims of the crime caused by drug abusers who seek an easy fix through selling the classic video machine which has been stolen, and the like. Whilst it is a frightening topic it is not something or other that we can simply ignore. I have always been of the view that there are two ways of viewing issues like this: the idealistic and the realistic. The idealistic way of viewing society is that it is all a very happy community, there is no drug problem, no crime and no-one is distraught by the effects wrought on anyone's life by a drug-crazed person.

Of course, the realistic view is at odds with that. Some people do find a need for a release and, whether or not they originally commence a series of drug takings with the object of becoming trapped, my view is that once they have made that decision to seek release in the first instance in pharmacological mechanisms they are then trapped. What then happens obviously is a downward spiral which would be addressed by the select committee, which would seek to avoid such drug abusers and misusers from committing crimes, from catching AIDS themselves and, indeed, from society's perspective perhaps more importantly, we would then look at stopping them transmitting HIV, and certainly, if they were not becoming drug crazed, we would look at their not doing things like driving cars under the influence of drugs, which is obviously a matter of great interest to society.

The other realistic thing is that, because we tend to sweep this problem under the carpet, there are so many mindless deaths so often. For argument's sake, when I was Minister for Health, I heard of a number of deaths that were so-called heroin induced of a few years ago involved misinformation circulating within the drug community. For example, if someone was hopelessly under the influence of heroin, in particular, one way of bringing them out was to immerse them in cold water, and I am informed that a number of people actually died not of the effects of heroin overdose but actually from drowning. To me, that seems like an absolutely senseless stupid tragedy.

South Australia has been at the forefront of a number of reforms already in this area, and in identifying that I certainly acknowledge the role of the police and I commend a now retired but good friend of mine, Rob Lean, who did an extraordinarily good job in relation to the Ministerial Council on Drug Strategy. I also particularly acknowledge the role of the Drug and Alcohol Services Council, particularly Mr Graham Stathearn and Dr Robert Ali, who are undoubtedly world leaders in this sphere.

We also have one of the best methadone programs in the world and, whilst I was Minister for Health, we extended that into the private sector, but it is not enough. However, some studies indicated an extraordinarily large effect on the diminution of crime caused by the availability of methadone legally, and that was one small advance which had a positive effect on society. If we were to end up conducting a scientific medical trial (I emphasise 'scientific' and 'medical') a number of dominoes would need to fall. In particular, I recall from my time as Minister for Health that there are a number of customs requirements to actually have the substance available. Tasmania, in particular, with its major poppy industry, would clearly have a major input into this as to whether or not it would be supportive of the Federal Government giving a customs release.

Another particular major domino—and this might be one of the reasons why a number of people in South Australia are wary of such a program—is called the 'honey pot effect'. We would need to ensure that South Australia does not become, as is clearly evident from the name, a honey pot for drug abusers. No-one need worry about this, because I know that it is not beyond the wit of legislators to overcome these problems. Indeed, previous similar ventures, which the select committee which will hopefully be formed by the passage of this motion may investigate, included ways in which the honey pot effect can be categorically stopped, so there is no need to be concerned about that.

This is a topic about which I feel passionate. I battled for a number of years in the Australian Health Ministers Council to get this over the line, and I certainly acknowledge the Chief Minister of the ACT, Kate Carnell, in her moves as well. Accordingly, when we eventually did get this over the line on the third attempt, I was very disappointed when the Prime Minister identified that this national trial would not go ahead. I certainly acknowledge his sincerity in saying that he did not want this trial to go ahead because (and I quote him), 'I am a father'. Well, Sir, I too am a father and, in my view, the fact that so many parents are distraught by the effect of drugs on their children is not a reason for not having such a trial: it is the very reason we should advance such a trial.

Our overseas knowledge is voluminous, and their experiences are positive. We have the opportunity to learn from their experience and to do something of great social import. Given some of the things that occur in Parliaments around Australia, I contend that to be able to do something of this magnitude and to have a great effect on society in general is an opportunity that is rarely accorded parliamentarians, and I sincerely hope that we grasp that nettle.

I acknowledge that the whole issue of drug abuse is a frightening topic. As I said before, whilst it can be frightening, we ought not be frightened as legislators from investigating the options in respect of whether we can do something positive and see society improve through those efforts. I acknowledge the efforts of the member for Waite in again focusing the attention of the House on this important social measure. I certainly support the motion, and I would urge other members of the House to do likewise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms RANKINE (Wright): I rise in support of the motion of the member for Waite.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Spence for the second time.

Mr Atkinson: What about the member for Adelaide?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms RANKINE: I rise in support of the motion of the member for Waite and concur in the comments of my two colleagues who have spoken previously. I think there can be no doubt that heroin addiction is one of the most insidious plagues besetting our young people. As we have heard, there are about 20 000 heroin users here in South Australia and 5 000 addicts.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The member for Spence interjected across the Chamber that I am corrupt. I request that he either verify his claim immediately—and I would prefer that he do it outside so that I can sue him immediately—or that he withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I did not hear the remark; there was another debate going on. If the—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member did make the remark—and certainly it would be a most unparliamentary remark if he did make it—I would ask him to withdraw. The Chair did not hear it and therefore is not in a position to force a withdrawal, other than that if it did float across the Chamber I would ask the honourable member to withdraw it. Can the honourable member confirm that he said it?

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Adelaide and I had a private quarrel in which he insulted me and I insulted him back. I withdraw my remark; I hope he will also withdraw his.

Members interjecting:

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

Ms RANKINE: I suggest that the two boys go outside if they want to go toe to toe; this is a really important debate. I believe it is time that we took some control in this issue. We have to be prepared to take back our children—I think it is as serious as that. This Parliament has the opportunity to show the leadership and courage that our Prime Minister so clearly lacked. He had before him a unique opportunity, and what he did was show that he had a backbone consistent with Aeroplane Jelly. We have had the member for Adelaide reminding us that people are very fearful of this topic—and they are. Many people have had no contact with drugs whatsoever, and it is probably one of the two greatest fears that face most parents.

I am the mother of two sons, and the two greatest threats that I see to my sons are road accidents and drugs. As parents we can only do our best, but none of us know whether or not we are doing the right thing. All we can do is hope and pray that the support and love we give our children through the vulnerable years will work. Some of us are lucky and some of us are not, but we must remember that drug addicts are not some abstract identities: they are our children.

I was really moved recently to read an article in the *Australian* by Duncan Campbell. Part of the byline of this article was 'The "war on drugs" failed to save my child.' Duncan Campbell wrote about the trauma that his family and daughter went through fighting 20 years of heroin addiction. I will read briefly from that article, as follows:

> One of our children died accidentally in September after injecting herself with heroin in her apartment in Sydney. The illegally supplied drugs that long shamed and finally killed her. . .

This is something that has obviously had a deep and lasting effect on this family, and it is a tortuous event that no-one should have to go through. At her funeral they printed some words on Jennifer's behalf and they quoted the Native

American war leader Chief Joseph when he conceded defeat to the US Congress: 'I will fight no more forever.' Mr Campbell states:

> [This] was the case for Jennifer, as for many drug addicted people, that the fight is forever because in the end the fight is with themselves.

Jennifer went through many processes to beat her drug addition. She went through detoxification and for Jennifer, as for many addicts, it was it was a terrifying prospect. It was a form of torture that she was forced to endure that ultimately most of them fail. She went through institutions to try to instil in herself discipline, seclusion and protection and to avail herself of their guidance. She joined supportive bands of other addicts in groups such as Narcotics Anonymous. She went through psychotherapy. She went through specialist acupuncture. She was involved in the methadone program, and the question that is raised there is: if methadone, why not heroin; and, if it is legal, why is it not available from a normal doctor or pharmacy without the stigma and other complications of a methadone clinic?

Finally, she went through a pilot project with naltrexone, wanting passionately to free her life of addiction and the control this insidious drug had on her. Duncan makes the point that heroin addicts are not necessarily weak: they are wounded and disarmed from the outset and have to fight on, despite going from frailty to frailty. He says that we should imagine in his daughter's case living and dying like this for 20 years, repeatedly trying the seven ways and always relapsing and eroding your self-respect; imagine desperately finding money and faking your life away; imagine having to depend on the most callous criminals; and imagine wishing the impossible—to visit your family doctor for regular small injections or prescriptions.

Whilst this is only one example of the heart rending tragedy that one family has gone through, I am sure it mirrors circumstances in which thousands of families have found themselves and unfortunately thousands more will find themselves in the future. This is about our children. Drug addiction is costing our community something like $2 billion a year in drug related crime. Perhaps those who do not accept the compassionate arguments will accept the economic argument. What we must accept, however, is that what we are doing now simply is not working.

Increasingly even those who could be considered to be the most conservative viewholders in our community are coming out publicly and saying, 'We must look at other ways of tackling this issue.' I support this motion because it is the very first step in looking at how we can do this better. I will conclude my remarks by paraphrasing Mr Campbell again as follows:

> There is no wisdom in policies that do not aim at some creative control of consumption, and pretend that merely condemning this problem can in any way be productive.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Local Government): I also rise to commend the member for Waite and those who have already spoken in support of the motion. Like the member for Adelaide, I have long held some convictions about drug reform. They are not so much related to drugs as to the need for us as a society to constantly never be afraid to seek the truth and never be afraid to confront the difficult issues when they need confronting. For too long, even in this Chamber, the prejudicial views of the ill-informed have held sway, and there are instances even in this place of legislation that has been enlightened but has been doomed to fail because, to quote a noted religious leader in this State, you cannot lead the sheep any further than the sheep are prepared to follow.

It is always to be deplored when we can see that something needs change, that it is sensible and intelligent and, as the member for Adelaide says, may well save human life but we find that we cannot do it because there are prejudiced and ill-informed views, people who would rather victimise others than face problems, look them squarely in the eye and try to solve them. I commend the member for Waite for this initiative. I would like to have seen him expand it further because it starts an important debate: that we should be looking, as he says, scientifically at a whole range of problems associated with substance abuse in our society. Heroin is but one problem—there are many others and most are treated in the same prejudicial way: either enormous prejudice in favour of them because they are an allowed drug or enormous prejudice against them because we have closeted them and said that we are going to victimise people who use these drugs.

I am not for the banning of any drug; and I am similarly not for the decriminalisation of any drug. I am for an absolutely informed debate, a scientific investigation and this House doing as it has courageously done sometimes in the past century and showing leadership and vision and doing not what is popular but what is right. I would rather be judged in future for having sat here and spoken for what was right than for what was deemed to be politically correct at the time. I need say no more than this: that, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (and the member for Spence waits to tell me that it was the fourteenth or some other quaint correction), people were burned or put to death because they dared to say that the world was round because theology at the time said the world was flat, so flat it had to be.

The Hon. R.B. Such interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I am not surprised to hear that the member for Fisher still thinks that it is flat. In all ages and at all times there have been people courageous enough to see what they believe to be the truth and to speak what they believe to be the truth, and society has inevitably benefited from it. This House should not move away from that concept. What the member asks for is not a radical reform to the law but an absolute scientific analysis so that this House might make an informed rather than prejudiced decision that really just caves in to sectional interest groups and those people in our society who bleat the loudest. We are entrusted in this place with leadership and with doing our best for all South Australians, not responding in the quickest way or with a knee-jerk reaction to small but very vocal bleeding hearts. I commend the member for Waite for the motion.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I rise briefly to give my strong support to this motion and congratulate and thank the member for Waite for having the courage to move this motion in this House. No-one is more anti-drugs than me, and that goes back to 1986 when I crossed the floor and voted against the decriminalisation of marijuana and copped an awful lot of flak for doing that from a lot of people. I am just as anti-drugs today as I was then. We have lost the war against drugs and we have to try something else. I agree with the member for Elizabeth when she said that this is a medical problem and not a police problem. I certainly agree with that. It is not directly a police problem but a medical problem, although the implications of drug abuse do become a police problem in the way things happen with house breakings and the need for

these desperate, pathetic people who get hooked on drugs to raise the necessary money to fund their habit. It becomes a police problem in that context.

Any member who supports the motion is not necessarily supporting a medical heroin trial but supporting the establishment of a select committee to investigate whether or not the Government should establish a scientific medical trial. They are two separate questions and issues. One is about a trial and the other is about a select committee to look at whether or not we have a trial. Irrespective of members' personal views on drugs and drug abuse, it would be irresponsible not to support this motion. It would be putting one's head in the sand and hoping the problem will go away. We all know that this will not happen. Governments must be pro-active and must do something to stem the tide of this awful social problem that has swept the world.

Some people have been critical of the narrowness of the terms of reference. Another select committee is looking at the general problem of drugs. If this committee is established, it will specifically look at having a heroin trial. I strongly support the motion moved by the member for Waite and congratulate him for so moving and urge other members of the House to support it.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I rise to support the motion of the member for Waite and commend him on his initiative. I have always taken the view that members of Parliament should not only represent their electors but also provide leadership, and this is a good example of doing that. The community expects Parliament to grapple with issues that are confronting our society and seek to provide solutions to those problems.

I think this is a case where we have in our society another form of cancer in the form of drugs, and the proposed trial is a step, albeit a small step, along the road to try to deal with the issue of a particular drug in our community. No-one would pretend that a trial in itself was the total answer: it could not be. We know that the reasons why people get involved in drug taking are complex and relate to a lot of factors in our society, not the least of which are the breakdown in the family unit, a decline in basic values, a sense of alienation, hopelessness and all those sorts of things, but we find that, even in families where people are materially well off, some people, mainly young people, are still tempted to go down the path of drug taking.

My view is that life is precious and that we should not squander and waste it. It grieves me greatly to see not only young people but people of any age literally throwing their life away through drugs or by any other means. That is brought home to me at the moment, because a young relative of mine at the age of 25 has a very serious form of cancer. When I see someone like that battling to stay alive and I also see and hear of people who are not afflicted with something but who are basically throwing their life away, it causes me great sadness and grief.

I would be happy to move straight towards a trial—and I was disappointed that the Prime Minister did not support a trial some months ago—but the creation of a select committee, as long as it is not too lengthy, I believe is appropriate. I trust that, as a result of that select committee, we as a community can move one step closer to dealing with a very serious problem in our society which is resulting in increased levels of crime and, as I indicated earlier, a wastage of human life. I commend, once again, the member for Waite for his initiative; I wish this motion well; I strongly support it and I look forward to a select committee being formed in the very near future.

Ms KEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

GLENTHORNE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hanna:

That the Environment, Resources and Development Committee investigate and report on options for future use of the Glenthorne Farm site, taking into consideration:

(a) the proposal for a wine industry training centre on the site;

(b) the Premier's public statement that there would be no housing development on the site;

(c) the value placed on open space by the local community; and

(d) the historic and cultural significance of the site.

(Continued from 4 November. Page 210.)

Mr HILL (Kaurna): I move:

Leave out the words 'Environment, Resources and Development Committee investigate and report on options for future use of the Glenthorne Farm site, taking into consideration' and insert—'Premier include the member for Mitchell, as the local State MP, on his committee to investigate and report on options for future use of the Glenthorne Farm site; and the committee should consider and publicly report on'.

Members interjecting:

Mr HILL: I was laughing at the member for Bright.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will come to order.

Mr HILL: Thank you, Sir. The Glenthorne Farm issue has been kicked around for some time in political circles. At the most recent Federal election, the Federal Government agreed to sell the property to the State Government for the sum of $7 million. That was heralded as a great boon for the local Liberal candidate at the last Federal election, Ms Susan Jeanes. Unfortunately, I think she was sidetracked by the issue of Glenthorne and forgot the other main issues about which the electors of Kingston were concerned, that is, the GST, hospitals, education, jobs and so on. The Labor candidate for the area, David Cox, while mindful of Glenthorne, of course, did concern himself with other matters, and history shows he was correct in the balance he gave to the various issues.

Glenthorne Farm is an important issue for the southern suburbs. It comprises a vast amount of open space which has been used by the CSIRO over many years for a range of purposes. It would be absolutely tragic if this piece of land was to be developed. The Labor Party prior to the 1997 State election raised the issue—

Members interjecting:

Mr HILL: The Labor Party, prior to the last State election, promised that this land would not be developed. Both the Federal Leader of the Opposition and the State Leader of the Opposition held a number of press conferences on the site and said that, under Labor, the land would not be developed. As a result of that, the pressure was put on your side, member for Bright—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HILL: Pressure was put on the other side of the House to do something about this issue, because the then local member for Kingston was getting desperate as she saw an issue on which she sought to make the running slipping away from her. Prior to the last Federal election, a promise was made whereby State money was to be paid for the site.

Interestingly, prior to that, Mr Greg Trott, a wine maker of great distinction from the southern suburbs and a gentleman whom I like very much and for whom I have a great deal of respect—in fact, he is something of an icon in the McLaren Vale area—made a suggestion about what should happen on that site. He suggested that it should be put under viticulture and that some sort of institute of wine research or wine investigation be placed on that site so that piece of land could remain as open space and also be used for wine industry purposes.

That was different from the proposition that the Labor Party had put, but it seemed like a reasonable proposal because it meant that the land would remain as open space and it would be used for useful purposes. Some time earlier this year, the State Government announced that it was spending $5 000 to investigate the feasibility of the national viticulture training centre at O'Halloran Hill, as it was called in an article in the *Southern Times* Messenger of 17 June. A committee was established—the Government is good at setting up committees—in June. As I understand it, that committee reported to the Premier in July, and an article in the *Southern Times* stated:

> A draft scoping study has already been prepared on Glenthorne Farm at O'Halloran Hill by Adelaide 21 project director and urban planning consultant, Professor Michael Lennon, but there is no word when the plans will be made publicly available.

That was on 15 July 1998; we are now getting towards the end of November and that draft plan has still to be made public. I believe the reason why it is yet to be made public is that that plan suggests that either the viticulture centre is unworkable without a large investment of public money or, alternatively, that some of the site should be sold off for housing. If that is the case, if the only way we can get this centre to work is by putting housing on the site, that will be a complete breach of the Premier's promise during the most recent Federal election when he said:

> When we buy it for $7 million, we promise there will be no housing on the site.

I suspect that this is the reason why this very important report, which was produced in July this year, is still sitting unopened and unreleased on the Premier's desk. The Premier's way of handling this matter is to set up yet another committee. The member for Mawson is taking credit for this proposal by Greg Trott—I am now looking at the best view of the member for Mawson; I am glad that he has come into the Chamber—and the Premier has put him on the committee and left off the local member, the member for Mitchell. Presumably, this committee will investigate the Lennon inquiry and a whole range of other issues.

I suspect that the Premier will have to back away from his commitment to have no housing on the Glenthorne Farm site because the deal will not stack up without some injection of capital. Either the Government will dip into its pockets again and put more money into the site or there will be housing, factories, shops or some sort of development to make the proposal stack up. I hope I am not right, but I suspect very much that this will happen.

Debate adjourned

OLYMPIC TORCH RELAY

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): I move:

> That this House welcomes the announcement of the Olympic torch relay as an exciting celebration of Australia's hosting of the 2000 Olympic Games. It is an important opportunity to promote many of our State tourism assets and a vital component of our local celebrations for the coming Olympic Games.

This event is the most important single sporting event—and, I think, social event—that will occur in our city for the next 20 years. Some people would disagree with that, but the torch relay will be an important part of the Olympic Games which are to be held in Sydney. I will begin by quoting from the official statement on the Olympic torch relay, as follows:

> The Olympic Games are about being part of something bigger than yourself, sharing the history, spirit, ceremony and tradition of the most enduring and admirable human event of all time, and the torch relay literally and figuratively embodies this sense of sharing—from the simple connection of two individuals as the torch is passed from one to the next in the sharing of the spirit of the torch relay with all Australians and the entire world.

There is absolutely no doubt that the Sydney Olympic Games will capture the spirit and imagination of our nation. I had the privilege as Minister for Recreation and Sport to represent this Government in Atlanta. The enthusiasm and excitement that was developed in the city in the short time I was there was unbelievable.

I will remember two of the main events for a long time. I refer to the opening ceremony in general and, in particular, the most unbelievable emotion that swept through the arena when Muhammad Ali took the torch and lit the Olympic flame. It was an incredibly emotional scene in which all the American and other spectators paid tribute to this magnificent athlete who, as we know, has been afflicted with a major muscle disease.

The culmination of the torch relay at Atlanta was very special for the host nation and for my wife, Judy, and I. I see exactly the same thing taking place here as the Olympic torch is carried around Australia and finally delivered in the stadium to one special person. I understand that a lot of gambling is taking place at the moment on who that person might be, but one special Australian will finally light the Olympic flame.

Some of the very gutsy and important individual incidents that took place at the Olympics involved a few South Australians. I refer to Gill Rolton's incredibly gutsy ride in the equestrian event when she broke her collarbone; the absolutely amazing effort of Kieren Perkins, which will go down in Australian sporting history as something very special that happened in Atlanta; and also the absolute disappointment when Shane Kelly's foot slipped out of the stirrup in the cycling event. My wife and I attended that event. We sat in the sun for three hours waiting for it to start, and in about one-tenth of a second Shane Kelly's whole future disappeared. He was the world champion—he held the world record—and it was felt at that time that almost certainly he would have won the event. So, we saw fantastic enthusiasm in favour of the winners and the distress and disappointment of the losers.

The history of the Olympic torch and the way in which it will be carried around Australia is an important part of the whole event. This event brings together what the Olympics is all about. The history of the torch goes right back to the first Olympic Games when the torch was carried across Olympia to Athens for the holding of the first modern Olympic Games. The torch for the Sydney Games will travel right across the world from Guam to Sydney. The event begins with the lighting ceremony in Olympia in early May 2000. The torch then touches down in Guam, and the relay through Oceania begins on Tuesday 23 May 2000. It will arrive at Uluru in Central Australia on 8 June and then

travel all around Australia. I will refer in a moment to the plan for the torch relay through South Australia.

In essence, this is a very special world wide event that signals, as I said earlier, the beginning of one of the biggest sporting and social events that is likely to take place in this country in the next 20 years. The community will be involved in the process. There will be a whole range of opportunities for members of the community to become involved as torch bearers. Some 10 000 Australians will carry the torch—a significant number—and I understand that about 800 to 1 000 people in South Australia will take part. Nominations will be opened through the *Sunday Mail* and the *Advertiser* during the next few months, and successful applicants will be announced on 26 January 2000.

The torch will arrive in South Australia at Port Augusta and then go to Whyalla and Port Lincoln, by plane back to Port Augusta, then to Port Pirie, Clare, Tanunda, Gawler, the Adelaide suburbs, Hahndorf, Murray Bridge, Bordertown, Naracoorte and Penola, and then through Mount Gambier to Victoria. So, significant coverage of the relay will take place in our State.

Another important issue is the involvement of the Adelaide University in the development of the flame. The lighting of the flame, the gas that will be used to keep it alight and the technology that has been created to make sure that the flame stays alight in the air and under water have been developed by researchers at the University of Adelaide who are working with a team experienced in fuel combustion technology towards producing a flame that can withstand gusts of wind up to 65 km/h, resist snow, rain, hail and dust storms, and function in temperatures ranging from -15°C to 45°C. And, of course, this torch has to burn underwater, as it will go down with a diver off the Queensland coast in our Great Barrier Reef area. So, the torch has to be able to remain alight. It is fantastic that Adelaide University is involved in that technology development.

Also of importance to South Australia is the fact that, as this torch moves through the State, it gives us an opportunity to promote South Australia from a tourism perspective, and it also enables young people, and some of us who missed the Olympic Games in 1956, to be part of this very special celebration in the year 2000. The economic benefits are quite enormous for the State, not only in relation to the torch bearing aspect but also because of a whole range of other issues connected with the Olympic Games. Through the Prepared to Win program, which has been the most significant sporting program linked to the Olympic Games, we have seen here in South Australia some tremendous economic boosts, and we will see the Japanese and New Zealand cycling teams, Swedish swimmers, German sprint cyclists, the New Zealand track and field team, individual teams from the Czech Republic and, of course, the Australian cyclists who are based here in Adelaide.

Non-Olympic teams coming to South Australia is another significant spin-off from the Prepared to Win program, and I congratulate the people working in the Department of Recreation and Sport team who, with the aid of technology through the Internet and CD-ROM, have been able to put South Australia on the map as a base for the training of sporting teams.

As I mentioned, I had the privilege to visit Atlanta, where we released the Prepared to Win program, and we received from both the American Chamber of Commerce and Austrade here an impressive series of letters commending the State Government and, in particular, the Department of Recreation and Sport, for putting together that program. It is one of the spin-offs from the Olympic Games, and I estimate that we will see in our State somewhere between $20 million and $30 million worth of economic activity directly as a result of the Prepared to Win program. I believe that that is a fantastic result. Seeing our cyclists being trained here in Adelaide is a very special thing for us all and, with Charlie Walsh (and whoever coaches it in the future) and the team, I am quite sure that South Australia will continue to have tremendous representation in relation to cycling.

South Australians will feel tremendous pride as a result of these activities, and that will be boosted along with the obvious pride that will develop out of Sydney and the Olympic Games in that great city. We can be part of this whole process, and I believe that we ought to be congratulating the SOCOG management team for going out of its way to make sure that all of Australia is involved in the promotion of this very special sporting event. I believe that both State and Federal Governments, as well as this committee, have really gone out of their way to make sure that it happens.

I would also like to mention here the *Advertiser*, because the Olympic torch relay souvenir was one of the best information papers that the *Advertiser* has published. I am not very often congratulatory of the *Advertiser* but in this case the research, the detail and the general readability of this torch relay event was admirable. It is a souvenir that I believe all of us should keep, because it really is something very special.

It is a privilege for me to move this motion. I encourage other members to support it and to make sure that we can all get together in September in the year 2000 to celebrate this very special event here in Australia.

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): I would like to speak in support of this motion and, in so doing, I congratulate the member for Bragg on bringing the motion to the Parliament. The Olympic Games is, if not the greatest sporting event in the world, certainly one of the greatest sporting events in the world and, with the torch relay being such a significant part of the Olympic Games, I believe that we should not let this opportunity go by. There is a great history with regard to the Olympic torch which I will touch on in a moment. The culture of the Olympic Games is very significant.

As much as we will benefit as a State from a tourism point of view, the people I want to see most become involved in this are our children. It will be our children who, in many ways, will be the carriers of the torch into the next millennium. They will become our next generation of athletes in the Olympic Games, and I invite all the schools right around South Australia to become involved in this event in one way or another, even if they have to travel some distance.

What we should all be aware of and what we should not underestimate is the fact that the Olympic torch plays a very significant historical part in the Olympic Games. The Olympic flame dates back to the first recorded Olympics in Olympia in 776 BC. It became incorporated in the modern Olympic Games in 1928 but it was not until 1936 that the first torch relay occurred. During the modern Olympiad through to the present day, quite significant events have occurred with respect to the torch involving breakthroughs as to how the torch relay has taken place.

The tradition of running the flame into the Olympic stadium commenced with the 1936 Olympic Games, and that is something which is now a part of our culture and to which we all look forward. There was an article in the last *Weekend Australian*, I believe it was, about Ron Clarke carrying the

Olympic torch into the Melbourne Cricket Ground for Australia's 1956 Olympics. Indeed, one can highlight a number of events with respect to the various Olympiads. For example, in 1948, when Greece was engaged in a civil war, the flame was transported from Olympia to the coast at Katakolon. Not only was this a triumph over adversity but it was also the first time that the Olympic flame was transported over water. In 1956, the flame was transferred into two miners' lamps and flown to Darwin via Calcutta, Bangkok, Singapore and Jakarta. This relay took 21 days to reach Melbourne and covered a distance of 20 470 kilometres. By the time it reached Melbourne the flame had passed through the hands of 3 118 runners and had been escorted by both civilian and military vehicles working in three shifts.

Of course, we have great affection for the 1956 Olympics. Not only was it a significant event for Australia but, of course, this is where we unearthed a number of our famous athletes, whom we still hold very dear. Betty Cuthbert won the sprinting events—the double; Dawn Fraser commenced her triple gold medal winning swimming at the Melbourne Olympics; and Mervyn Rose also was very successful in the pool.

Two firsts for the Olympic torch relay occurred in 1968 when, retracing the route of Christopher Columbus's journeys on a Greek destroyer, the flame was brought ashore by a relay of 17 swimmers. It was at the end of this relay that Basilio became the first woman ever to carry the flame and light the cauldron. This first for women was closely followed by a first for wheelchair athletes, and in 1972 at the Munich Olympics a wheelchair athlete carried the torch in as part of the relay. In 1976, the torch relay represented a synthesis between tradition and modern technology: whilst olive oil was used as the fuel for the torch to honour the origin of the Olympic flame, the flame was transferred to a sensor which transmitted electric impulses via satellite, igniting the flame in Montreal by laser beam.

This is an event of great historical importance. It is an opportunity in which all South Australians can participate, and I invite them to do so. But at a minimum let us make sure that all our children who are growing up and who, hopefully, are interested and involved in sport will take this opportunity. As the torch travels around South Australia there will be many opportunities for people to become involved. The torch will visit places such as Port Lincoln, Port Pirie, Clare, Tanunda, Gawler, Adelaide (of course), Hahndorf, Murray Bridge, Bordertown, Naracoorte, Penola and Mount Gambier. So, there will be many opportunities for people to become involved. By the time the torch leaves South Australia it will have travelled 1 146 kilometres by road and 500 kilometres by air. It will also have covered an average distance of 143 kilometres per day. There will be something like 800 torchbearers.

The economic spin-off for South Australia will be significant. Indeed, it has been estimated that, for each day the torch is here, $15 000 will be injected into various South Australian communities. This is just in the spin-off from support facilities required by the torchbearers. When the money generated by increased tourism is added, the figures increase dramatically. Since the torch will pass through or near 33 towns (excluding capital city areas), the Olympic torch relay will provide regional South Australia with a much needed boost. This is tourism which we must take advantage of.

Some of the benefits to South Australia from the Olympics can already be seen. One such benefit will apply to the arts community, due to its participation in the second Olympic Arts Festival. As part of this festival, entitled 'A Sea Change', South Australia has events and celebrations planned right up to the year 2000. An example of such an event occurred on 14 November at the Port Adelaide lighthouse concert. This was a combined effort of the Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games and the City of Port Adelaide Enfield. Appropriately, the Port's red lighthouse was re-lit for an hour during the concert in preparation for the Olympic flame. Not only are such events an attraction for tourists, but they also provide direct economic benefits for local businesses.

Another event which is expected to bring increased tourism to South Australia is an Art Gallery of South Australia exhibition of different artists' interpretations of the Fleurieu Peninsula. Reflecting South Australia's rich cultural heritage is the Skaubryn Project, a play performed by Adelaide theatre group Theatro Oneiron and which is based on the experience of South Australia's Greek migrants. These are just some of the South Australian contributions to the Olympic Arts Festival, contributions which will bring increased tourism, international attention and economic benefits to this State.

In the sporting area I predict that the opportunities will be untold. Let us have the maximum benefit, let us make sure that all South Australians contribute to and obtain the benefits from the Olympic Games. Let us ensure that we take hold of whatever benefits we can get to this State as a result of the Olympic Games in Sydney. We must leave no stone unturned in our efforts to attract to South Australia international sporting teams that want to train here in the lead-up to the Sydney Olympics. This is a magnificent opportunity for all South Australians and all Australians to be involved in probably the biggest, most diverse and most popular sporting event in the world's sporting calendar.

This is an opportunity that cannot be missed. I look forward to the torch being a vital part of the event. I am delighted that the member for Bragg, the former Minister for Tourism, has moved this motion, which all members should support. It is a very sensible and practical motion, and I commend it to the Parliament.

Motion carried.

RING CYCLE

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I move:

That this House congratulates the State Opera of South Australia and the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra on their superb presentation and Australia's first full scale production of Richard Wagner's *Ring* cycle and further congratulates the Government and in particular the Minister for the Arts on the significant vision and support provided to enable the staging of this magnificent production in Adelaide.

I am pleased to move this motion, although at the outset I point out that I needed to correct the motion. Some time between my presenting it to the House and its appearing in the Notice Paper today, Wagner's Christian name had changed. I am not sure whether this is Richard's twin brother, Michael, but it is, of course, Richard Wagner rather than Michael Wagner as appears on the Notice Paper.

I was one of the privileged few members to attend the four nights of the Cycle. I take this opportunity to thank my colleagues on both sides of the House for enabling me to attend what as far as I was concerned was probably one of the highlights of my life. It was a magnificent experience. It was a magnificent experience for those of us who were able to

attend, and it was magnificent for South Australia and for Adelaide in particular. Although I had been told that a large percentage of the audience would travel to Australia from overseas, I was amazed at how many people had actually travelled from the other side of the world to Adelaide for this production.

Of course, as far as the *Ring* cycle is concerned, that is not new. Members would have read in the morning press that one particular gentleman travelled to Adelaide from the United States and that this was the fiftieth production of the *Ring* cycle he had attended. I certainly met people who were attending their tenth, eleventh or twelfth *Ring* cycle. It may interest members to know that sitting directly in front of my wife and me were two couples who had travelled from Munich in Germany specifically for the production and that behind us a couple had travelled from the south of France to Adelaide just for the event. I might say that, while they appeared to be delighted with the production, they were also most impressed with Adelaide and with South Australia. Overall, it was a great success, and it continues to be because, of course, we have only just finished the first Cycle, with further Cycles to take place. In one of the publications that advertised this production, the Premier said:

> The State Opera of South Australia's production of Wagner's [Ring cycle] will be Australia's premier artistic event of the remaining years of this century.

I would suggest that, as far as South Australia and Australia are concerned, it would probably be one of the premier artistic events of the century. The Premier went on to say:

> The South Australian Government is proud that the State Opera will lead the way in presenting this bold undertaking together with Arts SA, the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra and Australian Major Events. This is an event that the whole of Australia can celebrate. It will be the first opportunity for Australians to see a complete production of the *Ring* cycle in their own country and the production is a wonderful example of Australian and international artistic collaboration.

It was certainly that. One cannot help but be impressed at the list of corporate sponsors who have swung their support behind this production. Time does not allow me to refer to all of them, but the numbers are significant. Of course, we are all extremely proud of both the State Opera of South Australia and the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra. As to the State Opera, it is almost five years since the idea to stage the *Ring* in Adelaide was first discussed.

Debate adjourned.

The SPEAKER: Call on Orders of the Day: Other Motions.

JET SKIS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hill:

That this House calls on the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning to prepare regulations for submission to the Governor in Executive Council under the Harbors and Navigation Act 1993—

(a) that provide for the regulation, restriction or prohibition of motorised jet skis in specified waters within I kilometre of the seashore adjacent to metropolitan Adelaide and other coastal cities and towns in the State;

(b) that take into account the views of local government councils that have areas adjoining those waters to ensure that appropriate regulations, restrictions or prohibitions are in place to protect public safety and to allow the public to enjoy the beaches without unreasonable disruption or disturbance; and

(c) that provide appropriate exemptions for jet skis used by surf life saving clubs.

(Continued from 19 November. Page 321)

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (Peake): I support the member for Kaurna's motion to ban jet skis from our shores and beaches. Jet skis are a novel form of entertainment and, as we have seen in newspaper reports and the Minister's statement, they are a much cheaper alternative to boats for recreational boating and skiing. Production improvements for jet skis has seen their greater use in water skiing and the like. We have to consider who the beaches are for and how they should be used. I do not believe beaches are just for people with jet skis, although generally people are very responsible about the use of jet skis but, unfortunately, many families who use metropolitan beaches would like to use those beaches without having to worry about dodging jet skis and the noise that they cause. Jet skis are loud, but they do not emit noise greater than the decibels allowed by regulations under the Noise Emissions Act.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Jet skis are great fun, as the member for Hart says. The member for Hart has promised to take me out on his jet ski, although no one has ever been on his jet ski apart from Kevin, because he will not allow anyone else to use it. I have had a number of complaints from people in the West Beach area whom I will be attempting to represent after the next State election. Many of these people have been telling me, 'Mr Koutsantonis, we enjoy using our beaches, which are a wonderful natural asset. They are the pride of South Australia.' I grew up in the western suburbs and have always enjoyed the beach. In fact, I have always felt that, when I am near a beach, I am near home because the beaches are an integral part of the western suburbs. The beaches are there for the enjoyment of everyone.

I often see people from the eastern and southern suburbs coming to use our beaches in the western suburbs because they are the best beaches in South Australia, as the members for Hart and Lee would attest: we have the best beaches in South Australia. West Beach and Henley Beach are far superior beaches, and the last thing we want to see is a lowering of people's enjoyment of these beaches resulting from the unreasonable use of jet skis along the coast.

In her ministerial statement the Minister argued the case for a reduction in speed to 4 knots. The shadow Minister and I find this totally unacceptable. Basically, the Minister is trying to jet ski over the issue and is trying to calm the waters. The Minister has realised that many people who use jet skis are probably sympathetic to the Liberal Party. However, beaches are just not there for the enjoyment of young playboys—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: —or playgirls. Our beaches are there for the enjoyment of all South Australians. I am pleased to see the member for Kaurna's courageous move to ensure that jet skis do not operate to the detriment of people's enjoyment of our beaches. I have been amazed how the Government has been attacking fishermen over the past five years—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Fisherpeople.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Fishes of the sea.

Mr Lewis: Fishers, not fishes.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Fishers. I am corrected by the member for Hammond, and I always take advice from such a noble member of the House. It is amazing how the Government has continually attacked the natural rights of fishers which most South Australians should enjoy. I grew up going fishing with my father and uncles. It was a great form of enjoyment and an excellent way for families to bond together and enjoy recreational fishing, but this Government has continually attacked the rights of those fishers, and it is outrageous. However, in relation to jet skis we have seen this Government cave into the interests of playgirls and playboys who enjoy the use of this very expensive equipment, and I find that outrageous.

Minister Laidlaw in the Upper House, rather than tackle the issue head on, rather than debate the issue and work with the Opposition to find a reasonable outcome and solution, what does she do? She releases a ministerial statement saying that we are going to keep the speed at 4 knots. That is not a solution at all, and I am sure the member for Kaurna agrees with me when I say that the Minister has basically washed her hands of any responsibility in respect of jet skis.

My concern in respect of jet skis relates to their ability to be involved in an accident on the water and cause injury. Jet skis are fast and zippy and are often difficult to control. With the upcoming summer season and the hot weather enjoyed here in South Australia many people flock to our beaches for enjoyment and recreation, and the last thing I would like to see is someone with a jet ski injuring or causing harm to swimmers on our suburban beaches.

It is often noted that when these people are on their jet skis there is little responsibility in terms of how they are policed. When I go fishing I often see an inspector on a jetty or at Port Lincoln, Whyalla or wherever inspecting bag limits and seeing how many fish people have caught, making sure that they do not over fish and the like. However, with regard to jet skis I have not seen many inspectors on suburban beaches, so I wonder how the Government intends to police these craft. How does the Government intend making sure that people do not break the 4 knot speed limit imposed by the Minister?

It seems that the Minister is making policy on the run. She has been pushed into a situation by the Labor Opposition spokesman, the member for Kaurna, because she has no policy or vision on this matter, and it has taken the member for Kaurna—the visionary that he is—to push her into action. It saddens me to think that we have a Minister of the Crown making policy on the run. It is very dangerous to do that, as we have noticed with the Premier and most of his policies, especially those relating to ETSA and the lease—it is basically policy on the run. South Australia deserves better than this, and it will get better than this once the Labor Opposition is in Government in the year 2000 or 2001, whenever the State election is called.

The member for Kaurna has done an excellent job with his motion. I am sure my constituents and the constituents of the member for Colton at West Beach who, hopefully, will be my constituents after the next election, will be pleased to know that it is members on this side who are looking after their interests and not members opposite, and not the Minister, Ms Laidlaw. As I said before, she has washed her hands of the entire issue. It seems a silly scenario when we have the Minister saying, 'The member for Kaurna has done something and I have done nothing on this in the past four years. I will quickly put out a ministerial statement to try to take the initiative away from the member for Kaurna.'

The Minister has not achieved that because many sports and recreational people are coming to us and saying that it is a responsible motion that the member for Kaurna has moved. I agree that he has done an excellent job. The Minister has let down the beach users of South Australia, she has let down the community of South Australia and she has done all people who use recreational beaches a huge disservice.

It is amazing that in her entire time in her portfolio this Minister cannot seem to get it right no matter what she does. She cannot seem to get her policy or her house in order. Whether it is taxi plates, fishers, jet skis or public transport in terms of buses and hire cars, this Minister is continually failing. It is about time the Government realised that it has an incompetent Minister in the Upper House, a Minister who is not dealing with the needs of ordinary South Australians, nor taking into account the concerns of beach users. I have spoken to the member for Colton about this, and I would be interested to hear his views about how well the Minister is handling her Transport portfolio, especially in the area of recreational boat use on our beaches.

In conclusion, I will say that Mr Hill has done an exceptional job—I think I have already said that a couple of times. The Labor Caucus has initiated a committee of seaside members, of which I have been elected secretary. The member for Kaurna is convenor of this committee, which will endeavour to make sure that the views of the people who live at the seaside or use our recreational beaches are voiced.

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): I echo the member for Peake's contribution, but also I commend the shadow Minister and member for Kaurna for bringing this important matter before the House. Certainly, the member for Peake has touched on a number of very sensitive issues. All members of this Chamber on both sides would be very strong in their commendation of the beauty of our coastline. I do not think there is any doubt whatsoever that we have some of the most beautiful beaches that exist in the world. Some of us who have the coastline as part of our electorate are additionally proud. Obviously, we are somewhat sensitive and want to represent the people who live nearby and also the broader community and make sure that the correct balance is achieved with respect to how the beaches are properly used. The member for Kaurna has brought to the House a very sensible and practical motion which by and large all members of the Chamber should support, because we must have the correct balance in the way our beaches are used.

There is little doubt that what the member for Peake said is correct. By and large, most people who use jet skis do it in a very responsible way; they are conscious of their social responsibility. But, that being so, we must be mindful that the majority—probably 99 per cent—of the people who go to the beaches do so on hot days during the summer to swim and otherwise recreate. I think the member for Kaurna has brought a very genuine concern before the House, namely, that there are some problems and concerns with jet skis, and this is a very practical motion that will overcome the concerns and problems that currently exist at our beaches with respect to jet skis.

I would have thought that if the Minister had any brains whatsoever she would pick up this private member's motion that has been put to the Chamber in good faith and adopt it, but of course she will not do that. We have a Minister who has no policy and who is in a vacuum and, when we have something that is sensible and practical, what does she do?

She wants to defer it, set up committees, let this summer go by and allow the situation to continue.

I will be very interested to hear what the members for Colton and Bright and indeed you, Sir, have to say with respect to this motion. All those members I mentioned—the members for Colton, Morphett and Bright—have seaside electorates. You are representing electorates where you have some very busy coastlines and where people go in their thousands during the summer. I suggest that those people would universally support the member for Kaurna's motion and would be most disappointed and in fact disgusted with the policy vacuum and the reaction of the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning to the member for Kaurna's motion.

Let us just dissect it somewhat, so that we are all aware of what the member for Kaurna is suggesting. The member for Kaurna is asking the Minister to provide for the regulation, restriction or prohibition of motorised jet skis in specified waters—that is a very key point of which all members should be aware—within 1 km of the seashore adjacent to metropolitan Adelaide and other coastal cities and towns in the State, and to take account of the views of local government. So, local government, which quite correctly participates and gets involved in this debate, would be able to put its agenda forward as to what areas it recommends with regard to the use of jet skis. So, this brings about some commonsense to this area of achieving some balance and making sure that public safety is at the forefront with respect to the use of jet skis.

I am delighted that this motion also provides for appropriate exemptions for jet skis used by surf lifesaving clubs. The member for Hart and I very proudly represent the Semaphore Surf Lifesaving Club, one of the best surf lifesaving clubs in Australia, and I would be very disappointed if surf lifesaving clubs were not exempted by this, but of course they are. So, all bases are covered. This is a very practical and sensible approach, which members should welcome. A number of members on this side also represent seaside electorates. The members for Kaurna and Hart represent seaside electorates, the member for Peake will represent a seaside electorate, and I am most fortunate that I have probably the most pristine beach in South Australia—certainly in metropolitan Adelaide, anyway. I have Tennyson, the most pristine beach in South Australia.

Although the member for Mawson shakes his head, unfortunately he has not been down to Tennyson, because he has been too busy looking after the police. I invite him to come down to Tennyson. I will give him an inspection. We might even be able to get the police to come down on their horses—some of those new colts and fillies he is so proud of. We might even be able to get him to come down to look at Tennyson, the most pristine beach in South Australia. I also have Semaphore Park, but I know that other members on this and the other side also have some absolutely superb beaches.

This motion is all about getting the correct balance and ensuring that public safety is at the forefront and that jet skis are accounted for in the appropriate way. I might say that as shadow Minister for Recreation and Sport I welcome those people who choose to use jet skis, but they have to be used with public safety very much at the forefront of the whole community's mind. It is important that not only the users of jet skis but also the general public know what, where and how they should be used. The general public must feel safe but also be safe with regard to jet skis.

Jet skis cause concerns and genuine problems on our metropolitan beaches and that must be addressed. The member for Kaurna gives us the opportunity to do so. He brings forward in good faith a motion before this Parliament that gives us the opportunity to address the problems now associated with jet skis, and the Minister should run with it. The Minister should recognise a good idea and not play Party politics. She should recognise that here before us we have the opportunity this summer to adopt a motion that will be good for all people who use our metropolitan beaches and achieves the correct balance. This opportunity cannot be lost.

I invite all the Independents to address this motion seriously and take it in good faith the way it has been designed to ensure that all people who use our beaches do so in a safe and constructive manner. I conclude by noting that the Jet Sports Boating Association also condemns the approach taken by the Minister.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I seek to move an amendment to the proposition that would leave out the comma between 'regulation' and 'restriction' and in place of it put the word 'or' in paragraph (a); further in paragraph (a), leave out 'or prohibition'; leave out 'one kilometre' and in its place insert '200 metres'; and leave out the words 'other coastal cities and towns in the State' and insert 'specified off river areas along the River Murray'. Regarding paragraph (b), I propose to leave out the comma between 'regulations' and 'restrictions' and in its place put the word 'or'; and leave out 'or prohibitions'. Regarding paragraph (c), I propose to leave out the word 'appropriate' and at the end of the line, after the word 'clubs' insert 'and in other appropriate cases', such that the proposition would then read:

That this House calls on the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning to prepare regulations for submission to the Governor in Executive Council under the Harbors and Navigation Act 1993—

(a) that provide for the regulation or restriction of motorised jet skis in specified waters within 200 metres of the seashore adjacent to metropolitan Adelaide and specified off river areas along the River Murray;

(b) that take into account the views of local government councils that have areas adjoining those waters to ensure that appropriate regulations or restrictions are in place to protect public safety and to allow the public to enjoy the beaches without unreasonable disruption or disturbance; and

(c) that provide appropriate exemptions for jet skis used by surf lifesaving clubs and in other appropriate cases.

I thank the member for Goyder for seconding the proposition. I point out to the member for Kaurna that he most certainly has the satisfaction of being the spur that has brought forward consideration of this proposition. Publicly that will be the way it will be perceived, even though I share with him his concern. The member for Schubert revealed in his remarks last week that he also has concern.

Mr Hill interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: The honourable member is right. However, much of what he was proposing was more draconian than is really necessary to deal with the problem. We do not need to prohibit jet skis. They are not anywhere near as damaging as are trail bikes in national parks or as they were prior to the introduction of restrictions that prevented trail bikes from being used in national parks. They are damn noisy things and used to annoy the hell out of me when I lived in Athelstone near Black Hill National Park. They did a great deal of damage. Not only did they tear the top soil to pieces by first stripping off the vegetation but they left gutters in steep slopes that the riders enjoyed riding up and down, which

resulted in gully erosion. People enjoy riding trail bikes—the same kind of people who enjoy riding jet skis.

It is not appropriate for those people who have such inclinations to indulge themselves at the expense of others' peace, safety and the right to enjoy their recreational activity such as bird watching, which will otherwise be disturbed to the point where it is incapable of being pursued; and at the expense of people who enjoy time delay photography of a given spot to note how leaf angle changes as the sun's position changes and such things as that.

In the case of jet ski riders, divers—to whom other speakers have drawn attention—are at great risk of being seriously injured if hit by one of these vehicles, just as if they were to be hit by a speed boat. However, because of the nature of a jet ski, it is more unstable and the angle of its planing varies more violently up and down as it has a shorter fore to aft distance and planes in the water on a shorter base, making it extremely difficult for the operator—far more difficult than for the operator of a speed boat—to see whether there is anyone in the water.

If we do not move this way before high summer—the post Christmas period—there will likely be a major catastrophe. To that extent, I commend the member for Kaurna and other speakers who have expressed their concern about the measure. Whilst personally I would not seek to ride a jet ski—and, indeed, my own skeletal condition would not allow me to ride a jet ski, even if I wanted to—I will not be a spoilsport and deny others who wish to indulge themselves in that way, so long as they do not damage or trample other people's rights.

Under this proposition, which I move as amendments to the member for Kaurna's motion, it would be derelict of the Minister to make it possible for it to happen on every beach. Indeed, it provides the option in consultation with local government to establish the areas where jet ski riders can have their fun and in any event to prevent it from occurring within 200 metres of the shore.

Mr Hill interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes, there is—200 metres. Just get out there further away and do not disturb the people with esplanade and foreshore homes or the people who wish to relax and sleep in the shade on the beach. Take your noise and go—it does not make any difference to your fun; just get it out of our ears and out of our sight.

Mr Hill: But the sound will carry 200 metres.

Mr LEWIS: I doubt it. The amendment from our Minister simply says that in any case it is a minimum of 200 metres and, in any circumstances where the local council and/or the Minister believes it ought to be more than that, regulation will make it so. However, you have to travel at four knots to get out past 200 metres.

Mr Hill interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes, you can paddle them, if you are stupid enough. I commend the amendment to the House and I commend the concern which all members have expressed to date. I do not expect I will see anyone on a jet ski hanging off the seat with their fins on trying to paddle the thing along.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

NOARLUNGA HOSPITAL

A petition signed by 2 500 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the Government to fund intensive care facilities at the Noarlunga Hospital was presented by the Hon. R.L. Brokenshire.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.W. Olsen)—

Office of the Small Business Advocate—Report, 1997-98

By the Minister for Human Services (Hon. Dean Brown)—

Charitable and Social Welfare Fund—Report, 1997-98
Health Commission, South Australian and Human Services, Department of—Report, 1997-98
Health Development—Report, 1997-98
Public Advocate, Office of—Report, 1997-98
Supported Residential Facilities Advisory Committee—Report, 1997-98

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

Land Management Corporation—Report, 30 April to 30 June 1998

By the Minister for Environment and Heritage (Hon. D.C. Kotz)—

Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs, Department for—Report, 1997-98
Environment, South Australian Report on the State of—Summary, 1998

By the Minister for Industry and Trade (Hon I.F. Evans)—

Industry and Trade, Department of—Report, 1997-98

By the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing (Hon. I.F. Evans)—

Greyhound Racing Authority, South Australian—Report, 1997-98
Harness Racing Authority, South Australian—Report, 1997-98.

MOTOROLA

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: As this House is well aware, the Opposition is today excited over a three year old leaked Cabinet subcommittee document. Unfortunately for members opposite, I am about to illustrate the dangers of accepting a mischievous and historical leak in isolation. By selectively misquoting from documents, my opponents are trying to suggest that I have been guilty of some impropriety. They are wrong, and I am about to bring an end to this dripfeed of allegedly damaging material.

But, before I do so, I have some pertinent points to make. First, Motorola has brought 230 jobs and a long-term presence to the South Australian economy. Motorola's presence in this State should be celebrated, not denigrated. That we see it being dragged into gutter politics is a message for interstate and overseas investors that this State cannot afford. To those who think otherwise, I question your commitment to the State and its people.

Now to the specifics of this allegation levelled against me as Minister for Industry. In January 1994, at the behest of the Economic Development Authority, I took a submission to

Cabinet suggesting Motorola be named preferred supplier for a long-promised much-needed Government radio network. I was advised that Motorola, which had won the New South Wales Government contract, had the most suitable equipment. The plan was to offer the company preferred supplier status but with the caveat of its having to meet all commercial criteria. Commercial criteria meant Motorola had to show the experts within the South Australian Government that it had the best technology at the best price when we came to let the contract. In other words, it would only get the contract if it met our criteria, not automatically. It was not a done deal. In fact, it was no deal at all if it was not the best available.

I wrote to Motorola in April 1994 setting out that offer in writing—an offer that was approved by Cabinet. In June 1994, Motorola and the South Australian Government signed a contract for Motorola to set up a software centre at Technology Park. The incentive package within that contract does not include being offered preferred supplier status for the Government radio network. It does not include it because the two issues were to be dealt with separately, and it had been decided both by Motorola and me that they were to be negotiated separately and with no connection with the software centre.

After the software centre contract had been agreed to in September 1994, I answered a question in Parliament truthfully that there were no side deals attached to it. That contract itself proved it. The later problem with that analysis was created when the head of the Office of Information Technology wrote to Motorola in October 1994. This was one month after my answer to Parliament, and I was not aware of his letter. I am informed that he, in turn, was not aware that the software contract had no link to the radio network contract.

This breakdown in communications between the EDA, which had managed the Motorola contract, and the Office of Information Technology, which had carriage of the radio network contract, has since been confirmed. There is no doubt that it was damaging. It is also my understanding that Mr Dundon's letter reactivated within the Public Service my April 1994 letter. Mr Dundon's department moved forward using my April 1994 letter as the base in dealing with Motorola when, in fact, the pertinent document was actually the June 1994 contract. I have said before that communications between the departments was sloppy and, yes, the process was deficient because of that.

When the Cabinet subcommittee met in May 1995, Crown Law advice had been sought on the ramifications of my letter linked with Mr Dundon's letter. What we did not know at the time of the Cabinet subcommittee is critical to this issue today. We did not know that Crown Law gave its legal advice without referring to the June 1994 contract with Motorola. This is confirmed in later advice from the Solicitor-General.

I remind members that the June 1994 contract, the binding software centre contract, does not include any mention of the radio network contract. In fact, it specifically excludes any other matter. In June 1996 the Government sought further legal advice on the issue. Very interestingly, this document has not been leaked. This second round of legal advice is at odds with that which was given to the May 1995 Cabinet subcommittee. It takes a different view.

It is clear to me today that the only way the people of South Australia can have confidence in the commercial negotiations of the Government is to refer every single one of the thousands of pages of documentation on the two Motorola contracts to the Solicitor-General—and this is being done as we speak. I am positive that this inquiry by the Solicitor-General will show, once and for all, that my actions have integrity.

COUNTRY SCHOOLS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Today, I am announcing a new deal for country schools. For a long time, communities in the country of South Australia have complained strongly that successive Governments have ignored their needs and demands, and in some cases they have been right. Central to their complaints is that they believe Government services are designed by Adelaide-based staff with little or no understanding of country life and the problems faced by country people. Again, there is some truth in their belief.

Because of this, I am proposing to radically review the way in which we provide services to country schools and children's services, but I am not going to do it by traditional means whereby officials in Adelaide decide what is needed and country communities are told what should be done. This time, country communities will be called upon to design their own solutions to what they see as their own problems. This is a unique approach which I am certain will deliver better, more timely and more responsive services to country schools and children's services.

As members realise, country people have unique problems often requiring individual and flexible solutions. It is sometimes very difficult for schools and pre-schools in rural areas to access regular and responsive support services such as assistance for children with learning difficulties and speech or behavioural programs, or even for teachers wanting to access a depth of professional training taken for granted elsewhere.

Generally, over the years, all schools across the State, be they in the city or country, have been regarded as though each was the same. There has been, to a very large extent, the philosophy that one size fits all—that if it fits the needs of metropolitan schools, then it will probably fit the needs of schools in the country. This will no longer be the case. Country services will be designed to meet the unique and specific needs of country schools.

This is not a plan to be implemented some time in the future: it will commence immediately. I have instructed the Chief Executive of my department to assign a senior executive officer to commence negotiations with country communities. I have also instructed the Chief Executive to establish a Directorate of Country Services within the department. This directorate will be responsible for providing direct services and support to country schools as designed and required by the country communities. It will give country schools a real presence in Adelaide and provide country communities with flexible responses to local needs. I have further instructed that Country Areas Program funding be maintained at 1998 levels until alternatives are explored under the new arrangements.

I have listened carefully to what people in the country have been saying to me. Quite frankly, they want and deserve a better deal for country children: they want services which offer their children more. They simply want increased opportunities for their children to realise their hopes and aspirations—opportunities which many metropolitan communities take for granted. The Government believes this

innovative and supportive approach to country services to be refreshing, responsive and responsible—a new era for country education.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I bring up the twenty-sixth report of the committee on electricity reform in South Australia and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

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

That the report be printed.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): Did the Premier—

An honourable member: Here we go!

Mr CONLON: Yes, here we go indeed! Did the Premier mislead Parliament last week when he said that the reason the Executive Director of the Government Radio Network, Mr Peter Fowler, did not know about the 24 June 1994 agreement between the Government and Motorola until later this year was 'a process problem between two departments' and that 'one department. . . did not know what another department or agency had signed off'?

A leaked copy of the minutes of an IT Cabinet subcommittee meeting held on 17 May 1995 showed that the Premier, the Deputy Premier, the now Premier (then Minister Olsen), the CEO of Information Technology, the CEO of the EDA, the Executive Director of the IT Unit, the Project Director (Mr Peter Fowler), the General Manager of Contract Negotiation, and four key ministerial advisers were all present at a meeting which discussed the legal obligations of the now Premier's April 1994 letter. Sources have confirmed with the Opposition that the now Premier did not mention the June 1994 agreement to this meeting.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Economic and Finance Committee is looking at this matter. The Opposition has called a number of people as witnesses, which is fine. In addition, I am more than happy to respond to an interjection which I think was from the member for Elder last week or a couple of weeks ago about whether we will cooperate. I will make every item of documentation on this issue available to the Solicitor-General who, under the Solicitor-General's Act, effectively has the status of a judge. He will look at these matters and report.

SA WATER

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Will the Minister for Government Enterprises outline to the House what the Government is doing with the dividends provided by SA Water in the last financial year?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Colton for this question about a very important matter. It is always pleasing to respond to questions of this ilk, because it gives me an opportunity to mention, even if only in passing, the financial crisis that the last and most recent Labor Government left for all South Australians. Responsible financial management is the key to overcoming the legacy left to us by the former Labor Government. The member for Hart laughs at the dilemmas left for all South Australians by the previous Government.

SA Water is a success story which Labor, because of its policy and blinkered attitude to the private sector, can only ever dream about. The facts are that every South Australian is saving a minimum of $100 thanks to better water management. In the last year of the Labor Government, the former EWS made a loss of $47 million. That is a loss which every taxpayer in South Australia had to subsidise.

There are about 1.5 million people in this State, so on average we each paid about $31 to foot the bill for the EWS losses. Obviously, that money could have been spent on other services such as schools, hospitals, roads, police and so on. I will not mention the other significant loss sponsored by the previous Labor Government and its effects on each and every South Australian, but we all know the losses which the Labor Government wrought through its mismanagement of the State's finances.

So, we each paid $31 to foot the bill for the EWS losses. In 1997-98, SA Water returned to the State Government a dividend of $185.4 million—an increase of $82.4 million, which represents, in the main, the return to the Government of community service obligation revenues as part of a budget reform process. An amount of $77.1 million will be paid to SA Water to cover its community service obligations such as the supply of water to regional areas at a lower cost than that incurred in providing the service: in other words, providing water to, for argument's sake, country areas.

The remaining $108 million will be used by the Government for services that matter to South Australians such as education, health and public safety. That amounts to $72 per South Australian that would otherwise have had to come from tax increases to maintain the current level of services. So, better management has allowed the Government to increase spending on the Health Commission, the Education Department and so on whilst cutting water prices from last July, but Labor has constantly opposed this reform.

In opposing this reform, it is clear that Labor must think that South Australians should pay twice for their water—once with their water bill and then again with funds diverted away from other vital Government services—or that country consumers should pay more for their water services. We all know just how dedicated the Labor Party in Government and Opposition is to the rural areas, and its concern about this clearly means that it wants country consumers to pay more for their water services. Or is the Labor Party in Opposition saying that we should cut Government spending by $184 million or, conversely, that we should raise taxes by that amount? They are the options.

So, the benefits of better water management in the form of a return to Government rather than a requirement for Government to subsidise EWS loss, as was occurring under the previous Labor Government, is in fact a major achievement, when one looks at the financial mismanagement left by Labor. It is a major achievement to have turned a $47 million loss into this sort of profit figure, and every South Australian benefits. Every South Australian enjoys the benefit of a well managed and efficient water utility in the form of better services in education, health, police and so on. It is these sorts of services which the SA Water efficiencies are helping us to pay for which make South Australia a better place in which to live.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): My question is directed to the Premier.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CONLON: It's all right, I'm cheerful today. Why did the Premier fail to inform the IT Cabinet subcommittee on 17 May 1995 that the Crown Solicitor's advice that a legal obligation had been set up between Motorola and the Government relating to his 14 April 1994 letter had been wiped out by the 24 June 1994 agreement with Motorola? The leaked minutes of the IT Cabinet subcommittee meeting on 17 May 1995, at which every relevant Minister, adviser and departmental CEO was present, reveal that the committee considered the legal advice of the Crown Solicitor's office that legal obligations had been created. The minutes do not indicate that the committee was ever advised of a June 1994 contract.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: What the member for Elder has not picked up from my ministerial statement—and I would ask him to go back and have a look at it and put it in context—is the fact that there was a letter in April 1994 that I wrote, with Cabinet authorisation; there was a June agreement I signed where, in clause 17, it renders null and void all other matters; and there was a letter subsequent to that, of which I was not aware, that was written in October 1994. So, just follow the sequence of events. This is quite a complicated issue—it therefore plays into the hands of the Labor Party and—

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, what the member for Elder should not do is take components out of sequence. There is a logical sequence and, when you follow that logical sequence through, you can see that the response that I gave to the Parliament was accurate.

HOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Is the Deputy Premier aware that this year is the fiftieth anniversary of the release of the 1948 Holden car, and will he explain to the House the considerable importance of Holden to the South Australian people and the economy?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thank the member for Schubert for the question, and I am aware that he led a delegation of Government members to the Holden works several weeks ago. Next Sunday, representing the Premier, I have the honour of launching the celebrations for Holden's fiftieth year, celebrating the 1948 Holden car and everything that has followed on from that. I am sure that many among us have great memories of the various Holden models. Many of us were probably brought up in a Holden. I remember my father's first FJ and, as the family grew, he progressed to the Holden wagon, like so many, where there would be one in the front and four in the back and the rest of us in the boot—there was a fair old tribe. Holden is certainly one of Australia's—and, in particular, one of South Australia's—great success stories, and it is very much a part of Australian culture.

The Holden gave the Australian people the confidence to see that it was possible to produce something which was truly our own, something which was of world quality and something which we have been able to successfully export to other countries. Over the years, the Holden has changed with the times—and certainly times have changed with Holden. The industry faced a huge challenge in the 1970s, with the world oil crisis and the need to produce more energy efficient, lighter and sleeker vehicles. Japanese and Korean models were also coming onto the market, with their mass production and cheap labour costs, and Holden found that it really did have to compete with those products. The fact that Holden today is even more successful is testament to the ability of the company and the workers to establish the technology and production systems that make the Holden car a world-class product.

On Sunday, the fact that more than 10 000 people—mainly past and present employees and their families—will attend shows the great pride that these people have in the Holden. The Holden company directly employs 8 300 people, with half of those at Elizabeth. Its annual purchases from Australian suppliers total $1.3 billion, and it has annual sales revenue of more than $3 billion. The State Government has demonstrated its support throughout, and it is worth noting this Government's 1994 commitment of a five year, $5 million per year, payroll relief based on exports of the Holden motor vehicle. As we all know, the Premier also showed great leadership in the recent debate on the imported vehicle tariffs and achieved an outcome which not only is responsible and sensible but is very much in the interests of South Australia and South Australian industry.

Next Sunday will be a great day for Holden, a great day for South Australia and a great day for Australia. To all the employees from over the years and their families, on Sunday, on behalf of the Government and the Parliament, I will say, 'Thank you and well done', as we very much recognise their efforts and achievements. Sunday will be a day to reflect on Holden's achievements, to celebrate its wonderful successes and certainly to look forward to a healthy future for the Holden brand. I hope that the company will continue to prosper and grow and continue what has been an enormous contribution to the economic and social life of South Australia.

MOTOROLA

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Given that the Minister for Human Services, when he was Premier, chaired the IT Cabinet subcommittee on 17 May 1995, will he tell the House whether the current Premier informed the committee on that day about the June 1994 agreement with Motorola and that the agreement wiped out any need to make Motorola the designated equipment supplier for the Government radio network contract? Is the Premier telling the truth?

The SPEAKER: Before calling the Minister, the Chair is not sure how much of this fits into the Minister's responsibility in his current portfolio. I leave it to the Minister to reply as he sees fit.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Members opposite have asked me, I suppose on four or five occasions, questions about Motorola. I have made it absolutely clear each time that I am no longer the Minister responsible. Whilst I am a Minister with other portfolios I do not go back and answer questions about what I did as Premier, full stop.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, WORK CAMPS

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): My question is directed to the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services. What does it cost the State's taxpayers to keep a criminal in prison for a year? Does the Minister have any ideas in mind which would require those prisoners to earn and make a contribution to the cost of their keep?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I thank the member for Hammond for his question: I know that he has a real interest in proactive correctional services, given that the Mobilong correction services area falls within his electorate. I am delighted to be able to inform the House today that South Australia now has the lowest cost ever for keeping an offender in prison. I believe that that is a fantastic achievement when one considers that, in 1992-1993—the year before this Government came into office—it was costing $64 000 a year for every prisoner in South Australia.

Today, we have the lowest cost ever in South Australia to keep an offender in prison: it has been reduced to $37 800. That is a significant reduction, and it is one example of what is happening right across government. It indicates that there has been an overall reduction on a per annum basis and per capita for prisoners of $26 000, in spite of the fact that there are ever increasing costs and staff salaries. As Minister, I thank management and staff for their assistance and for the way in which they have gone about their work in a very professional manner to ensure that this is the case.

As the member for Hammond highlighted, it is very important that we look at upskilling and at proactive rehabilitation programs for prisoners. As a new Minister I make no apology for looking forward to furthering the good work that previous Ministers have done in this respect. Ninety-nine per cent of prisoners re-enter mainstream society, and it is good to see initiatives put forward to allow those prisoners the opportunity to fit back into mainstream society.

In specific answer to the member for Hammond's question, one of the most successful programs which is being conducted and which was introduced in 1996 under our Government to ensure more cost-effective prison administration and opportunities for rehabilitation is 'mobile work camps'. These work camps consist of 10 to 12 selected prisoners who operate under the direct supervision of one prison officer. It needs to be clearly understood that the work these prisoners undertake is beyond the funding capacity of the organisations in which this work is done. In other words, this work would not be done if it were not for the initiatives I have just highlighted.

It is very important work: it involves the heritage parks in South Australia. I know that my colleague the Hon. Dorothy Kotz would be very keen to hear about this. The Dangalli Conservation Park near Renmark, Balcanoona National Park, Coorong National Park, Gammon Ranges National Park and, more recently, Troubridge Island are some examples of where this work is being undertaken by these mobile camps. A very conservative estimate of the cost advantages to the community since 1996 of this work being undertaken is at least $500 000. This simply reflects the labour cost of each prisoner and does not include the additional cost advantages to the community. A lower prisoner-correctional officer ratio applies in work camps compared with that which applies in prisons. Also, let us look at the cost benefits for State tourism and the fact that we have been able to improve the facilities of our national parks through this initiative.

In conclusion, I hope and think that as a result of these initiatives we will see real reductions in the number of prisoners who re-offend. These prisoners are now being taught real skills and are getting good opportunities to build up empathy and confidence to see whether they can become committed South Australians. I encourage the continuation of these work initiatives in the future.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the Minister that a lot of that answer would have been more appropriate in a ministerial statement.

MOTOROLA

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Did the Premier mislead the House on 26 August this year when he said that the 23 June 1994 agreement with Motorola was 'complete in its entirely, and there were no side deals', given that leaked minutes of a Cabinet IT subcommittee on 17 May 1995 show that the only reason Motorola was being made designated supplier for the Government radio network was the side deal the Premier made with Motorola in April 1994?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, I did not mislead the House. The fact is that the 23 June agreement and clause 17 of that agreement specifically indicate that there are no other factors related to the software centre.

TEACHERS, ENTERPRISE BARGAIN

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training explain the nature of the 'salary sacrifice' in respect of the teacher's enterprise bargaining negotiations currently before the Government?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Quite clearly, Janet Giles' version of what constitutes a 'salary sacrifice' has been lost somewhere in the mists of time, along with her theory of the 'cupboard is bare'; in fact, I think she is operating in another paradigm altogether. For those of us who dwell in the real world, 'salary sacrifice' means that you give up something for something else, and the AEU gives up absolutely nothing in its offer. The union's claims are hollow and, quite frankly, an insult to intelligent teachers in our schools. In fact, the AEU's latest trick is to hoodwink the public into believing that it will take less than what the Government is offering, that it will take only 10 per cent over two years—not 13 per cent over three years. The timing of the salary increase payment demanded by the union will be more expensive for each financial year—$50 million more expensive each year. In fact, the union's proposal requires—

Mr CONLON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker, and refer to the Standing Order against repetition. Word for word, this seems to be an answer the Minister gave to a dorothy dixer in this House a few days ago.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: As I was saying, this offer is $50 million more expensive each year under the union proposal. In fact, the union's proposal means that the Government would have to pay out an additional $178 million by the year 2002. I do not believe that for one minute the taxpaying public will swallow this demand or any other demand. The union's claims of salary sacrifice are as transparent as the futility of their ability to operate a calculator. All I can say is that many other unions and people in our community are asking, 'Can I have what Janet Giles is having?'

MOTOROLA

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Premier. Why was the Solicitor-General not supplied with a copy of the Crown Solicitor's advice of 14 May 1995 and 11 March 1996, the 22 November 1996 agreement with Motorola, or the 24 June 1994 agreement between the Government and Motorola when he asked the Solicitor-General to provide a legal opinion for the Premier on the Motorola issue on 29 September this year? The Premier says that the Solicitor-General's advice supports his position that the 23 June 1994 agreement with Motorola wiped out any legal obligation to Motorola. The Solicitor-General, however, admits in his advice that he had not seen any of the above documentation at the time of delivering that advice to the Premier.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: To put this matter beyond doubt, I will instruct any department to make any document sought available to the Solicitor-General.

SA WATER

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I seek further information about an answer to a previous question asked this afternoon. Will the Minister for Government Enterprises tell the House about the community service obligation payments made by the Government to SA Water and to what they were applied?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: In addressing the matter of SA Water and its dividends, it is vitally important to recognise that it is a public entity operating in a commercial fashion, and that is not at all a bad thing. In fact, I think that most South Australians would expect any public entity to operate in the most efficient way possible so that public funds are not wasted. To me, that seems like a perfectly reasonable expectation of the public. SA Water has achieved this goal—and it has achieved it well. At the same time as the community expects that operations will be commercial, there is also an expectation and a recognition that water services are a core necessity to which people need access, even if the economics of providing that service do not stack up.

Part of making SA Water operate commercially is to ensure that activities that are not financially viable are funded on a transparent basis in the form of community service obligation payments. Some examples of community service obligation funding include the provision of water and waste water services to country areas, the administration of the pensioner remission scheme for water supply, sewerage, irrigation, land tax and council rates, and rate concessions to exempt properties such as churches and councils.

In identifying the provision of water and waste water services to country areas, which form part of the CSO, given the Labor Opposition's comments and its complete misunderstanding or indeed misreading of the financial dictates of SA Water, one can only assume that, by complaining about the fact that CSOs exist, the Labor Opposition would like to see the CSOs for the following areas obliterated: Todd-Ceduna, Port Lincoln and eastern Eyre Peninsula, Eyre Peninsula, the Barossa Mid North and Yorke Peninsula, the Adelaide Hills, the remote North (with a population of 400 000 people), Morgan-Whyalla, Tailem Bend-Keith, Kangaroo Island, the South-East, Murray-Mallee and the Riverland.

That is where the CSOs went for water supplies. We can look at the sewerage schemes and obviously infer that the Labor Opposition would see people pay full tote odds for these services, because the Labor Party is complaining about community service obligations. These are the people under a Labor Government whose sewerage schemes would cost more: Whyalla, Port Pirie, Port Augusta East and West, Port Lincoln, Millicent, Mount Burr, Nangwarry, Naracoorte, Mount Gambier, Victor Harbor, Murray Bridge, Mannum, Hahndorf, Heathfield, Myponga, Gumeracha and Angaston. To supply water to those people costs more than they are charged. Accordingly, as an accounting mechanism, a community service obligation is then paid. It is then paid back to the State Government directly.

That is why the financial figures for SA Water come out as they do. I do not believe there could possibly be any doubt about a single one of those community service obligations which I have read to the House. If the Labor Opposition continually talks about SA Water and does not understand the community service obligations, and if it continues to make the point that SA Water is sucking money out of the community, those are the sorts of community service obligations which are at threat.

For the 1998-99 financial year, $77.1 million will be paid by the Government to SA Water to cover these community service obligations. I congratulate SA Water on doing an excellent job for the people of South Australia. It is clear that it has taken this Government to demonstrate to the Opposition how to act responsibly financially. If the lesson had been learnt just a little bit earlier—like about two Governments ago—South Australia may have been able to avoid the noose which the Labor Party put around South Australia's neck.

MOTOROLA

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Premier now table in Parliament all correspondence between the Government and Motorola which refers directly or indirectly to any possible obligations to Motorola which could flow from the Premier's letter of April 1994? The Opposition today has been advised that further correspondence between the Government and Motorola exists which confirms the existence of the side deal.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Rather than have selected pieces of paper about which the member for Hart talks—because, as we have seen in Question Time repeatedly, there is an extract of some evidence or a document put out of context and then history is rewritten by the Labor Party—we will do as I indicated to the House in my ministerial statement. We will put it all on the table for the Solicitor-General. His report will canvass all the publicly raised issues and be examined—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Let the member for Hart be a little patient, because this matter will be clarified.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

Mr CONLON: Mr Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. In accordance with your previous direction to the House, I would like to move the following motion:

That this House establish a privileges committee to investigate whether the Premier has misled the House in relation to matters surrounding the Motorola contract—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot move anything at this stage—he can only make an allegation.

Mr CONLON: Mr Speaker, when I made the allegation last time you asked me to deal with it in a substantive motion. I will make the allegation in the same way as I did last time, if that is your ruling.

The SPEAKER: That is correct. I will then set aside a time for the House to consider whether it wants to set up a privileges committee, and then the House will consider the motion.

Mr CONLON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. My allegations are these: that at least on five different occasions the current Premier misled this House on matters surrounding the Motorola deal, and I will detail those five occasions on which I allege that this Premier misled the House. On 21 September 1994 the Premier, then as a Minister, said this:

> Certainly to my knowledge, no formal or informal discussions or commitments have been given to Motorola. . . I repeat: there has been no formal or informal discussion with Motorola about other components of business.

On 26 August this year the Premier said this:

> As I outlined to the House yesterday, on 23 June 1994 the Government signed a contractual binding commitment between Motorola and the South Australian Government that was complete in its entirety, and there were no side deals.

On 27 August this year he said:

> In other words, this agreement [referring to the 23 June agreement] stands alone and supersedes any formal or informal discussions prior to the signing of that agreement—and that is clearly the position.

On 27 August 1998 he said:

> There is no side deal.

On 18 November 1998 he said this:

> If you ask me why one department did not know what the other department knew of, or that an agreement had been signed, it was clearly a process problem between the two departments; I freely acknowledge that. One department. . . did not know what another department or agency had signed off. That is the sum total of it.

I allege that at least on those five occasions the Premier misled the House for the following reasons. Again, I will outline what we know of the history of this matter, including some new matters not known to the House the last time this was raised. The chronology is detailed but it is necessary to lay it down.

In early 1994 this Premier, as then Minister Olsen, was locked in a competition to attract Motorola to South Australia to establish a software centre. It was a fierce competition with other States, and we are reliably informed that it got very willing towards the end of the process.

Mr Venning: We won.

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Schubert. There will be no interjections during this debate.

Mr CONLON: As the member for Schubert points out, Motorola was attracted to come here with what the Parliament was told was an incentive package of about $16 million. Rumour abounded at the time that other attractive inducements were included. In fact, so many rumours were around that a question was asked in October 1994, and then Minister Olsen categorically denied the side deals in the statement I have relayed to the House. That statement now is transparently misleading.

The matter was in abeyance for some time but as usual the Premier gets by with a little help from his friends. In an article by his former brains trust manager, Alex Kennedy, in the *Bulletin* called 'South Australians in a tender trap', the allegations resurfaced of a side deal—a very important side deal—with some $60 million alleged in that article to be accruing to Motorola as a result of the communication that this Premier denied ever occurred. We have to remember that right at the outset this Premier denied that any communication ever occurred. That is what he has tried to slide out off so far. He denied it ever occurred—no formal or informal discussions or side deals ever occurred.

Unfortunately for this Premier (and again getting by with a little help from his friends), in a printed answer to a question in the Estimates Committee this year, the Treasurer (Rob Lucas), advised by Minister Wayne Matthew, offered a very interesting piece of advice. As part of his answer, he said that in April 1994 the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development offered to Motorola that, subject to normal criteria and the establishment of its Australian software centre in Adelaide, Motorola would be appointed the designated supplier of radio equipment for the whole of Government SMCS.

What we have now is not an allegation from the Opposition and not even an allegation from the former adviser: we have an admission from the Treasurer of the State, advised by the Minister, that that is what occurred. That is certainly not consistent with the Premier's denial, so we asked the question again. Having been found out, as is his wont, his position shifted. He admitted that he did in fact write such a letter. It was in the terms as outlined.

It appears that at least the Treasurer and Minister Matthew were more forthright about this than the Premier was prepared to be but, having been caught out, he admitted it. But what did he find? He found that there was a June 1994 contract. This is his defence. The entirety of his defence is a June 1994 contract that negated those obligations. I will deal with that in a moment. The Minister for Tourism put out a book called *The Best Kept Secrets*. The best kept secret in this State for the past four years has apparently been this contract that wiped out the obligations, because no-one knew of it except the Premier.

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

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr CONLON: You're enjoying this, are you? I will address the June contract further, because we now have new information that makes the Premier's answer almost absolutely incredible. What the Premier wants us to accept is that he went off to Motorola, gave them $16 million and offered to make them the designated supplier in a multi-million dollar contract. Then he went back to them in June and said, 'I have a new deal for you. We won't put that bit in.' They said 'All right, let us think about that for a minute. Oh yes; OK.' That is incredible. That is simply incredible, as we will find out. People in the commercial sector do not give away things that they have. That was his defence. What do we know? That the June situation wiped it out. That is his best kept secret.

We know that in October, as the Premier has admitted, the CEO of the relevant department (Ray Dundon) wrote to Motorola confirming then Minister Olsen's offer of April that year. We have the evidence of Peter Fowler, who controls the contract, that when he joined the Government from Motorola he sought urgent legal advice about the Premier's letter, and that advice was delivered on 14 May 1995. We know what that advice said. It is almost trite to have to go through this. If people are not clear what has gone on in this place, they are refusing to see it. That advice confirmed that the Premier's letter had created legal obligations to Motorola. That is a bit of a problem for a Premier who has said that he had no communications with them: no letters, no offers, no side deals—nothing. That is a little problem, but the problem grows, because the letter, the legal advice—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sorry to interrupt the speaker. I address my remarks to the camera operators in the

gallery. I remind you of the rules you have all signed regarding focusing on members when they are speaking and not canvassing other parts of the Chamber.

Mr CONLON: It gets worse for the Premier, because that advice was acted upon; the legal advice was adopted. We know that a letter from Premier Dean Brown to Motorola in July 1996 confirmed the appointment in accordance with the offer made in Minister Olsen's letter. There is no side deal but we have the Premier of South Australia writing to Motorola, confirming the side deal, putting it in place and appointing Motorola as the designated supplier.

We have the detailed letter sent by Ray Dundon to the State Supply Board advising the State Supply Board that the multi-million dollar contract was not going to tender but that Motorola was going to be appointed designated supplier—and why was that? Yet again, it was because of Minister Olsen's letter to Motorola in April 1994. It never disappears. It appears in every relevant document concerning this deal. The contract that appoints Motorola as the designated supplier of radio equipment to the Government refers to Minister Olsen's April 1994 letter in its recitals. Still, there is no side deal.

The defence of this Premier throughout has been that the contract of June 1994 wiped out all prior legal obligations, despite the fact that we know that the contract was made on the basis of the April letter. The contract that appointed Motorola designated supplier of radio equipment to this Government was made on the basis of the Premier's letter. He has hung his hat on a June 1994 agreement which he says cleared the obligations. Motorola apparently decided to give up the obligations to be appointed the supplier of hundreds of millions of dollars worth of radio equipment. I am very pleased that we do attract such generous companies to this State. It did not do them any harm, because they got it anyway. They gave up their entitlement but, in an act of largesse, they got it anyway; it did not do them any harm at all, did it?

The defence was the June contract, but what do we know now? We know that after Peter Fowler saw the letter from the Premier and sought advice from the Crown Solicitor, he got that advice and took it to the Cabinet IT subcommittee. We know that at the Cabinet IT subcommittee there was the Premier, the Deputy Premier, then Minister Olsen, Peter Fowler, Ray Dundon and John Cambridge. It is a shame I was not there: I was the only one who was not.

What occurred on 17 May in this case of no side deals? They looked at the letter from John Olsen of 14 April and at the Crown Solicitor's advice on it. They found that the Crown Solicitor said that it had the potential to create very serious legal obligations, and on that basis they decided they had better appoint Motorola as the designated supplier and put in place the events that led to that conclusion. The Premier was there with his rock solid defence of this June 1994 agreement.

He now wants to blame poor old Ray Dundon for re-enlivening it after he cleverly got rid of it. His strategy seems to have been confused because, if you are to believe him, he got this very important June agreement and then kept it a secret from everyone. He kept it a secret from the man letting the contract; he kept it a secret from the person from Motorola employed to run the contract; he kept it a secret from the Premier; he kept it a secret from everyone. He sat at the subcommittee meeting on 17 May 1995 when a multi-million dollar contract was given to Motorola without due process, without proper processes, and he kept secret what should have been the most relevant piece of information he could have brought forward.

If Ray Dundon was to blame in this, what did this Premier do about it? Did he say, 'Dundon you dunderhead: look at what you have done'? He did not say that; he did not say anything, because Ray Dundon is not to blame. The Premier did a side deal with Motorola and has persistently misled the House about the matter throughout and continues to do so today with this statement. You have to admire his tenacity. He has persistently misled the House.

The Premier said there were no communications at all. We found the communications. Then he said, 'There were communications, but they didn't mean anything and there's no deal in place.' Now we find out that they certainly did mean something: the communication gave them the contract. What is the defence today? The defence today is, 'Well, that might have happened, but it was not my fault: it was a bureaucrat.'

The matter I ask this Chamber to address today is this: it is a matter for every member of this House, a matter of our standing as members of this House and what it means to be elected by the people of South Australia to represent them, what standards are expected of people elected by the people of South Australia to represent them. Let us be absolutely clear. Are we to accept that the Premier of this State, the first Minister of the Government, can mislead this House with impunity, can get out of it by finally allowing an inquiry but an inquiry that he will control? Who will check which documents the Solicitor-General gets at the suggestion of the Premier? Who will make sure? The track record is not good.

We have had to drag every single piece of information about this arrangement out of the Premier. When we first asked the Premier, he said there were no communications, none whatever—absolutely categorically none. Then he confirmed that there was one.

Mr VENNING: On a point of order, Sir, the honourable member is continually facing the media rather than the Chair.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The member knows that he addresses his remarks through the Chair. I ask him to do so.

Mr CONLON: The issue is this: it is not a matter simply for this Premier. It is a matter of whether the first Minister of the Crown can persistently mislead the Parliament and be absolved of it by some bodgie inquiry. If that is the case, it says to the people of South Australia, at least for the people who control this House, that that behaviour is acceptable for a representative in this democracy, and it is not. It has never been acceptable in any Westminster system and it is not satisfactory or acceptable here.

The matter is made doubly difficult. We will call for a Privileges Committee. There has been only one in the 150 years of this place and we are asking for one on the Premier. That is plainly a very serious matter, but the central point is that the Premier of this State is no more absolved from responsibilities to this House than is any other member. He must be judged as if he were any member of this House because the issue is not the Premier of this State but whether a member of this House can come into this House and egregiously, deliberately, persistently and aggravatingly mislead it. They are the allegations I make.

The SPEAKER: There needs to be some clarification of what is expected of the Chair. The speech delivered by the honourable member was supportive of a motion that would have been moved requesting the House to set up a committee. At this stage, the honourable member is putting up a case

asking that the Chair decide whether a matter of privilege exists that would allow the House then to decide whether it wants to set up a committee. It is in relation to that matter that I will address myself. This morning's press gave some notice of the honourable member's intention. I will address those remarks and the allegations made by the member for Elder.

The member has raised a matter of privilege, which is substantially the same issue as the House dealt with a few weeks ago, also under the question of privilege, and which had its origins back in 1994. Whilst the allegations clearly touch on privilege, it is my view that there is little new material in what has been raised today as against on other occasions and I decline to give precedence to it as a specific matter of privilege which, by its nature, would allow it to overtake all other business on the Notice Paper this afternoon.

However, the member is free and has the right to move a substantive motion along the lines of what he is proposing with the same result in the normal way. To allow the House the opportunity to decide whether some urgency should be accorded to the matter, I will allow the member to seek the concurrence of the House by moving for the suspension of Standing Orders. The matter can then be decided by the House. If the suspension is agreed to by the House, it will allow the honourable member to move a motion today rather than on our next Thursday sitting day. Will the honourable member advise the Chair whether he wishes to move to suspend Standing Orders?

Mr CONLON: Yes, Sir, I do wish to move to suspend Standing Orders in order to deal with this matter forthwith.

The SPEAKER: The motion you will then move is that Standing Orders be so far suspended as to allow you to move a motion without notice forthwith.

Mr CONLON: I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended to allow me to move a motion without notice forthwith.

I abide by your ruling in this matter, Sir, but I am somewhat taken aback with the procedure you have adopted, and the only fair procedure now available to us is to be allowed to suspend Standing Orders to debate this. The truth of the matter is that there is something very substantially different between this time and last time, namely, there is in our possession leaked Cabinet subcommittee meeting documents, which demolish the defence of the Premier.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: On a point of order, Sir, the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders is a very narrow debate. The honourable member is not canvassing that debate: he is canvassing matters which he wishes to bring before the House if Standing Orders are suspended. I therefore ask you to rule accordingly.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is technically correct. It is a narrow debate on the reasons why you want Standing Orders suspended. I ask the honourable member to confine himself to such.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: On a point of order, Sir, apart from the fact that your ruling today is totally at odds in terms of procedure with your ruling last time—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —which was different from the ruling before in terms of procedures—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The point of order, Sir—

The SPEAKER: The member will resume his seat.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —is this: the member—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have a point of order, Sir. In response to the member for Stuart, the simple fact is that there is new evidence, not in the press this morning—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —but a leaked document—

The SPEAKER: Order! No, no! The Leader will resume his seat.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —that shows that the Premier is not telling the truth.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition for continuing to speak when the Chair has called him to order. It is a very narrow debate on the Standing Orders. It is permissible, if this debate is successful, for the Opposition to move the motion that it intended to move in the first place.

Mr CONLON: I ask you to accept, Mr Speaker, in terms of the breadth of debate I am allowed, that, in moving for the suspension of Standing Orders, it is incumbent upon me to explain to the House the importance of the need for the suspension of Standing Orders. With your leave, Mr Speaker, that is what I will continue to do. This is a very different matter from that which was discussed last time. There is not only new evidence leaked.

Let me say this, and I can encapsulate this very easily: if there is nothing new, why has the Premier sent off all his documents to the Solicitor-General? He did not want to do that last time; he did not want to give any documents to anyone last time. So, this is substantially different. The fact is that this Premier is in desperate trouble. He has people flinging around Cabinet subcommittee minutes like confetti, and he will do anything to get out of trouble. I appeal to the conscience and fairness of members of this House. We should be allowed to debate this matter as it was debated last time and as it has always been debated in this House; we should not be gagged on a matter of a Premier misleading the State.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier): Mr Speaker, I will abide by your ruling about the narrowness of the debate. It comes down to whether or not it is substantially different. Certainly, I do not believe it is substantially different. It is just another selective document which is quoted, once again, out of order as far as the chronology—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is now debating the substance and he must come back to the narrow debate on why he wants the suspension of Standing Orders negated.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: The reason that the member for Elder wants to suspend Standing Orders is only heading down the track of the Premier, who earlier today announced an inquiry into exactly the same matter, and I cannot see why the House needs to waste its time.

The House divided on the motion:

AYES (21)

Atkinson, M. J.	Bedford, F. E.
Breuer, L. R.	Ciccarello, V.
Conlon, P. F. (teller)	De Laine, M. R.
Foley, K. O.	Geraghty, R. K.
Hanna, K.	Hill, J. D.
Hurley, A. K.	Key, S. W.
Koutsantonis, T.	Lewis, I.P.
Rankine, J. M.	Rann, M. D.
Snelling, J. J.	Stevens, L.
Thompson, M. G.	White, P. L.
Wright, M. J.	

NOES (24)

Armitage, M. H.		Brindal, M. K.
Brokenshire, R. L.		Brown, D. C.
Buckby, M. R.		Condous, S. G.
Evans, I. F.		Gunn, G. M.
Hall, J. L.		Hamilton-Smith, M. L.
Ingerson, G. A.		Kerin, R. G. (teller)
Kotz, D. C.		Matthew, W. A.
Maywald, K. A.		McEwen, R. J.
Meier, E. J.		Olsen, J. W.
Penfold, E. M.	t.)	Scalzi, G.
Such, R. B.		Venning, I. H.
Williams, M. R.		Wotton, D. C.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

ENVIRONMENT REPORT

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Environment and Heritage): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: The State of the Environment report was first published in 1988. The report I have tabled today represents the third such publication in this ongoing series. The report, which is produced at least every five years, is, in essence, a warts and all assessment of the environmental condition of the State. This report, unlike previous reports, is increasingly based on quantitative data. This is important, because it means that we now have a foundation for benchmarking and measuring movements in environmental status. Overall, the 1998 State of the Environment report reflects that South Australia is a good place to live, with a relatively healthy natural environment. As expected, the report, like its predecessors, reflects on the need to redouble efforts in some areas.

Since the release of the 1993 report, I am pleased to say that there have been a number of significant positive developments, including increases in air quality, the phasing out of ozone depleting substances, the introduction of the cap on water extraction from the Murray-Darling Basin, the development of soil conservation districts, boards and plans, and the implementation of many environmental improvement programs (EIPs) through the Environmental Protection Agency—all contributing to improving the environment in this State.

The State of the Environment report, however, is not only about good news: it is about taking stock, acknowledging successes and recognising areas for more work, greater effort and further resolve. It is about repairing neglect and utilising a rapidly expanding knowledge base dealing with environmental issues.

As this is the International Year of the Ocean, it is perhaps appropriate that I refer to the findings about our State's marine and coastal environment. Among the challenges, effluent disposal, albeit at a reducing rate, remains as one which will require constant attention. Another is recognising that many of our fisheries which are being harvested at near capacity and new aquaculture developments—a positive step in sustainable fish harvesting—remain as areas for Government and industry to monitor closely into the future. At the same time, there have been many positive efforts to provide greater protection for marine environments. The introduction of catchment water management boards by this Government is a case in point.

Greater application in the reuse of effluent for irrigation purposes, which is being implemented both north and south of Adelaide, will bring major marine and economic benefits. Closely related, it is encouraging to note that the report indicates that, where nutrient and turbidity are normalised, we are starting to see some seagrass regeneration, particularly within the Semaphore area. This gives us good reason for optimism and continued resolve.

Atmospherically, Adelaide is in healthy shape: our atmospheric quality is good and continuing to improve. Initiatives, such as the introduction of unleaded petrol, have paid dividends with lead levels dropping in the order of 80 per cent since 1985. The production of ozone depleting gases has reduced and use of harmful chlorofluorocarbons and halons is decreasing. The destruction of these substances through high temperature incineration has begun.

The State of the Environment report also makes it clear that in terms of climate change Australians are still producing too many greenhouse gases. Most of these gases are produced in the process of power generation. However, from 1990 to 1995 South Australia's production of greenhouse gases did decline by 4.6 per cent from a baseline that is already low compared to other States.

The report points to insufficient information collection regarding soil erosion, acidification and salinity. It indicates that the situation surrounding land use has not improved. Still it is recognised that many of the symptoms were created over the course of 160 years and will require years of effort to remedy. The registration of contaminated sites (many historical) has increased dramatically from 196 sites in 1992 to 588 sites in 1997. Whilst it is encouraging that there is greater community awareness of contaminated sites, such figures serve to highlight the need for vigilance in the future.

Turning now to our national parks and reserves system, it is encouraging that they continue to increase in area, improving biodiversity as a consequence. Our reserves system now totals 21.12 million hectares or 21.4 per cent of the State—an increase of 794 452 hectares since the 1993 report. With 82 per cent of our State's native vegetation cleared within our agricultural areas, it is important to note that broadacre clearance is banned.

The SPEAKER: Order! The use of cameras is against the rules.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: This Government has continually sought methods by which to improve the management of our remaining native vegetation. It is especially encouraging that our marine parks area has dramatically increased with the addition of the Great Australian Bight Marine Park, which was created with the cooperation of the State and Federal Liberal Governments.

The report points out that the present state of our water resources is cause for concern. Presently, many of our groundwater aquifers are utilised at or over capacity, resulting in deterioration of that resource. Within the Northern Adelaide Plains, the Barossa Valley, the Southern Vales, parts of the South-East and Angas-Bremer areas, water yield or quality is declining. At the same time, an examination of our surface water reveals that quality is variable, but with most of our waterways being of good to moderate water quality.

To improve the quality of our waterways, the EPA has released stormwater codes of practice which will assist in reducing the conditions which lead to the inflow of poor quality water. Under this Government, water resource management has improved significantly. The introduction of

the Water Resources Act 1997 has provided a sound scientific basis for managing water resources on an integrated catchment management basis.

The State of the Environment report realistically appraises for the members of the House and the broader community the condition of the environment in which we live. Such reports remind us that problems we face today took many decades to create. So, problems of this nature will not be solved overnight. However, it is pleasing to note that in relation to the State of the Environment recommendations the majority are already in developmental stages of strategy and process, setting the base to continue to implement and improve the state of the environment of which we are all caretakers. Importantly, the report makes it clear that individual and community actions can result in improvements. Together we can make a difference.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): For the Premier, the Government and the Independents, today's gag is just part of their state of denial. For the Premier, it is a state of denial about what he did, what he signed and what he said. We have been told even in headlines to lay off Motorola—enough of the 'M' word—and that the issue hardly matters.

The issue is whether or not the Premier tells the truth to his colleagues, the public, the media and, most importantly, this Parliament. Today, this House had the opportunity to decide whether it is still important, still essential, for a Premier to tell the truth. Apparently, the Independents and the Government do not believe that is necessary. The alibis are running out in a case which is becoming much more clear cut and serious than the one which saw the member for Bragg dumped—first as Deputy Premier and then as Minister. It is much more serious, because the alibis are running out and so is the credibility.

Misleading Parliament, to these Independents (including the member for MacKillop) and members on the other side of the House, who apparently do not believe in our Westminster system of Government, might sound quaint or old-fashioned. However, we are not talking about a Minister making a mistake or stuffing up; what we are talking about is what we have been asking this Premier for more than four years. He has had every chance to make amends, every opportunity to set the record straight, to correct his statements to this House, to acknowledge error, and to apologise for misleading the House. This misleading is not inadvertent; it is more than clumsiness; it is even more than the incompetence of the member for Bragg, because it is deliberate. And each deliberate misleading is compounded by the next.

Today's issue was not allowed to be debated, in an extraordinary gag that would not be tolerated in any other Parliament in this country or in any other Parliament in the Commonwealth of nations. They will not even debate the issue. We are told that there was nothing substantive to add to the previous privileges debate. But what about a leaked Cabinet document that now requires the Premier to refer to the Solicitor-General? This is about deliberate deceit, a conspiracy to deceive, in what amounts to the parliamentary equivalent of perjury, if so found by a Privileges Committee. But exactly two years after Dean Brown was stabbed in the back, the truth is coming out.

There was overwhelming evidence today for a *prima facie* case that the Premier has not been telling the truth to the Parliament over the Motorola deal. But the Opposition was not asking the Parliament today—particularly the Independents—to make a judgment. What we were asking them to do was to allow a debate and for them to consider referring it to a Privileges Committee that would hear the evidence. But they would not even contemplate a debate of the issues.

We have seen a change in procedures for a Privileges Committee from the one earlier this year (the first in 154 years) which went wrong for the Government. When presented with the evidence, members of Parliament from both sides had to find the Deputy Premier guilty as charged. But they will not allow it to happen again until the rules have been changed, distorted and perverted each time.

We have heard today from the Premier that the Solicitor-General will conduct an inquiry, and we were told that he has the standing and status of a judge. I have a copy of the Solicitor-Generals Act, and it says no such thing. The Act is absolutely explicit, in that it provides:

> The Solicitor-General shall, at the request of the Attorney-General, act as Her Majesty's counsel.

In other words, act as the Government's lawyer! He is not a judge who is independent: he is the in-house lawyer who does what he is told. He is the Government's brief.

In addition, we all know the extraordinary circumstances that would allow a judge to be dismissed: a vote of both Houses of Parliament. But the Solicitor-General can be dismissed on the advice of the Attorney-General to the Executive Council—in other words, the Government. So, the Solicitor-General, Mr Selway—nice fellow, bright fellow that he is—is basically being asked to clean up the mess, when he himself was deceived by this Premier and was not given the details. And so the man who was deceived is now the man who has to get the Premier off the hook, and he is paid to do so.

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

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Local Government): What a prince of rags and tatters we have in the Leader of the Opposition. What we have seen today is not an attack on anything other than a ruling of the Chair of this House—the same Chair who the member for Spence so vigorously applauded last night. When he wanted his trite little sin bin and things such as that, you, Sir, were the best Speaker this House has ever seen. Today—

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The Minister for Local Government is canvassing the merits of another matter before the House on the Notice Paper.

The SPEAKER: I have to uphold the point of order. The honourable member cannot canvass matters that are on the Notice Paper for today.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I hope that members opposite are aware of that when they have grievance debates in the future. The fact is that this House should be concerned with things such as unemployment, the sale and lease of ETSA and policing issues, and all we have seen for weeks at a time is a whole lot of fabricated nonsense about Motorola.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Is the member for Peake—

Mr Koutsantonis: Tell the truth.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The member for Peake is suggesting that I am not telling the truth, and I demand that he withdraw.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I can demand it.

The SPEAKER: The member for Peake is in the Chamber. To even imply that people do not tell the truth is quite unparliamentary. I ask the member for Peake to withdraw.

Mr Koutsantonis: I withdraw, Sir.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The important issues for this Parliament and for South Australians are unemployment, the sale or lease of ETSA, policing issues and economic development. And all this Opposition can do, day after day, is tease out and minuet about Motorola—pursuing rabbits down burrows.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The member for Spence will spell it for the—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence can sort this out later, as far as elocution goes.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: This is from the same Opposition that is wont to throw remarks around the Chamber as if they are confetti. It is the same Opposition, Sir, I put to you in another context, who threatened a member of the House who brought a Bill into this Chamber (and hopefully it is on the record), and threatened him seriously. If that is not a matter of privilege, I do not know what is.

Mr Foley: Who?

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I can't refer to it, because it was a debate that occurred this morning in the House.

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Minister for Local Government is making an allegation against the entire Opposition, that we threatened a member of the Government introducing a Bill so seriously that it ought to be a breach of privilege. I ask him to move a substantive motion or to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I will speak to the member for Hartley and ask whether he wants to raise it as a matter of privilege, because it is my counsel to him that he should.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This will soon be a good example in respect of stopping the clock.

Mr Atkinson: That's not in yet, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I know, but it is a good example.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The Leader of the Opposition talked about the traditions of the Westminster system. I, for one, believe in those traditions and would like to see them upheld. There has been one Privileges Committee in 150 years, and the Leader of the Opposition claims that, because that worked and because it resulted in this House coming to a determination which might not have been the Government's first determination, in some way, the processes of this House do not work. That, and your ruling, Sir, have proved that this House does work, and it works well.

Because members of the Opposition today have not got their way—and that is all it is about—they are crying foul. They are not very good players in the game, because they like it when it is going their way: when it is going any other way they do not. The member for Hart who, at best, can be rude—and I might use a better adjective than that—had better not sit there and lecture me on my standards or my ability, because I never have been in a confidential committee that has ever leaked, and then leaked information publicly to the whole of South Australia.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I will not rise to the bait of the member for Unley about who leaks what in this Parliament. This is a Government that is haemorrhaging, and a Government that is ripped apart at the seams. Day after day, hour after hour, week after week, we see documents, Cabinet submissions and whatever leaked to the media and the Opposition. I believe that leaks are a subject which, for the honourable member's Party, there is no greater master.

I want to briefly touch on the Premier's contribution today. His statement said it all. The Premier said that there was no side deal, that it was just a normal set of circumstances that saw Motorola gain this contract. I ask the Coalition partners of this Government, such as the member for MacKillop, to look at page 2 of the Premier's own statement, which is as follows:

> In January 1994, at the behest of the Economic Development Authority, I took a submission to Cabinet suggesting Motorola be named preferred supplier for a long-promised much-needed Government radio network.

Why do members think the Premier took this submission to the Government—to the Cabinet—in January 1994 at the request of the Economic Development Authority? It knew that Motorola wanted to locate its software export development centre here in Adelaide and it wanted that contract as an inducement. The Premier, in his haste to prepare his statement today, has let the cat out of the bag. As early as January 1994, the EDA wanted a side deal. The Premier took a side deal to the Cabinet to lure Motorola here for its export development centre.

The Premier's own statement to this Parliament today and the haste with which it was written this morning has finally laid to rest any notion that proper process was followed. It was absolutely clear for all to see today that the Premier and the Economic Development Authority knew all along that they wanted this inducement.

Given the Government and its coalition partners' successful move today to gag any further debate on this matter, I shall briefly refer to some other issues. We have seen what the Premier has said about this. At every stage the Premier has twisted, turned and blamed others. At one stage the Premier told the media—I think it was the ABC—that this process had followed due process as it related to the State Supply Act and had been signed off by the State Supply Board. We found there that, again, the Premier told an untruth. The Premier misled the media when he made that statement because, as the Auditor-General told the Economic and Finance Committee, the pre-emptive indication of intention and that type of communication was contrary to the State Supply Act.

Ms Anne Howe, chairperson of the State Supply Board, said that the State Supply Board had not authorised the arrangements for the appointment of Motorola as the designated supplier. So, yet again, the Premier was found to be lying; the Premier was yet again lying to the media of this State.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The member for Hart accused the Premier of lying. I believe that such accusations can be made only by way of substantive motion.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is correct.

Mr FOLEY: I withdraw that accusation in relation to lying, Sir. Yet again, the Premier, through the media, has misled not just the Parliament but the people of this State. When the State Supply Act was not adhered to, we found that the State Supply Board had to compile a policy statement (despite the quaint name for it), the 10.4 policy statement, that covered Government services and that somehow that absolved the Government. I direct this charge at the Premier: he was guilty of his own Public and Finance Audit, because the Treasurer's instructions prescribed in that Act provide:

> . . . arrangements for purchasing services under the services contract and outside the scope of the Supply Act should require at least three tenders.

Three tenders for a services contract should have been obtained. A person who contravenes that instruction by the Treasurer is guilty of an offence—maximum penalty, $1 000. Time and again, this Premier breaks every procedure; he tells untruths about it; he misleads; he squirms; and he blames other people. Today, the Premier blamed Ray Dundon; he blames every possible person. The hapless Minister for Local Government is running out to get the Premier. I make this charge: the Premier told a lie to this Parliament.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. At the conclusion of his comments the member for Hart again made an unparliamentary accusation against the Premier, implying that he lied. I ask that it be withdrawn. The member for Hart knows the Standing Orders.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I accept the point of order. I ask the member for Hart to withdraw the word 'lie'.

Mr FOLEY: I withdraw the word 'lie', given that at this stage that has not been allowed to be debated.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): What we have seen from the Labor Opposition is a deliberate attempt to pull the wool over the eyes of the people of South Australia to ensure that the focus is not on the real issues affecting the people of this State. First, members opposite seem absolutely hell-bent on destroying the opportunity for Motorola to establish and to run a business effectively in South Australia. That in itself is a most regrettable state of affairs, because we have an international company of the highest reputation and standing which wishes to establish itself in this State and to provide great benefits for the people of South Australia.

Secondly, two inquiries are now investigating this matter: one involves the senior law officer of the Government; the other the Economic and Finance Committee on which the Government does not have a majority. The committee is inquiring into this matter and still has witnesses to call. I would have thought that if members opposite are hell-bent on making wild allegations—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: The member for Hart is absolutely obsessed with getting on television—and he is wearing his red necktie so that it will show up nicely on television. The member for Hart is hell-bent on getting on television in an attempt to divert the real argument. We know that there was a stoush at this week's Labor Caucus meeting and that 14 members of the Caucus were most unhappy with the Opposition's decision on ETSA. We know that there was a stoush in Caucus about this matter. So, the best form of defence is to create a diversion and to try to put up plenty of smoke so that their own problems disappear. We know that members opposite do not want to focus on an issue which will have great benefit for the people of South Australia, because they do not want the Government—

Ms KEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. How could the honourable member know what happened in the Labor Caucus?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: We know that members opposite do not want the Government of South Australia to access revenue so that it can improve and update the social infrastructure, provide better opportunities in education and health and improve the road system. That is why members opposite are using every tactic and every diversion in which they can possibly involve themselves. Of course, the last thing members opposite want to talk about is the truth or the real issues. I refer to another matter. I have a constituent who is very keen to establish a recycling plant to recycle agricultural chemical containers, the plastic PVC containers—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: This is becoming a real problem because of the huge numbers involved. My constituent at Robertstown wants to recycle these containers so that the recycled material can be used for artificial posts, strainers, spacers, etc. There are firms in South Australia that are keen to recycle them—

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

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): The day before yesterday the Minister for Human Services in a ministerial statement to this House outlined the appalling social cost of child abuse to our community and referred to a report which estimated that the economic cost of child abuse and neglect in South Australia is $345 million per year. As part of his statement Dean Brown said that, 'the true shame lies in not responding.' I obtained a copy of that report, and at point 13 of its executive summary there is a recommendation, as follows:

> . . . in addition to current expenditure on prevention activities, a minimum additional investment of 1 per cent of the total annual cost of child maltreatment to the State of South Australia—

that is, $3.5 million—

> be made in an extended prevention program.

To hark back to Dean Brown's statement that 'the true shame lies in not responding', what additional funding did Dean Brown mention in relation to improving this situation?

He talked about an additional $1 million funding to be shared between the Women's and Children's Hospital, Flinders Medical Centre and Northern and Southern CAMS. He also mentioned an intention to try to get Commonwealth funding for a pilot program. This is nowhere near the minimum amount estimated by the report that he so carefully referred to. Meanwhile, we know from the Minister's own figures that child protection notifications in this State continue to increase. Over the past five years reports of neglect and emotional abuse have more than doubled. Physical abuse has been up by one-third. We also know that 20 per cent of tier one notifications, notifications of children actually in danger, are not being responded to by his department.

Also, we know that numbers of children at risk in the tier two category are not responded to. Certainly, we know that children in need in the tier three category are also not being responded to by his own department. In 1996 we had a South

Australian Child Abuse Prevention Strategy in this State that reported with 17 recommendations to the previous Minister for Family and Community Services. There are some interesting comments in that report and the first is this:

> Throughout the consultation process many workers and parents have discussed the difficulty of accessing services where there are protective issues for children involved. Waiting lists for agencies can be months long and children and families are often unable to be seen at times of critical need.

Further:

> Cuts in the level of funding are leading to tighter targeting of services which results in some families not having access to services because their situation is not urgent enough or serious enough.

The true shame lies in not responding. The true shame lies with the Government, which knowingly has cut back dozens of services in our community directly involved with the prevention of child abuse. In this morning's *Advertiser*, Mr Steve Ramsay, Director of the Office for Families and Children, is quoted as saying that he believes child abuse issues need to be addressed by the entire community and not just by the Government. I think the Government has an absolute responsibility to take a lead and facilitate community groups and help them in dealing with these issues. I think the $500 000 spent on Mr Steve Ramsay's Office for Families and Children would be better spent not on producing pamphlets on better parenting and a web site but on grass roots programs aimed at preventing the abuse of children.

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

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I wish to make a contribution on a recent article in the University of South Australia news headed 'Stormwater recycling attracts national interest'. Also, I wish to reflect on what we as a Parliament are doing and the issues that we bring up. I am saddened in many ways that we are continuously looking at short-term political gains. I am concerned that too often we are not discussing policies and the real issues that the public are concerned about.

All members know that South Australia is the driest State in the driest continent and we are all aware of the problem of water shortage in our State. And we are all aware of the problems with the Murray River and that South Australia, being at the bottom of the basin, has a problem with the type of water it gets as well as with salinity. All members are aware of those difficulties, but what do we do in this place? Day in and day out we talk about whom we can do a job on; which Minister we can discredit; how we can contradict the Premier; and so on. However, when we look at the real, long-term issues that the public wants us to talk about, we find that they are few and far between.

Nevertheless, I take the opportunity today to dwell on something that is important. I commend the Government for what it has been doing over the past five years with regard to water catchment. Although people complain about water levies, last night we walked around the River Torrens and we could see the improvements that have taken place. I have lived along the Torrens Linear Park for many years and have seen the improvements of the past five years. We are surely making this place a better environment for all in the future. Nevertheless, still much more needs to be done.

I now return to the article on stormwater recycling. Indeed, I still get the University of South Australia news and I commend the university on all the good things it is doing. Certainly, this article impressed me as it dealt with the recycling of stormwater. It is a matter of national interest. Centred in Newcastle, the article states:

> '. . . the project represents Australia's first attempt at developing an inner city housing complex based on cleansed stormwater runoff as a major component of supply,' Professor Argue said. 'Few if any of the potential contamination issues have arisen.'

Of course there are costs involved but, if we look at the development (and I recommend that members read the article), we find that the cost is justified when we consider the amount of water that can be collected and not wasted. Of course, we are all aware of the Bolivar works and how we are recycling water so that we can use it for irrigation in the northern market gardens. The report continues:

> Development elements include:
> - underground water tanks fitted with 'first flush' pollution diversion devices;
> - gravel-filled trenches at the front. . . of 19 home sites to receive rainwater tank overflow and provide recharge to the groundwater;
> - all runoff from the paved areas around 19 of the 27 homes diverted to a recharge area.

I believe that in all new areas in South Australia we should have water collection, we should have tanks and Government should do something about encouraging that. We should collect water underground for future use.

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

PASSENGER TRANSPORT (SERVICE CONTRACTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

With the passage of the Passenger Transport Act 1994, the Government introduced fundamental reform in the delivery of public transport services in South Australia. As required by the Act, an external review of the operations of the Passenger Transport Board was tabled on 13 August 1998. The Review, conducted by consultants, Ms Bronwyn Halliday and Mr Mark Coleman, made a number of recommendations, which are now in various stages of implementation. One recommendation, which relates to using an improved means to control the size of contracts, necessitates an amendment to Section 39 of the Act.

Currently, the Act provides that service contracts for the provision of public transport services should not require the use of more than 100 buses. This limit has been a critical factor in determining the size and delineation of contract areas, and by placing an absolute limit on the size of contract areas has given rise to a number of unintended negative consequences:

1. The 100 vehicle limit takes no account of the different size of public transport vehicles. The capacity of buses varies between 13 and 75 seats. Trains have about 100 seats. Hence, the bus limit constrains innovation as it requires operators to use larger rather than smaller buses to keep within the 100 vehicle limit.
2. The limit does not make it clear which vehicles are to be taken into account for the purpose of the limit-for example, whether to include some or all of the buses that operators hold to allow for buses that are undergoing maintenance, and to replace or complement in-service buses when required for operational reasons?

3. Advice indicates that if a bus service should operate between two contract areas, buses used on the service should be counted as part of the fleet in respect of each of the contract areas. Therefore, a single bus may be counted in two contract areas. This is an artificial impediment to the provision of effective public transport services to the community.
4. TransAdelaide is exempt from the constraint. Accordingly, TransAdelaide is provided with an advantage that is not consistent with the principle of competitive neutrality, and is at odds with the broader principles of Competition Policy.
5. The limit applies only at the time of awarding the contract. These is no sanction if the limit should be breached in the course of the contract.
6. Finally, the contract areas required to meet the 100 vehicle limit have led to the elimination of through-linking of bus services that had previously occurred for some bus services within the central part of Adelaide—generating the cost and operational efficiencies.

The 100 vehicle limit was introduced following amendments moved by both Hon. S. Kanck and Hon. B. Weise—which were supported. In good faith, our intention was to provide opportunities for small local operators, and to ensure that a public monopoly was not replaced by a private one. The 100 vehicle limit has not proven to be an effective means of achieving these objectives. In particular, it is noted that:

1. Contracts requiring in the vicinity of 100 vehicles are very large by comparison with the scale of most private bus companies in Adelaide. There are only a few companies in South Australia that have more than 10 buses. Most companies have less than 10 buses. Even the small contracts (e.g., Circle Line, Womma Rd) have not attracted interest from local operators.
2. The 100 vehicle limit per contract area does not prevent a single operator from dominating the market in Adelaide. For example, a single operator could bid for, and potentially win, every contract that was put to tender.

Against this background, the Government has considered a range of measures to overcome the limitations I have highlighted, whilst still meeting the original objectives intended of the 100 vehicle limit.

One option considered was the use of a larger number of smaller contract areas. The current system involves 11 contract areas for buses, four route contracts for individual bus services, and separate contracts for tram and train services. However, smaller contract areas would reduce the efficiency of service provision, make service integration more difficult, require more central planning of services, increase Government administration costs, increase industry tendering costs, and increase the risk of contract areas that are incompatible with depots, logical route structures and geographical communities of interest.

Other options considered, but dismissed as too prescriptive, were:

1. Establishing a maximum market share for any individual contractor. This could be accomplished by introducing a limit of, say, 40 percent of the share of the market that could be held by a single contractor. This approach has been adopted in Western Australia and Victoria.
2. Replacing the 100 vehicle limit with some other constraint such as a share of patronage.

In the final analysis, the Government's preferred approach is to strengthen the intent of Section 39 by providing more explicit guidance to the Passenger Transport Board regarding the contracting system.

Accordingly, this Bill amends the Act to provide that the Board, in awarding service contracts, must take into account the following principles:

- that service contracts should not be awarded so as to allow a single operator to obtain a monopoly, or a market share that is close to a monopoly;
- that sustainable competition in the provision of public transport services should be developed and maintained;
- that the integration of public transport services should be encouraged and enhanced; and that service contracts should support the efficient operation of passenger transport services and promote innovation in the provision of services to meet the needs of customers.

Overall, this approach allows Parliament to set the principles for establishing contracts, and enables the Passenger Transport Board to tailor contracts to meet clearly enunciated objectives, rather than relying on simple indirect, prescriptive measures such as the present limit which has not achieved the desired outcome.

As a final matter, Section 39(3)(a)(ii) requires that TransAdelaide be given the opportunity to provide not less than half of the public transport services in Adelaide until 1 March 1997. This condition was designed to allow TransAdelaide sufficient time to make the transition from being a monopoly provider of public transport services in Adelaide to a provider of services in a competitive environment. The transitional period is now over, and so the subparagraph now has no effect.

In the meantime, the staff and management of TransAdelaide have made a considerable effort in the four years since proclamation of the Act in transforming the agency. Their success in adapting to the new contracting environment is reflected in the Government's proposal to corporatise TransAdelaide. TransAdelaide has not been subject to the protection of the subclause for the last 20 months, nor is there a need to re-establish the protection. Accordingly, it is proposed that the subclause be deleted as a principle which is to guide the Passenger Transport Board in awarding service contracts.

I commend the Bill to Honourable members.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 39—Service contracts

This clause replaces subsection (3) of section 39 of the Act with new provisions that state certain principles that must be taken into account by the Passenger Transport Board when awarding contracts for services that form part of the public transport system within Metropolitan Adelaide, and state that the new subsection (3) is an expression of policy that does not give rise to rights or liabilities.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

A quorum having been formed:

SECOND-HAND VEHICLE DEALERS (COMPENSATION FUND) AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

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

That I have leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Second-Hand Vehicle Dealers Act 1995.

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): This measure is a shabby little act; it is a grubby little political trick. Introduction of this Bill is an attempt to pre-empt the legitimate processes of this Parliament. We notice that an almost identical Bill to amend the Second-Hand Vehicle Dealers (Compensation Fund) Act is on the Notice Paper. This morning when I asked the Minister for a copy of the Bill that he was to introduce, the Bill that I was shown was my Bill. This is a shabby little act. If this Government chooses to amend the Bill I have on the Notice Paper, the appropriate way to do it is when it is brought to the attention of the House. Although I will not move that we do not support this proposal, I want it on the record that this is tacky politics.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): The member for Gordon introduced a Bill, of necessity a private member's Bill, to amend the Second-Hand Vehicle Dealers Act to protect the compensation fund. What he wanted to do was to protect the compensation fund from claims involving dealers who were not licensed motor vehicle dealers such as auctioneers. It is a point I raised on a Bill last year, in the previous Parliament. I tried to achieve this, but the Government refused to accept it for the reason that it was an Opposition amendment, and it routinely refuses to accept Opposition amendments purely on that ground.

The then Deputy Premier promised that he would fix this up by Government legislation quickly, but it has taken the

member for Gordon to act on the point. Once the member for Gordon introduced his private member's Bill, the Attorney-General and the Minister representing the Attorney-General (the member for Adelaide) got together and decided to frustrate the operation of private members' time and to introduce a Government Bill so they could go off to the Motor Traders Association and say, 'It was the Government that fixed this up, not the Independent member for Gordon or the Opposition.'

As the member for Gordon says, it is a most unpleasant tactic by the Government to try to frustrate private members' time. Let me tell the House that if it were up to me I would refuse leave to the Minister to introduce a Bill that is substantially identical with the private member's Bill.

The Hon. M.H. Armitage: You can't.

Mr ATKINSON: Well, I can; and we can vote to refuse it. If the member for Gordon agreed with us, we would refuse leave. The Opposition will not cooperate with this Bill in any way, because there is a Bill already before the House capable of achieving the same objective and introduced by the member for Gordon. If the Government wants to add matters to the member for Gordon's Bill, we will do that. If it wants to amend the member for Gordon's Bill, we will do that too. But I will not allow the member for Adelaide to use this childish tactic of trying to prevent the operation of private members' time by gazumping a private member's Bill with a Government Bill. I would also say what a disgrace it was, when this Bill came before the House, that the member for Adelaide was not here and that it took three minutes for him to saunter in and speak to it. That is lazy, indolent legislating.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): Again I choose not to respond to the personal vendetta in which the member for Spence chooses to indulge on a regular basis, but it is important to identify a couple of things to the House. The first is that, as the member for Gordon indicated in his speech (with a good deal of emotion), when I was discussing this with him in private members' time this morning and he asked to see a copy of the Bill which I now intend to introduce if given leave by this House, it was his Bill: that is what he said. What the member for Gordon either did not understand or choose not to understand—because it makes a great story—was that that Bill was indeed his Bill and it was in my file for private members' time. That is appropriate and is exactly what the member for Gordon knew.

I have in my hand the Bill which I intend to introduce if given leave by the House and which actually has another 20 lines in it. So, not only does this Bill include a number of provisions covered by the member for Gordon's Bill but it also does a large number of other things. The reason we are choosing to introduce the Bill in this fashion is that we are informed that a Bill which requires the second-hand vehicle dealers compensation fund to be dealt with via a court is a money Bill. Standing Order 232 of this House provides that money Bills are introduced by a Minister. So, the reason I was speaking with the member for Gordon earlier today was to indicate to him that we would suggest that the Speaker remove his Bill from the Notice Paper, on the understanding that this Bill will do what the member for Gordon intended and a number of additional features.

We understand that there is a series of other pieces of advice that call into question the Government's advice. In our view, there is only one way to answer this and, indeed, I was speaking with the Speaker earlier today to indicate that we would seek that he make a ruling on this. For the member for Gordon to indicate that we have done anything other than be open with him, and that we are attempting to gazump his Bill by bringing in an exactly similar Bill, that is incorrect. For the member for Spence to allege anything other than that we are doing what we are required to do as the Government, I refer to Standing Order 232, chapter 23, Public Bills Initiation of the South Australian House of Assembly Standing Orders, which states:

> Money Bills to be introduced by Minister.
>
> A Bill which imposes a tax, rate, duty or impost or authorises the borrowing or expenditure of money (including expenditure of money out of money to be provided subsequently by Parliament) is introduced by a Minister.

That is our advice: that this Bill—

Mr Atkinson: Well, it is wrong.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The shadow Attorney-General, who so often gets these things right, is telling us we are wrong. I am happy to inform the member for Spence—

Ms KEY: Mr Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I seek your ruling on this Standing Order, because I do not think it applies. Will the Minister explain how it applies?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The person who gave the Government the advice in good faith is a person whose legal opinion I respect.

Mr ATKINSON: On a point of order, Sir, is the Bill the Minister is introducing in your interpretation a money Bill?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is not appropriate for the Chair to give a ruling on that matter.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The person who has given the advice, which the Government is accepting, is someone whose legal opinion, frankly, I respect more than the opinion of the member for Spence. Even if that were not the case, that is the advice the Government is getting: that this is a money Bill. Accordingly, as the member for Spence, being an upholder of the traditions of the House would expect us to do, we are in fact saying that the Bill introduced earlier by the member for Gordon offends against Standing Order 232. We are not trying to do anything other than be complimentary, I guess, to the member for Gordon. We acknowledge that his Bill does the things our Bill does, but our Bill does a number of additional things, and accordingly I believe it is in the interests of South Australians that we progress our Bill as quickly as we can.

The House divided on the motion:

AYES (23)

Armitage, M. H.(teller)	Brindal, M. K.
Brokenshire, R. L.	Brown, D. C.
Buckby, M. R.	Condous, S. G.
Evans, I. F.	Gunn, G. M.
Hall, J. L.	Hamilton-Smith, M. L.
Ingerson, G. A.	Kerin, R. G.
Kotz, D. C.	Lewis, I. P.
Matthew, W. A.	Meier, E. J.
Olsen, J. W.	Penfold, E. M.
Scalzi, G.	Such, R. B.
Venning, I. H.	Williams, M. R.
Wotton, D. C.	

NOES (23)

Atkinson, M. J.(teller)	Bedford, F. E.
Breuer, L. R.	Ciccarello, V.
Clarke, R. D.	Conlon, P. F.
De Laine, M. R.	Foley, K. O.
Geraghty, R. K.	Hanna, K.

NOES (cont.)

Hill, J. D.	Hurley, A. K.
Key, S. W.	Koutsantonis, T.
Maywald, K. A.	McEwen, R. J.
Rankine, J. M.	Rann, M. D.
Snelling, J. J.	Stevens, L.
Thompson, M. G.	White, P. L.
Wright, M. J.	

The SPEAKER: There are 23 Noes and 23 Ayes: there is an equality of votes. In making my ruling, as the House has not yet seen the Bill, it is probably appropriate that the Bill at least be brought into the House so we can see it and on that basis I will give my casting vote for the Ayes. The motion passes in the affirmative.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr Atkinson: No.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The Second-hand Vehicles Compensation Fund (the Fund) was established under section 28 of the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act 1983 and continued under the Second-hand Vehicle Dealers Act 1995 (the Act). The Fund is administered by the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs (the Commissioner). The Fund exists to compensate persons who have suffered loss during a transaction with a second-hand vehicle dealer (a dealer) and who have no reasonable prospect of recovery of that amount.

Claimants on the Fund must have purchased a second-hand vehicle from a dealer, or sold a second-hand vehicle to a dealer, or have left a second-hand vehicle in a dealer's possession to be offered for sale on consignment. Claimants on the Fund must satisfy a Magistrates Court that they have a valid unsatisfied claim against a dealer in connection with such a transaction. A claim may be successful even though the dealer is not licensed. Whether a person is a dealer is a factual question; it does not depend on whether they are licensed. Licensed dealers must pay an annual contribution of $350 to the Fund.

In July 1997, Parliament passed amendments to Schedule 3 of the Act which deals with the Fund in order to clarify who could claim against it. The amendments were designed to limit claims against the Fund arising from the sale of vehicles by auction on behalf of private sellers and were in response to the decision of the Full Court of the Supreme Court in *Commissioner for Consumer and Business Affairs v Melrose* which dealt with a claim occasioned by the demise of Kearns Bros Auctions. In the course of consultation with the industry on those amendments—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Will members move to the side of the House.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: —a number of issues relating to the operation of the Fund were raised. In particular, the issue of whether transactions with unlicensed dealers (or 'backyarders') should be the subject of claims on the Fund was questioned. As a result, the operations of the Fund were reviewed and further extensive consultations with the second-hand vehicle industry occurred.

In late 1997, the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs released an Issues Paper on the review of the Fund. The paper canvassed a range of issues in relation to the Fund. A total of 130 copies were sent to interested parties and 16 responses were received.

Most of the responses dealt with the amount of the contribution to the Fund and with claims in relation to unlicensed dealers. The consultation revealed that the major stakeholders are comfortable with the present funding arrangements if claims were to be limited to defaults occasioned by licensed dealers.

This Bill incorporating changes to the Compensation Fund provisions has been prepared, taking into account the Issues Paper and the responses to it. Key matters addressed are as follows:

1. Claim threshold

A dealer is defined in the Act as 'a person who carries on the business of selling second-hand vehicles'. A person is presumed to be a dealer under the Act if the person sells four or more vehicles in any 12 month period. A number of successful claims have been made where the 'dealer' was no more than a person selling stolen vehicles from residential premises.

The Fund is presently at risk when any person sells four or more vehicles within a 12 month period. Instead of transactions with all persons selling four or more cars being the subjects of potential claims on the Fund, it is considered that the ability to claim should be limited to transactions with licensed dealers, or persons who appear to be licensed dealers.

Claims on the Fund are limited by the Bill to transactions with persons who are licensed dealers or whom the claimants reasonably believed to be a licensed dealer at the time of the transaction. Where the claimant did not deal with a licensed dealer, the onus will be on the claimant to satisfy the court that the claimant had reasonable grounds to believe they were dealing with a licensed dealer.

2. Claim criteria

A claimant must have a 'valid unsatisfied claim' against the dealer under the transaction before the Court will order compensation. This is extremely wide. If a dealer offered travel or other inducement to secure a sale and did not subsequently provide the inducement, potentially there could be a claim against the Fund. It is not considered such claims, which could severely deplete the Fund, should be permitted.

I seek leave to insert the remainder of the explanation in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

In addition, if an insurance scheme envisaged by the Act is ever introduced, there will be the need to limit claims from the Fund to events occurring before the advent of insurance. Regulations would be able to be made making it clear whether the insurance scheme or the Fund is liable in a particular case.

The Bill provides for regulations to be made limiting the claims which may be made against the Fund.

3. Recovery powers

Once a claim has been paid from the Fund, the Commissioner is subrogated to the rights of the claimant against the dealer and can pursue the latter for the amount of the claim. However, in situations where the dealer was a company which was subsequently wound up, recoveries have been minimal. In such cases, the Commissioner becomes an unsecured creditor and enjoys no special priority.

It is considered that the Commissioner should be able to pursue the directors of companies whose conduct has led to

payments from the Fund. The ability to pursue those directly responsible for the activities of corporate motor dealers has long been recognised interstate. This State's Liquor Licensing Commissioner also possesses such powers. The Bill provides for the directors of a body corporate to be jointly and severally liable for any amount the Commissioner can recover on account of the act or omission of the body corporate. A broad ranging defence is however included so that the Director has no liability if the act or omission occurred without the director's express or implied authority or consent.

4. Miscellaneous matters

The Commissioner is able to recoup the expenses incurred in administering the Fund from the Fund itself. The Bill standardises the payment processes between all Funds administered by the Commissioner. The Auditor-General is obliged under the Act to audit the Fund at least once a year.

The Act makes provision for second-hand vehicle dealers to be insured at all times when carrying on business as a dealer, in accordance with the Regulations. There is currently no scheme in place. However, should a viable scheme be put forward in the future, the Bill provides for regulations to address transitional issues.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Amendment of Sched. 3—Second-hand Vehicles Compensation Fund

It is proposed to strike out clause 2 of Schedule 3 and substitute a new clause 2 headed *Claim against Fund*.

New clause 2(1) provides that if, on the application of a person not being a dealer who has—

- purchased a second-hand vehicle from a dealer; or
- sold a second-hand vehicle to a dealer; or
- left a second-hand vehicle in a dealer's possession to be offered for sale by the dealer on behalf of the person,

the Magistrates Court is satisfied that—

- the person has a valid unsatisfied claim against the dealer arising out of or in connection with the transaction; and
- the person has no reasonable prospect of recovering the amount of the claim (except under Schedule 3),

the Magistrates Court may authorise payment of compensation to that person out of the Second-hand Vehicles Compensation Fund (the Fund).

New clause 2(2) provides that clause 2(1) applies to such a claim whenever the transaction to which it relates occurred but only if, at the time of the transaction, the dealer was licensed, or the person making the claim reasonably believed the dealer to have been licensed.

New clause 2(2) further provides that new clause 2(1) does not apply—

(1) to a claim arising out of or in connection with the sale of a second-hand vehicle by auction or the sale of a second-hand vehicle negotiated immediately after an auction for the sale of the vehicle was conducted, if the sale was made after the commencement of the *Second-hand Vehicle Dealers (Compensation Fund) Amendment Act 1997* and the auctioneer who conducted the auction or negotiated such a sale (as the case may be) was acting as an agent only and was selling the vehicle on behalf of another person who was not a licensed dealer; or

(2) to a claim prescribed by regulation.

Clause 3 of Schedule 3 provides for payments into, and out of, the Fund. Currently, the Treasurer is required to certify the payment out of the Fund of expenses incurred in administering the Fund. It is proposed to amend clause 3 so that such administrative expenses can be paid out without the Treasurer having to certify them.

It is proposed to amend clause 5 of Schedule 3 to make it clear that, on payment out of the Fund of an amount authorised by the Magistrates Court, the Commissioner is subrogated to the extent of the payment to the rights of the person to whom the payment was made in respect of the order or claim in relation to which the payment was made.

Further amendments proposed to clause 5 provide that, if the Commissioner is subrogated to rights arising from an act or omission of a body corporate occurring on or after the commencement of this amendment, the persons who were directors of the body corporate at the time of the act or omission will be jointly and severally liable, together with the body corporate, for any amount recoverable by the Commissioner from the body corporate in pursuance of those rights. However, a director will not be liable in respect of an act or omission of the body corporate if he or she can prove (on the balance of probabilities) that the act or omission occurred without the director's express or implied authority or consent.

Clause 7 of Schedule 3 provides that Schedule 3 will expire on a day fixed by regulation for that purpose. It is proposed to amend clause 7 by adding a new subclause to make provision for the regulations to provide for transitional matters that may arise from the expiry of the Schedule, such as the payment or distribution of any money remaining in the Fund.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In Committee.

(Continued from 18 November. Page 311.)

The CHAIRMAN: I remind the Committee that we are examining the Deputy Premier, Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development in accordance with the budget results and the report of the Auditor-General.

Ms HURLEY: I refer to the supplementary report on page 96. The Auditor-General states in the supplementary report that money paid to consultants for the year 1997-98 totalled $2.3 million. My understanding is that the Government says that its policy in relation to TVSPs is that it will not re-employ those employees for a period of three years. However, the Opposition understands that a senior officer of Fisheries SA, Mr John Presser, was one of nine employees of the department who took a TSVP during 1997-98. Can the Minister confirm that situation, and whether or not Mr Presser is currently employed with the department as a consultant either in his own right or through some corporate structure? If so, what are the details of the consultancies, and what payment has been made to Mr Presser from the department for these consultancies?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I am informed that John Presser did not take a TSVP. He has left the department. In relation to a consultancy, I am not 100 per cent sure but I understand that it is for one of the fisheries management committees. We can provide further information if the Deputy Leader requires it.

Ms HURLEY: Page 83 refers to the Natural Heritage Trust. The Auditor-General states that Commonwealth grants to this State under the Natural Heritage Trust were in the order of $18.7 million. Can the Minister provide full details of grants made in South Australia and the reasons for the approval of those grants?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: It should not be difficult to provide that information. The NHT grants are listed, so we can provide a copy for the honourable member.

Ms HURLEY: I understand that one of those grants has been made to the Bookmark Biosphere Trust for research into fishing industries in the Murray River and that it has caused some controversy within the local community because of the use of those funds to construct fish traps on the Murray flood plain. I also understand from the correspondence that the department has sought legal advice in relation to regulations covering the use of fish traps and has advised that such traps are legal when the intention is not to take fish. Does the Minister accept that the use of fish traps within the context of the Bookmark Biosphere Trust research project will

'impair the free passage of fish in those waters', as stated in paragraph 54 of the Fisheries General Regulations 1984?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: It is true that the Bookmark Biosphere Trust received one of the NHT grants. I think the terminology initially was that it involved research into the river fisheries resource or something similar, which was based on the management of carp. At the time, we expressed some concern, and meetings were held between, I think, the Director of Fisheries, Fisheries officers and representatives of the trust. My recollection is that considerable agreement was reached and that the program that the Bookmark Biosphere Trust was putting in place was reasonably compatible with other research that was being conducted.

Regarding fish traps, once again it is my recollection that that issue was worked through. There were some problems with the way the fish traps were initially set up—there are fish traps and there are fish traps. I understand that they came to an agreement on that. I am not saying that every person in the Riverland totally agreed with it, because I know that some people are not particularly supportive of the Bookmark Biosphere Trust. We had some problems initially, but my understanding is that the officers went up there, considerable discussion took place, and agreement was finally reached.

Ms HURLEY: Whether or not agreement was reached with people in the Riverland, if that action is contrary to the regulations there must still be a problem for the Minister. Is it the intention of any owners within the geographical area of the Bookmark Biosphere Trust research project to harvest carp or any other fish from behind these traps and, if so, will they require or have they applied for a licence?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: If they are going to harvest carp, they will need a licence. This issue comes up periodically from people without a licence who say that carp are a pest. So, that issue has well and truly been dealt with: you do need a licence to harvest carp. I am aware of people applying for a licence to harvest carp, but not specifically as a result of these projects. I am not saying that they have not applied—I do not see every application for a licence—but I am not aware of any such applications to harvest carp going to the department. However, I can check with the Director of Fisheries and provide the Deputy Leader with the details of anyone in the Bookmark Biosphere region who has applied for a carp harvesting licence.

Ms HURLEY: If any such licences have been applied for or, in particular, granted, does the Minister believe that any authorisation of such traps is compatible with current management practices for native fish stocks, and will he say whether any studies have been done on the possible impact on native fish stocks and the harvesting of carp or any other fish from those traps?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I am informed that we will have to check with Fisheries licensing officers. We are not aware of any applications to harvest carp. As far as fish traps are concerned, I think it is important to note the purpose of the fish traps that were installed in this region: that was to try to exclude carp from some of the wetlands, which occasionally dry out, and encourage native fish.

On one of my trips to the Riverland—I think it was near Loxton—I saw where they had been able to exclude carp from a backwater. The difference was amazing. Standing on the bridge with the trap underneath, if you looked to the side where there was no carp you saw an enormous amount of weed and the banks were consolidated, whereas on the other side where the carp were the water was extremely muddy and the banks were caving in.

The fish traps are there more for R&D to see what will happen if the carp are not there. I am not aware of anyone applying to harvest carp as a result of the use of those fish traps, but we will ask the licensing officers whether anyone has applied. We have talked about this with the department quite often, and I am confident in saying that we have not granted any licences.

Ms HURLEY: I refer to the Supplementary Report (page 78). The Auditor-General is critical of departmental auditing and states that considerable effort was expended by audit officers in preparing and verifying the department's financial statements. The Auditor-General states that this was due to:

> an inadequate experience and skill level amongst departmental officers. . . inadequate systems to facilitate the production of financial statements on an accrual basis. . . an inadequate level of quality assurance exercised by the department. . . [and] inadequate documentation to support the representations of the financial statements.

This is clearly scathing criticism. We all know that the Auditor-General's Report on this department had to be delayed until the Supplementary Report was produced. We received that Supplementary Report only a couple of days ago to prepare for this questioning. I would say that that is fairly inadequate in terms of our ability to study fully the Auditor-General's Report and ask the questions that need to be asked. What is the Minister's response to these concerns and what action does he intend to take to ensure that his department meets the requirements of the audit process in future?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: The Deputy Leader raises a reasonably important issue. It gives me an opportunity to state why this happened. We would have liked this information to be published at the time of the initial report. However, that was not to be. One thing that is worth noting is that in this case there was a very complicated merger of four agencies into one consolidated set of accounts—no mean feat. As the Deputy Leader would know, many of the other merged agencies have reported separately. So, that merging did not take place with a lot of other agencies.

We acknowledge the Auditor-General's comments. We are confident that we now have the knowledge within the organisation and the staff to make sure that it is done properly in the future. The introduction of accrual accounting and the consolidation of material from the separate financial ledgers of the four former agencies of PISA, SARDI, Mines and Energy, and the Office of Energy Policy contributed to the situation. We have basically achieved what many other agencies have not been able to with the merging of accounts. That is basically the explanation.

In response to the last part of the question, action has been initiated to address what were the deficiencies. We have restructured the Corporate Finance Branch, and a new integrated financial system will be introduced from 1 March 1999.

Ms HURLEY: The Minister said that there has already been some restructuring of the department. Does he intend to follow the advice of the Auditor-General and conduct a formal review of the current structures as well as staff resources and the financial accounting system processes?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: There might be a slight misunderstanding. The first dot point that refers to reviewing the current structure is the general ledger financial system to improve the ability to discharge its external financial reporting obligations. So, that is basically in hand. Then, it

is necessary to identify the staff resources, experience, training needs and quality review processes required. That will be picked up in the restructuring of the corporate finance branch. The third one is to improve certain financial accounting system processes and reconciliatory procedures in order to maintain the integrity of information recorded for external financial reporting purposes. Once again, that is taking place.

In respect of the review of the structure as such, as the Deputy Leader will know, this was a big restructure. Some people in the industry did not particularly want the Mines and Energy Department to go. It was a major restructure that brought some problems with it. But the restructure as such has worked well, and the work is currently going on as far as pulling together the financial systems of the four former agencies.

Ms HURLEY: What does the Auditor-General mean by 'an inadequate level of quality assurance', and how will the Minister ensure that this is addressed?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I suppose that I am presuming to interpret the Auditor-General's language here, but when he talks about an inadequate level of quality assurance he is talking about the information that has gone in. I take it that what he is mainly referring to—

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Yes, we always discuss these things. I take it what he means is that, because of the drawing together of the four agencies, much of the information would have been in a different format. With respect to the quality assurances that he refers to, we realise that, now that the agency has come together under a single financial system, there has to be uniformity. With respect to the restructuring of the corporate finance branch, that will certainly flow and come about.

Ms HURLEY: I now move to page 93 of the Supplementary Report. I want to ask some questions about the Marine Scale Fisheries Management Committee. The Auditor-General states that industry and State grants were made to Fisheries SA during 1997-1998. What is the current membership of the Marine Scale Fisheries Management Committee?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: That is quite a challenging question. The Chair is Martin Cameron. I know that Neville Sampson is a member, as are, I believe, Alan Suter and John Winwood. We have quite a few of these committees: I know most of the faces and can put names to many of them. However, rather than make a mistake, I will obtain the list for the Deputy Leader, and I am sure that she will read it with great interest.

Ms HURLEY: Does the Minister accept that at the South Australian Fishing Industry Council AGM on 29 September 1998, attended by both the Minister and the Director of Fisheries, the Director of Fisheries gave a commitment that positions for the fishing management committee would be advertised in November this year?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Yes, that was mentioned in the Legislative Council the other day, so I have read that. My memory as to what was said is not exact. I remember the question that was asked of the Director of Fisheries. It has been intimated—and it may well be correct—that the Director said that it will be advertised in November. A decision has been made with the management committees across the board. The industry has asked us to look at the structure of fisheries management in South Australia. A consultant has come up with some options.

The consultant is talking to the industry about what those options are, and a decision was made on the basis that the adoption of some of those options would require a change in the way in which we run our fisheries management committees and that certain members would roll over. I am informed that the rollovers are possible as a result of the way that the committees are set up. Rather than replacing people for what might be only six months before we change the structure, the decision was made to roll them over. I know that within the marine scale fishery—which is a very challenging and enjoyable part of the portfolio—there is always a lot of—

An honourable member: Samples.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Yes, samples. There is a lot of debate about the composition of all industry bodies, and certainly the Fisheries Management Committee, like the management committee for the marine scale fishery, is not exempt from a lot of scrutiny from within industry, and there are what you might call small power battles as to who is appointed to these FMCs. So, whether you appoint people or do not appoint people, there is always a bit of criticism. My understanding is that, because of the restructuring, the terms of those whose time was due to expire have been extended for a period, and it is within the rules of these committees to do so.

Ms HURLEY: Still referring to the restructuring of marine scale fisheries, in November 1996 the Minister wrote to Mr Michael Whillas, General Manager of SAFIC. That letter states:

> The 1990-1992 review of the South Australian marine scalefish fishery and the 1994 review of net fishing identified an urgent need to rationalise the number of commercial licences and to restructure the marine scalefish fishery and management arrangements.

The letter further states:

> In May 1995, the Minister for Primary Industries announced a Government decision to restructure the commercial marine scalefish fishery which would ultimately reduce the number of licences by two-thirds to around 180-200 licences. However, other than the licence amalgamation scheme, no other fishery adjustment program has been developed. I consider an economic assessment is required before we can identify the most appropriate structure of the fishery.

The letter continues:

> It is anticipated that the total cost of this consultancy will be about $50 000 and that it would take six months to complete.

As the letter was written 12 months ago, can the Minister update us on that review and what has happened with it?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: The letter to Mr Whillas does talk about some of the former restructure attempts, and I know that my predecessor at one stage set some goals. It was hoped that those goals might be achieved through the amalgamation system. That has proved to be somewhat slow. There has not been a lot of restructuring through the amalgamation system. There is a need for this, a need which many feel is urgent; but others do not feel that way about it.

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Yes. I feel it is urgent. Some fishermen feel that things are all right but, overall, the incomes of marine scale fishermen are not commensurate with the effort they put in. It is widely felt that something else has to be done, but you cannot just take away people's property rights. When we talk about restructure—and I have said this at a couple of meetings with fishermen—perhaps 'restructure' might not be the right word. We are looking for other ways of doing things within marine scale fishing to get to the stage where the licence holders receive better incomes and where those who might want to leave the industry perhaps have something better than the amalgamation scheme.

But a lot of that has to be flushed out in the restructure process or in the debate on where the industry goes, and that will take place soon. We have not let a tender for that; it has been worked through with industry. Certainly, SAFIC is involved. The FMC is involved in talking about just where we go to try to make things better for licence holders. The basic answer is, 'No, we have not committed to that $50 000 at the moment', and discussions with industry continue.

Ms HURLEY: I refer to Part B, Volume 3, page 693 of the Auditor-General's Report and to the Animal and Plant Control Commission. During questions on the Auditor-General's Report for 1997 in February this year, I asked a question about audited accounts of control boards incorporated under the Animal and Plant Control Act 1986. In his 1997 report, the Auditor-General found that 20 of the 47 control boards had not supplied audited accounts for the year ending 31 December 1996. In his response to my question about this failure, the Minister said:

> I agree that it is totally unacceptable the way that the reports are being put in an untimely manner, and that is why we will change the Act and put a definite time limit on that practice. The department has assured me that they will be addressed before the preparation of the 1997-98 financial statements.

In this year's report, the Auditor-General has commented again on the failure of certain control boards to supply audited accounts as required. At the date of finalisation of the audit of the Animal and Plant Control Commission, 11 of the 46 control boards had not supplied audited accounts for the year ended 31 December 1997. Can the Minister explain?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thought this question would be asked but, as the Deputy Leader acknowledged, with 20 last year and only 11 this year, it is improving. Unfortunately, the honourable member is correct. The Act is the problem in that, while it states 'as soon as practical after 31 December' it does not actually provide a deadline. What has happened in the past and what continues to happen is that some of the boards have not been all that speedy when submitting their reports. When I read this the other day, I remembered my comment of last year. We do intend to change the Act; it has been proposed. As with the entire new Act to deal with animal and plant control, in consultation with industry, industry has asked that we not introduce that Bill and the Landcare Bill until we are able to draw together these Acts into an integrated resource management system. That is why the Bill has been held up.

As soon as we work through some of those issues, it will be introduced. Hopefully, next year the Deputy Leader will not be able to ask me the same question as we will have it sorted out by then. We are in constant discussion with SAFF and with the various community groups that have an interest in integrated resource management in terms of how we proceed.

Ms HURLEY: I refer to the pig meat industry. Today's *Financial Review* reports that the Productivity Commission will impose tariffs in this respect; however, South Australian pig producers may not be in such a good situation. The ABC *National Rural News* of Friday 20 November cites ABS figures in relation to a dramatic increase in exports of pig meat. However, the final part of the article states:

> The consistent decline has been in South Australia, from over 100 000 head slaughtered in June 1997 to just 78 000 head last quarter.

Will the Minister explain in what way he is assisting the South Australian pig meat industry?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I am not too sure how this question relates to the Auditor-General's Report, but it is a question that a member on this side of the House could have asked. We have done quite a bit of work with the pig meat industry over the last six months or so. It is true that the industry has been through some pretty hard times and that it continues to do it hard. We did give the industry assistance to prepare an application to the Federal Government for 'exceptional circumstances'. We worked closely with the SAFF pig meat section on that.

One of South Australia's big problems is the lack of export abattoirs for pigs. It is well and truly identified that, while we tend to have a problem with imports and with domestic consumption, the big opportunity with pig meat is the export market, where there has been some market failure due to the lack of works to slaughter the pigs and export the meat.

In relation to what we are doing in this regard, I have been working with the Department of Industry and Trade and various others within government to try to ensure that a major investment in a new export pig abattoir at Murray Bridge proceeds. Unfortunately, like so many of these matters, it is currently being held up by planning appeals; but the Government is assisting that abattoir. I have been involved in that, and we see that as being one of the major turnarounds for the pig meat industry in South Australia.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Hon. R.B. Such): The Committee will now examine the Auditor-General's Report and budget results 1997-98 in relation to the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services.

Mr CONLON: I welcome the new and most junior of the Ministers and point out that I do not necessarily share all the views that people have been dudded in terms of being responsible to such a junior Minister—a view shared by the police and emergency services. I think the Minister should be given the chance to prove his lack of competency before we start bagging him—and I look forward to that. The Country Fire Service Board rarely gets a good rap from the Auditor-General. What has the Minister done about it?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: It is a fairly general question; the honourable member might like to be a little more specific about what he is asking.

Mr CONLON: I understand that, if we get through these questions quickly, we can all go home, so the Minister might want to be to the point with his answers. The Auditor-General identified problems with the asset stocktakes and for the third year running he has commented on the lack of management of leave entitlements. When are they going to get their act in order and what have you done about it?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I thank the shadow spokesperson for his question and his initial comments. Before answering the question, I would simply say that the importance in policing, emergency services and corrections is the commitment, interest and endeavour that a Minister has and not whether they are a young Minister or wherever they may rank in the Ministry. I take my portfolio seriously and look forward to doing my best within my capacity to work with all those services, and I look forward to working as cooperatively as possible with the shadow spokesperson in the interests of good policing, emergency services and correctional services.

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I am even fairer. With respect to asset recording, the Auditor-General did qualify his independent audit report on the basis that the CFS had not been able to provide appropriate documentation to support, with a considerable degree of certainty, values attributed, as

the shadow spokesperson has pointed out, to property, plant and equipment assets. Asset deprival value was not consistently recorded and there was an absence of regular stocktakes. That has been acknowledged by the CFS. I accept also that it has been going on for longer than I would have liked but, given that I have been in the job only for six weeks, I am not able to turn around things that are three years old. Asset identification and management within the CFS still does remain a complex issue due to the varied ownership of appliances, infrastructure, buildings and equipment. We have involved the CFS board, local government, other Government departments, such as Environment, Housing and Aboriginal Affairs, and then the individual brigades.

They are committed to an asset stocktake during this financial year as part of the preparation and adjustment to central funding and, of course, the implementation of the emergency services levy. At the time the Auditor-General visited the CFS, asset values were being reviewed in accordance with accounting policy statement No. 3 and, as part of the CFS transition to this, it has included the justification of two new positions. The board has put on two new people who will be absolutely focused on asset management. Finally, these positions were justified—and I am sure the member opposite will be interested in this—and Treasury and Finance has approved that, highlighting that a lack of staff support in the asset management area prior to this time might have been part of the reason why this occurred previously.

Mr CONLON: I now refer to the police portfolio. I note that income from expiation fees has risen some 21 per cent, which is a rise of $9.1 million. I know it is a different department but, when I consider this in conjunction with the extra $6 million raised in the past 12 months from speed cameras, it seems to be a remarkably good earner for the Government. Will the Minister explain why he cut $3 million from the police budget when they are out there making an extra $9 million for him?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: As the honourable member would know, right across government, unfortunately, there have had to be cuts in every area of about 1 per cent. I acknowledge it is unfortunate whenever there have to be cuts in government, but the fact is that recurrent budget issues are still under enormous strain and we know the reason for that. Relatively speaking, we came into government only a short time ago (only five years ago)—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Hart needs to restrain himself.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Thank you, Mr Chairman. It is nice to see the member for Hart being so excited. Only a mere five years ago we had a recurrent budget—

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister has the call.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Only five years ago we had a recurrent budget problem. The Government has been trying to fix that and there are still difficulties that have been acknowledged. As Police Minister, I would obviously like to see no cuts in the police budget. The important thing is that we are working to provide the best possible policing services. We have just seen what was a well received enterprise bargaining agreement accepted by the rank and file, and the fact is that the increase in income, as the honourable member has highlighted, does not go far towards expenditure when it comes to road carnage and smashes in this State.

Mr CONLON: I have to say that is an entirely unsatisfactory answer that the police should be contributing an extra $3 million to your budgetary considerations when at the same time they are contributing an extra $9.1 million out of extra pinches. We have seen the documents fly around requiring the police to get the number of pinches, despite denials from the Minister. We have seen it: the document has been in public circulation. Is the $9.1 million increase associated with higher fines or extra pinches?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I understand, if I heard the question rightly, the additional $9 million of revenue raised by speed detection equipment and general fines is across the board. There was an increase in speed camera revenue and an increase in laser activity, and a range of other activities within the force. It was not associated with one area only.

Mr CONLON: Did you get extra money because you got more pinches or because you put up the fines? It is a pretty simple question.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Unfortunately, there has been an increase in speeding detection and quite a significant amount of that has come from an increase in the number of people detected while speeding. I encourage those people to slow down and then they will not be contributing to our revenue.

Mr CONLON: I understand that you say that, but I am not sure that you would encourage them all to slow down because you are making $45 million a year out of it.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CONLON: That is right. If we can pinch everyone for speeding, we can keep the electricity supply. Given the size of the increase in pinching people speeding, what study has been done to show whether the focus has worked? It seems that the focus of policing seems to be remarkably unsuccessful if the number of people being pinched is increasing. I would have thought you would have been showing greater success if fewer people were being detected for speeding. What analysis has been done by the Minister or the Police Department into the success of the current measures or are they simply, as so many people believe, a back door revenue raiser for the Government?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Interestingly, the honourable member keeps talking about revenue raising, pinches, funding going into general coffers and all the rest of it. I am not sure whether that was an unwritten law when the Labor Party was in government. Certainly as the Minister responsible I have one responsibility only, that is, to assist the police to do the best possible job. I congratulate the police on the way they go about all their duties. As to speed detection, the fact is simply this: more people have been speeding and more equipment has been brought forward over the past couple of years. There has been an increase in rate revenue, but it is not about revenue raising.

Members opposite do not think I do this often, but I congratulate the previous Government because, when it first brought in speed cameras, it was the start of showing that those sorts of initiatives by responsible Governments have an impact on reducing fatalities and the road toll. For example, as recently as 1974, only 24 years ago (the honourable member is a similar age to me and will remember during his high school days) there was more than one road death every day. Last year we had about 148 deaths. There has been a 50 per cent reduction.

When we have brought in any initiatives to increase speed detection—random breath testing and the like—it has shown a clear reduction. I must also report to the honourable member that Dr Jack McLean, who is from the university and who is heavily involved with some of his colleagues in research on accident investigation, has indicated that speed detection equipment and policing for speed has an enormous impact on reducing the road toll. In fact, just to give the honourable member an example, I point out that a driver speeding at 70 km/h risks a potential accident to the same degree as someone with a blood alcohol level of .1 per cent.

Mr CONLON: I wonder if I could get an answer to the question I asked. What study has been done to show the efficacy of the current methods of policing speeding? I am not satisfied that if you are pinching more people it is working. This suggests to me that it is not working; more people are speeding. What study has been done into the efficacy or the preventive nature of current policing methods?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: A range of work has been done. Although I do not have them with me right now, I am happy to supply the honourable member with some graphs and pie charts dealing with those issues. In a press release that I put out only this week I highlighted that in the past 12 months 7 000 people were detected for speeding on Burbridge Road. If those 7 000 people were picked up for speeding on Burbridge Road, I would suggest that if the equipment was not there not only would they not be picked up there but a culture of increased speeding would be continuing to develop. The bottom line is that I am not prepared to see that increased culture in speeding occur.

Mr CONLON: I am—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Elder will stand in his seat.

Mr CONLON: This was my whole point; I am very interested in all this. I am surprised that there were 7 000 pinches on Burbridge Road: that is very high. I wonder whether they are concentrated on Burbridge Road because it has a high accident rate or it is a hot spot or because they get a lot of pinches there.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: The honourable member would understand that police operations are a decision for the police and not the Minister. The police look at this scientifically. They assess computer data on road incidents involving either a high road toll or high accident rate over a three year period, and that is where they put a lot of their police detection equipment. In addition, police who are highly trained in this area, particularly traffic police, look at what they believe to be areas of potentially high collision rates and make a decision to locate the equipment based on risk.

The honourable member may be interested in a third matter. I am sure many members of Parliament have been in a situation where constituents have come into their office and said, 'I'm sick and tired of people speeding down this road; could you as the local member do something to encourage the police to consider putting equipment there?' I have been advised that the police do pay attention to local residents who observe speeding on a continuing basis and who have a very good knowledge of it, particularly when people are driving to and from work and school.

Mr CLARKE: I have a few questions along the same lines as those of the member for Elder. First, I thought that at your Party's recent love-in in Port Pirie the decision was taken that signs advising motorists that they had just passed through a speed camera zone would be reinstituted. I have passed several of your speed cameras of late, and I have not noticed the signs. When will they be erected?

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair has a particular interest in this, as well. The Minister.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Thank you, Mr Chairman; I am pleased to see that you are showing an extraordinary interest in my portfolio, as is the member for Ross Smith. I am pleased to see that the honourable member acknowledges the initiative that we put forward at the important planning seminar at Port Pirie. The honourable member did not highlight in his question the fact that over all the years when the Opposition was in Government it did not have any signage anywhere for speed detection equipment, whereas we are prepared to be more pro-active and up-front than that. I have been advised (and I ask you to let me know if this is not the case when you drive past a speed camera) that as from this Monday (23 November) a sign will have been put in place at the end of every speed camera zone. That is being evaluated, which I support. Some new signs had to be painted up and I understand that they have now been in place with every operating camera since last Monday.

With respect to the pro-active road safety message type of signage, I am pleased to report that the Hon. Graham Ingerson is heading up a task force, comprising me representing police issues; Minister Laidlaw representing transport; the Deputy Premier Rob Kerin, regarding primary industry signage; and Minister Joan Hall, representing tourism. With the people who are involved in the placement of signs, the Hon. Graham Ingerson is considering what we will do as regards signage on all our arterial and country roads and the entrances to our State.

Mr CLARKE: Perhaps in answering my next question the Minister might also answer a question with respect to the issue that he just raised about this task force that has been established, led by the Hon. Graham Ingerson. Will he or the task force need to investigate similar types of signage overseas or around Australia to bring back some ideas to this State? If that is the case, can I also nominate for the task force? Following the line put by the member for Elder about the correlation between the increase in the number of speeding fines and the increase in the revenue for the Government, I will mention a couple of particular areas. I do not expect you to have an answer straight away, but you may be able to come back to me. I would be interested to know how many fatalities and actual road accidents have occurred on Park Terrace near that infamous Barton Road turn-off as you go towards Clipsal or Gerard Industries. Just as you go down the hill, miraculously and with fairly monotonous regularity I see a speed camera there. I have lived or driven in that area for some years, and I have yet to see a car accident or hear of any fatality that may have occurred.

Another area I would like the Minister to consider is along Montefiore Hill. As you leave Memorial Drive and drive up Montefiore Hill towards Jeffcott Street, a speed camera seems to be placed there regularly, and I would be interested to know the number of accidents and fatalities that have occurred there over, say, the past four years. I have also noticed that, after accelerating up the hill to go over Morphett Street bridge and as you start to go down and decelerate approaching the traffic lights, where you are inevitably travelling at just over 60 km/h—around 65 to 70 km/h—a preponderance of laser guns has been stationed there. Again, I would be interested to know the number of accidents and fatalities that have occurred in that location along that route in the past five years. I will mention two other locations. I

could give you an army of locations, but these are just a couple that have caught my attention.

On Main North Road at Enfield near Darlington Road heading out of the city, again, just as you are coming down the hill towards Gepps Cross when you naturally tend to pick up speed because you are going downhill having accelerated uphill, a speed camera seems to be present regularly. In fact, I contributed towards your $9 million increase in traffic fines in the past 12 months at that very location only a few months ago. The last example is Tapleys Hill Road as you leave the 80 km/h speed zone to go into the 60 km/h speed zone by the airport just before you get to Burbridge Road. It cost me $400 two years ago, just after the police won their pay rise. A speed camera caught me on Monday night at about 9.30 p.m., as I went from the 80 km/h zone into the 60 km/h zone. Then, turning right up Burbridge Road to go back into the city, running alongside the airport, you move from the 80 km/h zone to the 60 km/h zone and, amazingly, another speed camera was there on the same night in September 1996, which cost me another $180.

So, on that location, I contributed $360 dollars in five minutes to the State's coffers. I would be interested to know whether the Minister could give me that information on the number of fatalities or accidents at those locations.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: On the first point I will report to the Hon. Graham Ingerson, who is heading up the task team, that the honourable member would be interested in assisting if there is an opportunity, and I gather that that involves the possibility of the honourable member's taking a trip to Marree or Birdsville.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: The honourable member mentioned overseas study trips—he may have to go to Marree or Birdsville to undertake the necessary study. We will get answers to the specific questions asked. By virtue of the fact that the honourable member has had the unfortunate experience of being detected for speeding on so many occasions, I hope that he has learnt the error of his ways and will reduce his speed as I would hate to see him as a tragedy case in hospital.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Some of us here actually enjoy your company. The honourable member highlighted the fact that he sees cameras there on a regular basis. If the statistics come back and show that police have not detected a lot of people speeding there or that there have not been many accidents there, one could argue two things. First, it may be that people are aware that police are out there actively monitoring speed that is stopping road accidents in the area, and if that is the case I applaud the police operations for using that discretion and intelligence training there. Secondly, there should be a message to people that if they are going past these cameras on a regular basis they will be caught if they break the law.

Like the example of the Morphett Street bridge, there are plenty of traffic lights at the bottom of hills. It is no excuse for people to go through a red light at the bottom of a hill because they are going downhill. Equally there is no excuse for speeding downhill. You have a duty of care in driving a vehicle; 60 km/h is the speed limit and you need to keep your eyes on the speedometer, just as you need to keep your eyes on the traffic lights. If you do not speed you will not contribute to revenue.

Ms KEY: I refer to road audits. I am on the Environment Resources and Development Committee, which has been looking into the rural road strategy, and I was interested in the evidence of the witnesses we had, especially from the Police Force, with regard to the responsibility that seems to have gone more into the SAPOL area for road audits, particularly in rural areas. Will the Minister comment and indicate whether will funding will continue in that area for road audits?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I will obtain detailed information on that matter for the honourable member. I thank the honourable member for being involved in that work because it involves an important issue, and it is horrifying to see tragedies occurring on rural roads. People get out there and really accelerate. Whilst it is primarily the responsibility of my colleague in another place, the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning, I am not against her making some use of our police resources out there. Country police in particular are there for quite a few years, travel over those roads and have a better understanding of so-called hot spots. If there needs to be integration between Transport SA and the police in respect of road conditions, clearly resources are scarce, and if you have a situation where Transport SA officers are not out there auditing as much as police, who are making rural visits, I do not have a problem with that and would support it.

Ms KEY: I refer to the constant information that I seem to hear from the member for Wright with regard to the feeding of the horses and dogs. Is it true that the Minister has cut their food supply in half and that resources in that area have been cut back?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I am happy to give the honourable member a written response. I was out recently looking at these magnificent new fillies and colts and I have never seen stock cared for any better. The police have a real love for and interest in their animals, and I have never seen anything in the Dog Squad or Police Department to indicate that animals are not being well and truly looked after. Sometimes these things run for different reasons, but I have no evidence to indicate that they are not being at least adequately looked after.

Mr CLARKE: I refer to the use of police resources. I have a constituent, Mr Don Shipway, who runs Sports Locker, a sports store in Sefton Plaza which a fortnight ago was burgled. He was called from his home in Black Forest by his security guard, and when he arrived at Sefton Plaza he found his security guard there trying to contact the police. The guard asked him to listen to his mobile telephone, only to hear piped music while waiting to get through to the communications room to inform them that the thieves were believed to be still on the premises, up in the ceiling. It took another 30 minutes before any police officers arrived at the site.

No blame is attached to the police officers. Obviously a lot of things are going on in terms of occupying their time. This was an occasion when the guard was telling the police, 'We think the thieves are in the ceilings; if you get here now you can nab them.' It was impossible for the police to get there under 30 minutes. That is not good enough. I do not believe that this Government is giving the police sufficient resources to enable them to do their job, particularly given the increase of $9 million paid out of the pockets of people like myself caught speeding. I would not mind if the Government spent the money on boosting the number of police patrols so that they could actually nab the thieves while on site, rather than having the present situation where that money is not being used to improve law and order.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Minister wish to respond briefly?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Very briefly. The new local service area models are aimed at improving response time, as I highlighted to the House yesterday. If the member would provide me with specific details, I will look at it and see why. The honourable member did indicate that they rang 11444 and yet they thought there were intruders on the premises. From my understanding of the situation, if you think intruders are on the premises, you should be dialling 000 not 11444 because that is a potential life-threatening situation or one where the intruders could be arrested. If the honourable member obtains the details for me, I will provide him with a considered response.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I advise the Committee that the time for examination of the report of the Auditor-General and budget results has expired.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I inform the House that consideration in Committee of the report of the Auditor-General and budget results for 1997-98 is complete.

TRANSADELAIDE (CORPORATE STRUCTURE) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

Consideration in Committee of the report.

(Continued from 25 November. Page 438.)

The CHAIRMAN: I remind the Committee that we are currently dealing with Standing Order 145A which relates to a citizen's right of reply. Are there any more speakers on that matter?

Mr CLARKE: Mr Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the Committee.

A quorum having been formed:

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further speakers, the question is that New Standing Order 145A relating to a citizen's right of reply be agreed to. For the question say 'Aye', against 'No'; I think the Ayes have it. It would appear there is some confusion. I will put it again.

Mr CLARKE: On a point of order, Sir: you clearly told the Committee what they were voting on. You asked very clearly for the Ayes and for the Noes. There were no Noes. You called correctly for the Ayes. There was no dissent or motion or any member calling 'Division', so the matter stays. That is my point.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: On a point of clarification, Mr Chairman, we did call 'No'. You have not yet said whether the Ayes or the Noes got the call.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! As there appears to be confusion—and there has been considerable confusion in this Chamber today—I will put the call again.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Yes, I can. The Chair has that capacity.

CHAIRMAN'S RULING

Mr CLARKE: I move:

That the Chairman's ruling be disagreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Ross Smith will bring that matter in writing to the Chair.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Ross Smith has delivered to the table an indication he moves dissent in the Chairman's ruling. Mr Speaker, I have to report that the member for Ross Smith has moved dissent from my ruling with respect to seeking to call for another vote on a question already put and carried in Committee, namely the clause dealing with citizens' rights.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have examined the resolution before the Chair. I uphold the decision of the Chairman and, in doing so, I would point out to the House that it is on the public record on many occasions—and I would even suspect in relation to the member for Ross Smith—that this matter has been raised before and, with the agreement of the House, votes have been put again. However, the motion has been moved and I now call one speaker from either side to speak for and against the motion. Does the member for Ross Smith wish to speak to his motion?

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): Mr Speaker, you are quite correct that on past occasions, with the agreement of the House or of the Committee, a motion has been put before the House or Committee to vote upon again. But, on this occasion there was no agreement on the part of the Opposition with respect to that type of tactic. What happened in Committee, which was abundantly clear for all who were here to see and hear, was that the Chairman of Committees, quite rightly, put the amendment with respect to that moved by the member for Spence on citizens' rights. The Chairman asked for those who were for the proposition to say 'Aye' and those against to say 'No'. There were only the 'Ayes' in terms of any audible sound within this Chamber; there was not one audible 'Nay'. It might have been the neighing of a horse—Caligula's horse, in the form of the member for Unley—but there was no naying in a parliamentary sense.

Mr CONLON: On a point of order, Sir, I do not think that Caligula's horse deserves to be compared to—

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. That is a frivolous interjection.

Mr CLARKE: The Chairman correctly called the vote, that is, that the Ayes had it. No-one on the Government side called for a division. Indeed, the Chairman looked towards the Minister and the Deputy Premier to see whether or not either of them would call for a division. No-one did. I know what happened, and it is a perfectly logical explanation; that is, that neither the Minister nor the Deputy Premier (in particular the Deputy Premier as Leader of Government business in this House) was aware of what was going on at that time; it had escaped their notice. That is not our problem.

I know that the Deputy Premier has other matters to think about, namely, whether he accepts the final step and moves up one more seat. However, on this issue the motion was put, the Chairman correctly called that the Ayes had it, and no-one called for a division. This was after some time had elapsed, so there was ample opportunity for a Government member to call for a division, and the amendment was carried.

When Government Ministers realised that inadvertently a clause that the Government did not support got through on the voices, they sought to have the Chairman rule again and called for another vote. My argument is that the vote was put and carried. If the Government wishes to rescind the motion, it is possible to move such a motion under the Standing Orders. However, it must be done in accordance with

Standing Orders and not simply on the basis of the Deputy Premier scratching his head and saying, 'I missed that one. Come on, Mr Chairman, let's have another show of hands.'

It does not work that way in this place. It might with the cooperation of the Opposition of the day, and on non-contentious matters that is probably quite an expeditious way of doing things. But this is a hotly contended matter, supported by the Opposition and, if the Government was too slow off the mark with respect to calling 'No' or calling for a division, it must go through the proper procedures of seeking a rescission in accordance with Standing Orders, and members should not simply try to barrel the Chairman into calling for another show of hands.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier): The member for Ross Smith was in the House, as I was, and obviously he needs his ears cleaned out. We did call 'No', and I stand corrected because I was of the opinion that the Chairman had not called it, but one of my colleagues has said that he did. I did not pick that up, but I had called 'No' initially. The Chair, because of the raucous behaviour of members on the other side, may have had some trouble hearing that, but it was clearly called. For the member for Ross Smith to say that the Chairman was barrelled into changing his mind is incorrect. It was very raucous in here and the Chairman, by his own choice, called for another vote, and I think that we should stand by the Chairman. I think his call was correct. The call for another vote was correct and I think we should back up the Chairman.

The House divided on the motion:

AYES (20)

Atkinson, M. J.	Bedford, F. E.
Ciccarello, V.	Clarke, R. D. (teller)
Conlon, P. F.	De Laine, M. R.
Foley, K. O.	Geraghty, R. K.
Hanna, K.	Hill, J. D.
Hurley, A. K.	Key, S. W.
Koutsantonis, T.	Rankine, J. M.
Rann, M. D.	Snelling, J. J.
Stevens, L.	Thompson, M. G.
White, P. L.	Wright, M. J.

NOES (23)

Armitage, M. H.	Brindal, M. K.
Brokenshire, R. L.	Buckby, M. R.
Condous, S. G.	Evans, I. F.
Gunn, G. M.	Hall, J. L.
Hamilton-Smith, M. L.	Ingerson, G. A.
Kerin, R. G. (teller)	Kotz, D. C.
Lewis, I. P.	Matthew, W. A.
Maywald, K. A.	McEwen, R. J.
Meier, E. J.	Olsen, J. W.
Scalzi, G.	Such, R. B.
Venning, I. H.	Williams, M. R.
Wotton, D. C.	

PAIR(S)

Breuer, L. R.	Penfold, E. M.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

New Standing Order 145A negatived.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, the member for Spence appears to have an implement in the Chamber that I do not think is allowed.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair is of the opinion that as long as the member for Spence does not display what he has on his lap, it is in order.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

Proposed amendments to Standing Orders 149, 160, 171, 172 and 186 agreed to.

Standing Order 190 left out.

Proposed new Standing Order 194 agreed to.

Standing Order 196 left out.

Proposed new Standing Order 197 agreed to.

Standing Order 239 left out.

Proposed new Standing Orders 242, 265, 348, 370 and 399 agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is that all references to 'printing' and 'printed', wherever they occur, be replaced by 'publishing' and 'published'.

Question agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is that the 'g' in 'Sargeant-at-Arms', wherever it occurs, be replaced by a 'j'.

Question agreed to.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I move:

That the report as amended be adopted.

Mr ATKINSON: This was an opportunity for the Parliament to change the Standing Orders in a way that would improve parliamentary behaviour and would give citizens who are unfairly defamed under parliamentary privilege the right of reply in *Hansard*. The proposals were modest and would have improved the standing of parliamentarians and Parliament in the eyes of the public. Let no-one who reads this debate and reads the division list misunderstand who was responsible for perpetrating rabble-rousing in this House and the use of parliamentary privilege unfairly to defame a citizen: it was the Liberal Party, and their names are recorded.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: The procedure now is that this document has to go to the Governor for his assent, and I would expect that it will come into operation probably about the beginning of February.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 8 December at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 24 November 1998

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

NEEDLE EXCHANGE PROGRAM

3. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Are the cost of syringes subsidised by the State Government and if so, who are the recipients and what were the associated costs for 1996-97 and 1997-98.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In 1989, the needle and syringe exchange scheme was established in South Australia as a harm minimisation strategy to prevent the spread of infectious diseases, such as HIV/AIDS and Hepatitis B and C. Injecting drug users are recognised as being a group at high risk of contracting and transmitting the HIV virus and the group through which the infection is most likely to be spread to the wider community. The adoption of strategies, such as needle exchange, which are aimed at reducing the potential harm of drug use, are the most practical and cost effective means by which injecting drug users can be attracted to and positively influenced by health services. The effectiveness of these programs is evidenced by the fact the proportion of all HIV infections attributed to illicit injecting drug use in this state decreased from 30 per cent of cases in 1987 to 4 per cent of cases in 1996.

At present, there are 191 needle exchanges operating in South Australia. The number of exchanges has continued to increase markedly every year since 1988-89, when there were only five in total. These exchanges operate from a variety of sources such as specialist services, community health centres, youth, women's and student health centres, hospitals and chemists. Of these, 78 are located throughout rural South Australia.

Prior to 1992, the needle exchange service was offered free of charge to clients. In 1992, the State Government and the Pharmacy Guild entered into a joint venture to operate the 'Fitpack Scheme'. The initial cost of the Fitpack to the clients is $5. If they return a used pack for safe disposal they are entitled to purchase their next pack at the discounted price of $3. The Drug and Alcohol Services Council (DASC) purchases the Fitpacks for $1.37 and supply them to pharmacists at no cost. It costs DASC approximately 10¢/unit to dispose of the returned Fitpacks. The pharmacists pay for the syringes supplied in the Fitpacks. The total cost to DASC is approximately $1.47 per Fitpack. The difference between the sale price ($5 and $3) and the purchase price is passed on the pharmacists to cover their costs on the syringes and as a professional fee for their services.

The total number of syringes supplied by the needle and syringe exchange program in 1997-98 was 1 683 433 compared to 1 220 184 in 1996-97.

The total costs for syringes and other equipment which have been supplied during this period were:

Description	1996-97	1997-98
Needles and Syringes	$161 500	$221 168
Fitpacks	67 030	83 900
Sharps Disposal Units	21 490	30 748
Other Supplies	19 442	20 211
Total	269 462	356 027

Of these amounts, $70 389 (1996-97) and $103 182 (1997-98) were provided to community pharmacies.

Under the Medicare Agreement, goods and services in public hospitals are paid for by the State Government and this would include the provision of syringes for patients with diabetes.

The Diabetes Association has advised that people living with diabetes receive a Commonwealth subsidy under the National Diabetes Services Scheme on their needles and syringes provided they purchase them from the Diabetes Association of South Australia.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT REBATES

4. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** What is the current pensioner rebate on council rates, when was the last increase and when will the next increase apply?

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The Minister for Human Services has provided the following information:

The current value of the Council rate rebate is 60 per cent of the rate charged to a maximum of $150 per annum. Pensioners and other Centrelink (DSS) recipients and some low income earners are eligible.

The rebate was introduced in the 1970s and has not been increased since then. There are no current plans to increase the level of the rebate.

It should be noted that although there has been no increase in the value of the rebate to individual households, significant increases in the eligible population due to demographic changes have resulted in a dramatic rise in expenditure, eg. from $13.5 million in 1991-92 to $19.4 million in 1996-97. This rate of increase is expected to continue. Any increases in the level of the rebate will clearly have significant budget implications.

CHILD CARE

14. **Ms WHITE:**

1. How much of the $600 000 fund allocated by the Government to help community-based child centres remain open has been spent?

2. Of the centres that have announced their closure since the establishment of the fund, how many have received funding?

3. Have the Pennington or Pines child-care centres benefited from this fund?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:

1. Funds will be allocated progressively over the coming months as applications are received and assessed by Department of Education, Training and Employment staff.

To date, I have approved the allocation of $43 431 to four child-care centres.

No recipient centres have closed and I am not aware that any of these centres intend to close.

2. I have recently approved the application from the management committee of the Pines Community Child Care Centre for a restructuring grant of $12 000.

The Pennington child-care centre was operated by the Port Adelaide Central Mission (PACM), and it ceased operation on 28 June 1998, shortly after the announcement of the restructuring fund by the Premier. I understand that the ongoing viability of that site was in doubt because of the poor utilisation of the centre over a period of time. Discussions between officers of the department and PACM following the Premier's announcement suggested that the centre would require ongoing assistance in order to continue to operate. Its viability could not be secured by a once-off restructuring grant. PACM did not apply for restructuring assistance and subsequently closed the centre.

STURT PRIMARY SCHOOL

15. **Mr HANNA:** In relation to the site of the former Sturt Primary School—

(a) How much has been spent on both maintaining and securing the site since its closure and what are the ongoing maintenance and security costs;

(b) Is the Government committed to retaining the major part of the site as community open space; and

(c) Will the walkway at the end of Tilley Court at Marion be retained when the site is sold?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:

1. Maintenance and security costs for the site to date total $11 181. Ongoing security costs are $521 per month, maintenance costs are incurred as required to attend to gardens and lawns (approximately $700 per month), repairs as required to windows and doors and repairs as a result of vandalism.

2. The government has offered the Council the opportunity to purchase the whole or portion of the site for open space.

If the site is sold for development there are requirements under the *Development Act 1993* concerning provision of open space.

3. The walkway at the end of Tilley Court at Marion was created at the time of division of the adjoining land and is a public walkway in the control of the City of Marion. There are no registered rights of way over the school land for a pedestrian walkway access. Walkway access through any future development of the land would be considered as part of the negotiations with interested parties.

KOALAS

16. **Mr McEWEN:** What was the total cost of the Koala Sterilisation and Relocation Project on Kangaroo Island and in particular what were the following costs—

(a) direct staff;
(b) indirect staff; and
(c) koala transportation?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:

1. The Koala Management Program arose from national and international concerns about the overpopulation of koalas on Kangaroo Island and their possible starvation from over-browsing. The program also protected South Australia's tourism industry. Since the commencement of the program in January 1997, 2 500 koalas have been sterilised and 850 of these relocated to the south-east, from a 1994 population of 3 000 to 5 000 koalas. It is important to note that the environment is recovering on Kangaroo Island; manna gums in the area where the koala population has been reduced by translocation have recovered and the birth rate of intact females has declined where a high proportion of males have been sterilised.

2. The expenditure for the Koala Management Program on Kangaroo Island over the 18 months from its commencement in January 1997, to the end of June 1998, was:

Translocation	$ 70 463
Fertility control	$300 334
Coordination	$208 147
Community awareness	$ 32 698
Total cost of the program	$611 642

3. Of the $508 481 incurred for fertility control and coordination, $163 000 was allocated to employment costs, with the remainder for the veterinary contract, establishment of surgery and field equipment, hire of vehicles and travel costs, and monitoring of trees and koala health on Kangaroo Island and in the south-east of the State.

4. An additional $100 000 was incurred by the Department for Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs for staff indirectly involved but not directly funded by the program.

5. Total costs for translocating koalas to the south-east of South Australia were $70 463.

6. The Koala Management Program will continue for a further two years to achieve the appropriate level of population control. It has been hailed a success and both the program and the State have received considerable national and international publicity and support.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

17. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** When will the new angiographic laboratory at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital be ready for use and how many people can it accommodate a year?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The new angiographic laboratory at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was completed in late July 1998 and the first patient was treated at the new facility on 4 August 1998.

It is anticipated the new facility will treat an estimated 1 200 patients or carry out an estimated 1 700 procedures per year.

BOOKMARK LIBRARY AUTOMATION SYSTEM

27. **Ms WHITE:**

1. Does the department intend discontinuing support for the BookMark Library Automation System and if so, what arrangements will be made for those schools currently using BookMark software and will DETE cover all costs associated with the changeover to a new system or will individual schools cover the costs?

2. What undertaking have been given to interstate schools that have purchased BookMark?

3. How many customers use BookMark and of these how many are Government schools and how many are private schools?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:

1. The department does not intend to discontinue support of BookMark.

2. Support is guaranteed for interstate schools through annual support arrangements.

3. As of 10 November 1998, there are 1 795 registered users. 421 are Government schools, 81 are private schools in South Australia, 1077 are interstate schools, 216 are not schools (businesses, Government agencies, etc.) including 27 overseas.

31. **Ms WHITE:** In relation to the BookMark Library Automation System—

(a) How much did it cost the Government to develop the system and what are the support costs; and
(b) How much revenue has been received by the Government from the sale and support of the system to entities other than South Australian Government schools?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:

(a) The original cost of development of the BookMark Library Automation System was approximately $200 000, excluding support costs. Support costs amount to approximately $220 000 per year.
(b) It is estimated that since its release in 1990 until June 1998, total revenue of $833 000 has been received by the Government from the sale and support of the system to entities other than Government schools.