

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 11 February 1999

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

COLLECTIONS FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES (DEFINITION OF CHARITABLE PURPOSE) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 10 December. Page 569.)

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): I want to speak briefly to this initiative. It is a very minor matter, but we do need to clarify the definition. It has full support and even the Treasurer, Mr Lucas, on 5AA earlier in the year indicated that there was an anomaly here. As it is a simple matter of definition, it is time we fixed up this matter because, to continue to delay it, is flying in the face of common sense.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION (CITIZENSHIP) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 10 December. Page 573.)

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The member for Spence said that the member for Hartley introduced this Bill with the best of intentions and I am very sure that that is so. The member for Hartley with his affiliations to another country is keen to prove himself and keen to have other people prove that there is no doubt about his duty to the South Australian Parliament and the people of South Australia. However, I think his intentions are misguided and do a disservice to the multicultural community in Hartley which he represents and also to the ethnic groups in South Australia generally. His argument is that, in a similar way to the Federal Parliament, members of Parliament should renounce their citizenship, and the member for Hartley's motion has provided 14 days after the election for members to do so.

The member for Spence has argued in a quite erudite fashion that in fact the Federal Constitution had no intention of requiring Federal members of Parliament to renounce their citizenship. I have great faith in my colleague's legal abilities, but regardless of that argument I do not believe that it should apply to State politicians. Under the constitution the Federal Parliament has responsibility for foreign affairs, so I think it is very appropriate in that case that there be absolutely no doubt about where the affiliations of members of that Parliament lie. I believe that there might be some good argument that those members of Parliament should renounce their citizenship. State members of Parliament and the State Parliaments have no responsibility for foreign affairs. The member for Hartley went on at some length about conflict of interest. I do not believe that would ever be the case. In fact, I think the interest of State members of Parliament should lie in harking back to the multicultural heritage of South Australia and being proud of and maintaining that heritage.

I do not believe that those who seek to stand as members of Parliament should be penalised by having to renounce citizenship of which they should be proud. I do not believe that the public of South Australia would think any better of or have any more confidence in their State parliamentarians for this gesture of renouncing their citizenship. In fact, I would say that those members of the public who also have dual citizenship would see it as a bit of a slight on themselves in retaining their dual citizenship.

I think the member for Hartley has made a mistake. I do believe it was with the best of intentions; I do not believe he has thought through the ramifications of this Bill. I think he has a misguided zeal to prove his patriotism.

Mr Condous interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: The member for Colton makes the same point as the member for Hartley makes—it is only 69 politicians—but you have to ask yourself, why do we ask politicians as representatives of the people of South Australia to renounce their citizenship when we do not ask the people of South Australia to renounce their citizenship? There is no cogent reason for this Bill going ahead: the only effect it will have is to insult people and perhaps cause legal debates down the track about whether or not someone has renounced or is able to renounce their citizenship. The only effect of this Bill being passed is that some new members of Parliament will be forced to renounce their citizenship when they do not want to and when they are proud of their heritage. It will insult significant members of the South Australian public, including many in the member for Hartley's own electorate.

I would ask members of this House to save the member for Hartley from his own error by ensuring that this Bill is voted down. It is not appropriate; it is not needed; and it has no point. I certainly oppose it. I do not have dual citizenship. I have no problem with any of my colleagues on either side having dual citizenship. I have never heard of any history of problems with any member of a State Parliament having dual citizenship.

Why should we pass a Bill that has no point to it; that has no significant effect to it; that is not needed; and that has not been called for? I repeat: the member for Hartley is acting out of misguided zeal. We should not support him in that and we should, indeed, save him from himself.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I support this Bill introduced by the member for Hartley. I believe that it is an extremely important initiative which should be considered by this House. It raises a number of very interesting questions. First, what is citizenship and what does it mean to be a citizen of this country? What is nationality? What is cultural diversity? Are they all mutually exclusive? Why require an MP to hold only Australian citizenship? Is it through concern for the security of this country, to set an example to the citizens of this country that if one wishes to provide a leadership role in public life one should be an Australian citizen exclusively? Is it to do with allegiance?

I remember visiting Greece on one occasion and being told that, if you are a Greek citizen, regardless of dual citizenship, and you are a 20 year old who finds yourself in Greece on holiday you can be conscripted into the Greek Army. I do not know whether that is still the case but I understand that it can happen, and in fact young Australian citizens holding dual nationality have found themselves coerced into the Greek military whilst on holiday in Greece. It raises the whole issue of allegiance.

When one swears an oath of allegiance whilst taking citizenship one makes a deep dedication to a head of state, a foreign crown or a foreign power. I join the member for Hartley in finding that an issue of confusion for a member of an Australian Parliament to be swearing allegiance not only to Australia but also to a foreign power and a foreign head of state. I think that the member for Hartley is on the right track with this motion and that we should openly embrace it.

Let us get to the core of what it means to be an Australian. Unlike so many countries, we were given our freedom without a fight. Unlike the French who fought a bloody revolution in 1789, during which tens of thousands of people were massacred, and the Americans who fought a similarly bloody revolution and then had to endure a long civil war during which more Americans were killed than in all subsequent wars in order to preserve their constitution in that democracy, and the Russians who fought a bloody revolution for their freedom from dictatorship, we were given it for free. It raises the issue of whether we Australians really value something that we were given for free. It is a matter that is topical in the current debate about whether or not we should become a republic. Just because we got it for free does not mean that our Constitution and all that we represent is worthless. Just because we did not shed blood does not mean that we should not hold up our heads proudly and admire it.

We are a nation still struggling to identify symbols and to define ourselves in a changing world, and this process of ongoing change is good. Change is going forward; change is growth; change shows maturity. Should we members of Parliament in South Australia not champion this coming of age? I find some of the arguments against the proposition coming from members opposite a little spurious.

When serving in the Australian Defence Force in South-East Asia, Europe and, later, peace keeping with multinational forces in the Middle East, neither I nor any soldiers under my command had difficulty identifying that we were Australians. Some of us have ethnic, family or cultural linkages to other countries and people far away. This cultural and ethnic diversity enriches and uplifts our community. These cultural, linguistic and philosophical ties to our fellow man should be encouraged and developed; we should embrace them. But do we need to hold foreign citizenship to be part of a culturally diverse community? That is the issue that the member for Hartley is raising. Do we as members of Parliament need to declare our allegiance to Australia alone or can we share that allegiance to a foreign power or foreign head of State? Do we need to declare divided loyalties, and possibly even to offer ourselves for foreign military service? Any of these propositions are clearly ridiculous, and the member for Hartley is making this point in his Bill.

Why would we as members of Parliament want to do these things? Arguments that our doing so would set a wrong example to the citizenry are patent nonsense. We are not asking the citizens of Australia to give up their foreign citizenship: we are simply saying that, if you wish to be a member of Parliament, representing the people, you owe it to this great country to declare your allegiance to the people of Australia and the country of Australia alone, without confusion or doubt.

I, like so many here (and, I am sure, like all in this House) am proud of being an Australian. I feel certain that every member of Parliament in this country feels that pride. Certainly, our Federal members have acknowledged that by requiring Australian citizenship alone. So, why would we

resist this Bill? We are married to this great nation: let us declare it.

Whilst not forgetting our origins, whilst actually promoting and encouraging our cultural diversity, let us never forget that as members of Parliament we are proud citizens of Australia, walking with our heads high, leading the nation, beholden to no other country but that which has given us so much and which we are honoured to serve.

Ms BREUER (Giles): I am shocked by this Bill from the member for Hartley. What sort of elitist, supremacist attitude is behind this Bill? The Minister for the white Australia policy? I will not speak for very long on this because I do not think we should be giving this Bill any time at all; it should have been tossed out in the first instance. I think that this Bill smells of Hansonism at its worst. I do not think that we should be trying to equate with the Federal situation: what we should be doing is lobbying them to change their position. I am a fifth generation Aussie on both sides and I am proud of it. Where is the fair go in this proposed legislation?

I share an office with the member for Norwood (Vini Ciccarello). It is a very interesting experience sharing an office with Vini (and with her bike). There is absolutely no question of Vini's allegiance to Australia, to South Australia and to her beloved Norwood. And we have seen that this week in this Parliament. I do not believe that there is any question of the member for Colton's allegiance to Adelaide. He has shown his love for his beloved city of Adelaide over the years. But Vini is Italian as well as Australian, and she is fiercely proud of her ancestry. I am very aware of it with the mutterings in Italian that I regularly hear alongside me in my office. It has certainly improved my vocabulary: I can now swear in Italian!

I do not question her loyalty and commitment to South Australia. The member for Hartley will always be seen as Italian Australian; and the member for Colton will always be seen as Greek Australian. I come from a community where some 75 nations are represented. Multiculturalism has brought so much to our community, to South Australia and to the Australian culture, so why do we question a person's allegiance because they have dual citizenship? I believe that this smacks of elitism, of some sort of supremacist attitude that we are superior because we are Australian.

I feel I must point out that, if we are Australian born—as I am—we are discriminated against by legislation in this country. I want to talk about Andrew Thomas, the Australian astronaut from Adelaide, who has had massive publicity in the past two years. We are all very proud of Andrew Thomas: we love to hear about him; and we love to see the headlines on our Australian astronaut, Andrew Thomas. We see it in our papers and in overseas papers: 'Australian Andrew Thomas'. In fact, Andrew Thomas is no longer an Australian. He became an American citizen for professional reasons and had to renounce his Australian citizenship in so doing—not by American law. The Americans are quite happy for Andrew Thomas to be Australian, but our Australian law says that he cannot hold Australian citizenship if he is born in Australia and takes citizenship from overseas. Rupert Murdoch is not an Australian citizen.

This is an anomaly for Australian born citizens and it is discriminatory. We should be legislating against this sort of thing, not trying to make politicians elitist Australians. I will not support this motion proposed by the member for Hartley. I am appalled by it, and I believe that we should just toss it out without any further consideration.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): Holier than thou is the approach being taken, it seems to me, by members of the Opposition, who have rallied to the clarion call of their Leader, who enjoys travel documents at least for three countries: Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I didn't.

Mr Atkinson: Why did you change your mind?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: My points are quite simple. First, I would like to refute the mistaken impression of the member for Giles. Andrew Thomas is not required by our law to renounce his Australian citizenship if he takes American citizenship: that is a requirement of American law, not of our law. More particularly, this motion simply says that, if you or I wish to make laws for this country, to enter into arrangements on behalf of this properly constituted State of this Federation called the nation of Australia—the Commonwealth of Australia—we ought to be willing to renounce allegiance to all others. If you have allegiance to any other, you must be in a position where you are willing to compromise that commitment to one or other or both of those countries. And if you cannot be clear in your own mind as to which Constitution it is that you are willing to respect, you ought not to attempt to become a member of the body that makes the laws that govern those people.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: The tragedy is, then, that you would find yourself in a conflict of interest situation when negotiating trade deals—not just defence, not just treason but when you are, in fact, negotiating a trade deal—and which community, whose jobs, do you care for? You have to decide who you will stick up for.

In this case, all the member for Hartley is saying, in bringing forward this measure, is that we ought to be clear, as members of this place. And any other citizen who aspires to be a member of this place ought not to be just entitled to be elected here because they are, conveniently, citizens of this place and another place. They ought to be required to state publicly, 'We are for South Australia; we are for Australia's interests; and we will set aside all others, we will forsake all others, for South Australia and Australia. If it comes to war, we will fight for what we believe in and what we have here against anyone who takes an alternative view and wants to change that. And, if it comes to the point, we will negotiate for the interests of our work force, for the savings of our people invested in our enterprises against the interests of anyone else. And if we do not, we have made a mistake.'

The logic of the argument being advanced by the Opposition is, quite simply, that it ought to be possible not just to be a member of this place if you are a citizen of South Australia and happen to be a citizen elsewhere but, if you are a permanent resident, there ought to be no requirement, because there is no difference between permanent residency in their mind and citizenship as it relates to the right to accept responsibility to make law.

To my mind, they are mistaken if they think that is what makes for a healthy society. The Opposition clearly does not understand the envelope of ideas that have to be contained in a constitution to give proper authority to the law made under that constitution. That envelope locks up the commitment that must be made by the umpires appointed to protect and to interpret what that envelope means for the sake of the rights of the citizen. Without that you have nothing. If we tear open

that envelope, then we begin to import the ideas of citizenship and law from elsewhere into our courts. The actions we take as law makers can then in court be defended by us if we have dual citizenship on the ground that we have sworn an allegiance to a constitution and a law that was not South Australian and was clearly different from and in conflict with the law that was South Australian. That brings into our structure of statute such uncertainty as to make it impossible for us to deal with each other, to treat with each other, to relate to each other, or to engage in contracts that are not only commercial but also civil, for example marriage.

It means that we are prepared to accept the jurisdiction of the law of marriage, for instance, in another country as being the means by which people in all conscience can have been said to have made a decision about the marriage which they perhaps are dissolving. Contemplate, if you will, the argument that went on between Ms Gillespie and one of the princes in Malaysia in consequence of the proposition members are advancing in this argument. The consequences of that are that it was entirely justifiable for the prince in Malaysia, if he took Australian citizenship, to say that it was the Malaysian law to which he owed allegiance. Indeed, that is the argument he has advanced, but he cannot put that in our courts now.

However, under the Opposition's proposition to oppose the simple proposition of the member for Hartley, that becomes real. I say to them, 'Don't go down this path. Don't be sucked in by the sophistry that it is okay.' I have always stood for standards: I have always stood for clarity in understanding what the rule of law is and where the limits of it are, and this clarifies that more so than has been the case before at a time when such clarity is sorely needed. Anyone who votes against this Bill clearly does not understand the nature of citizenship.

Ms RANKINE (Wright): This Bill raises the basic question of the commitment of Australian citizens born overseas or who have citizenship of another nation bestowed on them because of the birth of their parents to this State and to this country. This Bill questions their suitability to take an active role in the governing of this State. Sadly, I believe this Bill is based on racism. There are a number of forms of racism. Racism is the—

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: I will get to that, Joe.

Mr Scalzi: Are you calling me a racist?

Ms RANKINE: I will get to that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will refer to members opposite by their electorates, not by their christian names.

Ms RANKINE: Sorry, Sir. There are a number of forms of racism. Racism is an insidious plague which every now and again raises its ugly head in a number of forms. The most obvious is overt racism, that everyday racism, the flames of which have been burning brightly over recent years. They have been fanned by a Prime Minister who has encouraged the notion that we all have the right of freedom of expression to say whatever we like, irrespective of the consequences or impact. He has tried to turn around the term 'political correctness', that is, language and actions which do not allow people to be degraded and berated, to be disadvantaged and discriminated against because of their race, religion, gender or sexuality.

Then there is the racism of organised groups which support white supremacy, those thugs and morons who take

great delight in terrorising young children—as we saw not too long ago at the Parafield Gardens Primary School. When people speak out against them, they go out under the cover of night and deface or destroy their property.

Racism is used to gain political and economic benefits. This is much more subtle but can be as devastating as other areas of racism. It is used to exploit migrant workers and has been used to preclude potential employment competition. Our history in this area is not one of which we can be proud. We encouraged post war migrants to this country. They were then exploited, given the lowliest of jobs and the lowest paid jobs. Their skills were disregarded and they were given no assistance to adjust to our way of life.

I grew up in an area where a large number of Italian post war migrants settled. It was a time of least tolerance. We saw much of the overt racism that the member for Hartley suffered under as a young person. These people were criticised about how they worked daylight to dark in the market gardens to give their children a better life. They were criticised about the food they ate and about how they dressed.

It was an enormously difficult time for young people in the area in which I lived. The member for Hartley suffered under this sort of racism, and what we see in his proposal is a new category of racism—the racism of embarrassment. I urge the honourable member to be proud of his heritage, where he came from and the enormous benefits that migrants brought to this country. The honourable member should be proud of how they have enhanced our nation to make it a much better place in which to live.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: You wake up. Here we are, in 1999, debating a motion which in effect questions a migrant's commitment to our country and to our State. It devalues significantly those who have taken the enormous step of accepting Australian citizenship. People come here for many reasons. Some have come here for an adventure and have stayed; others have come here because the country in which they lived was suffering difficult times and they wanted to give their children a better start in life.

Last year, I attended the launch of the South-East Asian Women's Association. I listened to a woman say how proud she was to live in Australia and how she now had the opportunity to love her family safely. I also attended the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, where I heard a woman talk about how she experienced the slaughter of her entire family. I heard about how a young man had escaped war ravaged Europe, leaving his family behind. These people have left their homes, their families and the countries they have loved. They have shown enormous courage. They have come to a country which has a completely different way of life, different customs and a different language.

As I said, these people have taken up Australian citizenship and have brought so much to this nation. To accept Australian citizenship is their gift to us. To challenge their commitment, to insist that they turn their backs on their heritage, is harking back to the bad old days of the 1950s and 1960s when we insisted that they look like us, talk like us, dress like us, eat like us and think like us—nothing else was good enough. I do not accept that for one moment.

My family arrived in Australia many years ago; in fact, at one stage five generations of my family were alive. I would be the last person to suggest in any way that a person who has shown this amount of courage, who has come to this country, who has raised their children here and who has given a

commitment to this country would in any way be less worthy of a place in this House than I. Perhaps we need to look at some of the people who have come here. Are we to question people such as our wonderful medical specialists, the Victor Changs of this world? Are we to say, 'No, we cannot have you treat our people because you have not renounced your citizenship'? What about our wonderful sports people? We certainly take credit for them. As the member for Giles said, we are happy to take the credit for Andy Thomas. This Bill is a nonsense. It is unjust, and I do not support it.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Local Government): I am disappointed by some of the contributions to this debate, which is not about racism. This debate is not about people being able to hold dual citizenship within our nation and to fulfil many different and very valuable roles such as doctors, physicians, etc.; nor is this debate about walking away from multiculturalism. Multiculturalism is a celebration of people's roots. Multiculturalism is about cultural diversity and strength through that diversity.

I put to all members of this House that if any member is not proud of our achievements in multiculturalism they should think again. Many other countries get the rhetoric exceedingly right but whose actions belie the truth of their society. I get offended to hear people in some countries in South-East Asia lecturing this country on all that is wrong with us, when you only have to look beneath the surface of their society to see repression, greed and every manifestation of what is worst about our kind perpetrated on other groups. That is not a characteristic of our society. That is not a characteristic of this Bill.

What this Bill talks about—and the only thing it talks about—is people's qualification to sit in this place. I remind members opposite that the position each of us enjoys is a trust that is conferred on us by the people of this State. It is a very important trust because we are entrusted to make the law. By ancient right we are entrusted to be the highest court—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The member for Hart does not understand a lot about this place. He is more interested in smart political tricks than the institution of which he is a custodian.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I don't take my ball and run home because people are jibing me or interrupting me while I am speaking, unlike the member for Hart. Childishness is not something of which I have been accused. One of Parliament's most ancient rights is to constitute itself as the high court of Parliament. There is no appeal from the high court of Parliament.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The member for Hart wants to drivel. What does he think a privileges committee is? When a privileges committee deliberates and Parliament makes a decision, that is Parliament constituted as a court. If the member for Hart is too stupid to realise it, why the hell was he on a privileges committee? Probably some of us wasted our time trying to educate him, and he never learnt a thing!

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: That is right. This motion is about the rights of this House, and this motion speaks about a person who is the citizen of a foreign state or power or a person who is under acknowledgment of allegiance to another foreign state or power. That is what this motion talks about.

It talks about people in this House having one allegiance and one allegiance only, and that allegiance is to the people and the Government of this country. It does not deny to any of our citizens outside this place the right to dual citizenship.

What it does say is that, if you want to accept the high responsibility of being elected to public office and to serve the people in this Parliament, people have a right to expect that you will have one allegiance and one allegiance alone, and that is an allegiance to this country, to our system of government and to the people whom we serve. There are ample examples of institutions throughout our society, from marriage right across the spectrum, where a precondition of a contract demands exclusivity, because most people when they marry do not say, 'Well, I will choose you as a partner but we can have a range of other partners.' It is a principle often espoused.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Members laugh but I did qualify that by saying 'most people', not all people. It is nevertheless an important principle. It is not a principle about saying to the member for Colton, or to any other member in this place, 'You are or have been a citizen of another culture.' You bring all those traditions and all those cultural practices and beliefs into this Chamber and you enrich this Chamber by that. No-one is denying that. No-one is saying that that is not a valuable contribution to the Parliament. The member for Hartley is, as he describes himself, an Australian, but an Australian of an Italian background.

The member for Peake is of a Greek background but he is, I would contend, first and foremost an Australian. The member for Colton is the same. No-one is denying them the importance of their heritage nor in any way diminishing the contribution which that heritage makes in this place. What the member for Hartley wishes to establish, and I think establish justifiably, is that there should be beyond question this principle in this place: that no-one's allegiance can be questioned to any other foreign principality or power. The highest duty of the people in this place is a duty to the people of South Australia and a duty to its institutions. I believe that when we take an oath of office we are sworn to protect and uphold; that is what—

Mr Koutsantonis: Do you need to be an Australian citizen to join the Liberal Party?

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: —is important here. The member for Peake asks, 'Do you need to be an Australian to join the Liberal Party?' The answer is 'No.' Do you need to be an Australian to join the Labor Party? The answer is 'No.' Do you need to be an Australian to be a doctor? The answer is 'No.' That is not what is in question. What is in question here is the qualification of a person to sit in this House. That is not to deny a person their roots; that is not to deny the richness of their cultural heritage. It is only to say that, in the member for Hartley's opinion and my own, it is reasonable for the people to expect that there is no other allegiance payable or that allegiance to any other power is beyond question.

That is quite reasonable. That is all the member for Hartley seeks to establish in this measure. I would say that many people from diverse backgrounds can see merit in this argument. I would acknowledge that some people do not see the merit in this argument but it is not an argument about racism; it is not another manifestation of Pauline Hanson. It is a genuine argument about allegiance within this place, about the nature of this place and about what people can

expect of participants in this place. The member for Hartley is quite right to bring such a measure into this place.

Members opposite are quite right to voice their very strident opposition, if that is what they feel, and some of them do. What disappoints me is that they seek, in voicing their opposition to this measure, to couch it in terms of painting the member for Hartley, or anyone who stands up to propose this measure, as a racist. I do not see it as a racist measure. I see it as a measure which seeks to ensure that this place and its integrity in the minds of all South Australians is beyond question.

I value this place. I am sure all other members value this place because we are custodians. It existed for 150 years before we came; the institution of Parliament existed in other places for hundreds of years; and it is a valuable institution. I think Churchill said, 'Democracy has got lots of flaws, but it sure beats the other systems of government.' We are custodians of that system; we need to treasure it and nurture it. The member for Hartley proposes a measure to do that, and I commend it to the House.

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

Mr Koutsantonis (Peake): I do not claim to say that members opposite are racist and I do not think I have met many racists in this House, but I have met many people in this House who have misinformed views about race relations, multiculturalism and other forms dealing with minority groups. I watched a television program—I think it was *Today Tonight*; it might have been *A Current Affair*, I cannot remember—on which there was an Australian soldier who fought in Vietnam. He served his country from 1969 to 1972. He served three years in Vietnam in the navy. He was a gunner on a ship. However, he was adopted when he was two years old, and to his misfortune he was born in England. However, because he was born in England and not Australia, and his adoptive parents never told him that he was born in England, he never became an Australian citizen.

I cannot remember the exact details of his case, but tomorrow he is being deported to Great Britain because he has not taken up Australian citizenship. This person, unlike members opposite—unless there is someone about whom I do not know—or members on this side, has fought for this country. He was prepared to put his life on the line for his country, yet members opposite think that same person is not worthy to sit in this House. Shame on them! That person put his life on the line for this country.

Mr Scalzi: Two different things.

Mr Koutsantonis: That is right: defending democracy is one thing but coming in here practising democracy is completely different! Thank you very much, member for Hartley, I am glad to know how you define serving your nation. We in this place are servants. People who fight on the front-line in our wars are servants of the people as well. They serve our nation just as we serve our nation; in fact they do a better job than we do. I have more respect for them than I do for members of Parliament. Yet, members opposite would want to see Australian diggers who fought at Tobruk and in Europe and who fought to liberate Greece and Italy from fascism, but who happened to be born in England, not allowed in this place because they are not Australians—they might have some sort of foreign allegiance to the Queen of Australia.

This is the outrageous part of the honourable member's claim. If someone is a British subject and a member of this

place, they have an oath of allegiance to Queen Elizabeth of England who also happens to be Queen Elizabeth of Australia. However, the member for Hartley thinks that that is dual loyalties, and they could not possibly sit in this House.

Then there is my example. I was born in Australia in 1971 at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. My parents migrated here from the Peloponnesus in Greece. My father—

Mr Scalzi: Spartans.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: No, they are not Spartans. My father chose to come to Australia because of famine and oppression, and he came here for a better life. He did not come here asking for handouts or for a free life. He came here and worked as most migrants do—

Mr Scalzi: And they work hard.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: And they work very hard. He did not want his children to have to overcome the problems that he overcame. I have to say that through no fault of my own, but because my father was born in Greece, the Hellenic Republic considers me a Greek citizen. No amount of renouncing that citizenship will deny the Greek Government's right to claim me as a Greek citizen. Not only me but my children and my grandchildren are considered Greek citizens, and no matter what I do, I cannot renounce that citizenship. Will the member for Hartley ask me to leave this Chamber? What is even worse is that the member for Hartley thinks my father is not worthy to sit in this place. I say to the honourable member that my father is a better man than most people on that side of the House because he has worked for most of his life.

What scares me the most about this motion is that we are defining what is a real Australian. What is 'Australian'? Who has a real loyalty to this nation? I bet those protesters who stood outside Parliament House in the 1960s and 1970s protesting against the Vietnam War are just as much patriots as every soldier who fought in the Vietnam War. Every Australian who came here in the 1950s and 1960s from Europe or from Asia in the 1970s has just as much loyalty to Australia as someone whose family has been here for five generations, having arrived on the First Fleet.

I cannot believe that members opposite are adopting the policy that Federal Labor holds in the Federal Parliament. I am ashamed of that. I have no problem saying that. It was a mistake. The idea of political Parties not admitting making a mistake is stupid. If we make a mistake we should admit it: I have no problem with that. Now moves are afoot in the Federal Parliament to change that law. Senator Bolkus and others—

Members interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: It was my father; he is outraged at this Bill. I do not consider the member for Hartley a racist, but I remember the words of Prime Minister Paul Keating at a function. He said, 'They are not racist, but if you scratch them a little bit they behave like one.' I do not think that the member for Hartley is racist—he could not get away with it, but there are other people on the front and back benches who are supporting this Bill but not speaking on it and letting us no why they are in favour of changing this law.

I do not know what more I have to do to prove my allegiance to this country. At citizenship ceremonies, people who were born in Australia do not have to swear an oath of allegiance to this country or to our Queen. People who migrate to this country have a greater sense of loyalty and duty to this country than people who are born here. I do not think the member for Hartley's Bill represents that. This Parliament above all else should be a mirror of the

community. We should reflect their views, concerns and make up.

Mr Scalzi: And set an example.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: And we should not sell ETSA, either. I will not take much more time. This is an important debate.

Mr Lewis: Thank God for that!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I will speak for another three minutes now, Peter.

Mr McEwen interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: That really hurts Rory; you got me! The fiercely independent backbencher got me. This is a very important Bill. I think the member for Hartley is misguided, as is the member for Colton. I urge all members to oppose the Bill on the grounds of decency.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): What an amazing debate! I will start with the member for Peake. He outlined a lovely little story about the Englishman who is being deported because he did not take out Australian citizenship. I do not know the story, but I can guarantee that nobody has ever been deported from this country because they did not take out Australian citizenship. I am sure there is another reason.

Members interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: That is what he said. If you go back through the *Hansard* record I think you will find that that is what he said. He may have avoided deportation had he taken out Australian citizenship, but that is not what the honourable member said. If the honourable member had had the opportunity to represent his Party in the Federal Parliament, would he have had a problem?

Mr Koutsantonis: No.

Mr WILLIAMS: He would have renounced Greek citizenship?

Mr Koutsantonis: I do not have Greek citizenship.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will come to order.

Mr WILLIAMS: The honourable member purported to have this House believe that it was impossible to renounce Greek citizenship. There are plenty of Greek Australians who represent their electorates and people in the Federal Parliament. All have sworn exclusive allegiance to the Crown of Australia. So, I correct those few little comments or slips—I would hate to think they were made on purpose.

I will go back a little bit to one of the previous speakers, the member for Wright. Unfortunately, Paul Keating is still alive and sitting on the back bench over there. Every time that people in this country find that they are losing an argument, they tie in the topic of racism and hang on to it like a life raft and accuse their opponents of being racist. What a load of claptrap! What a load of emotional rubbish came from the member for Wright! I do not think that she got anywhere near the point of this Bill. We are talking about something completely different.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I will deal with that point now. I am sure that members on that side of the House and a lot of the members who have spoken against this Bill see themselves as republicans. The call of the republicans is to have an Australian as the head of our country. They want to see an Australian head of State open the Olympic Games in Sydney in 2000. Can they define what an Australian is? Is an Australian someone who has allegiance to a foreign power? Is that what they think an Australian is? Is that what the people they represent accept as being an Australian?

I think that an Australian is a person who lives in this country—not necessarily born here—and is willing to swear exclusive allegiance to Australia. It is a person who is so proud of and committed to this country that they are more than happy to say, 'I am going to make this country my home. It is going to be a home of my children and grandchildren.' That is the sort of person that most of the people we represent want in this place to make decisions on their behalf.

Ms Key: What is your evidence?

Mr WILLIAMS: I would like to see some of the evidence to support the claptrap about racists that has come from that side. The evidence is that this reflects what is happening in our national Parliament, and a lot of people from various Parties in our national Parliament have not sought to change that.

I go back to another point made by the member for Peake when he said that people born in Australia do not have to take out Australian citizenship, they do not have to physically swear allegiance to the Crown. It is my understanding that, under the Australia Act, if a person who comes to Australia from a foreign country does not swear allegiance to the Crown and does not take out Australian citizenship, they cannot be charged with treason. However, people born in Australia, even though they do not have to take out Australian citizenship, can be charged with treason. There is a difference, and the member for Peake should reflect on that. By being born in Australia, a person is committed to Australia automatically and cannot walk away from that.

I come now to the member for Giles, and I think that she got it completely wrong when she spoke about elitism, and about elitists wanting to make this an elitist place. I think that she got it completely back to front. Elitism can be found in people who come in here purporting to represent Australians and South Australians, yet who maintain an allegiance to some other power. Why would they want to do that?

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Exactly. There are two reasons why people want to retain dual citizenship. One is that, if through some misfortune on their part they were thrown out of this place by their electorate and their commitment to South Australia was not quite as strong as they made out, they could scurry off back to another country and become gainfully employed there.

The other reason is that when they fly out of the Adelaide International Airport to travel to somewhere else in the world—and this is the main reason—they take their Australian passport out of their breast pocket and put it in their back pocket. They pull out the passport for another country where they might be going and put that in their breast pocket. When they arrive in that country they believe they will be treated in a better way because they have a passport belonging to that country. They believe they will be treated better by being a citizen of that country than by being a citizen of Australia. The member for Giles talks about elitism, but I suggest that that is the most elitist thing that someone could do: flying out of this country as an Australian citizen and then landing on foreign soil and choosing to be regarded as a citizen there. To suggest that they are not being elitist is unbelievable.

I find it amazing that members opposite would suggest that people who purport to represent South Australians and make laws on behalf of South Australians would be too ashamed to stand in a queue in an airport on the other side of the world with an Australian passport in their hand. As to people who want to represent South Australians, they can be

South Australians from anywhere in the world because, for all of us in this place, our roots are outside this nation. I am just as proud of my original heritage from over the shores, yet my family has been here for five generations. I am well aware of the history of my family and my heritage. I am just as proud of that as someone who arrived at the airport a week ago. That is not in question. The question is whether we are willing to make the commitment to swear exclusive allegiance to the Australian Crown and come in here so that everyone we purport to represent knows that we have one and only one allegiance. I commend the Bill.

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): This is not a debate about lofty principles: to my mind this Bill is motivated by tacky politics. Nothing of greatness has ever had its genesis in mean spirited parochialism.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

DOOR-TO-DOOR SALES (EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 November. Page 215.)

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): From the outset I indicate that I agree entirely with the principles and what is being attempted to be achieved by the member for Torrens in bringing in this piece of legislation, that is, that there will be protection for young children who, up until now, have been used to sell sweets on a commission basis. There have been one or two cases where the risks involving children have been drawn to the public's attention. We want to make sure that those children are protected.

It is fair to say that the member for Torrens and I have had a number of discussions on this, and I appreciate the very diligent way that she has first gone about consulting with groups in the community and then brought this measure before the Parliament. I commend her for that. Few other members would have put the effort and personal commitment into seeing this through that she has. I have had several discussions, because it is a very complex issue as to how we are best able to deal with this matter.

The Government and I have been looking at the Child Protection Act, and this does not sit comfortably with the Act. We have looked at the proposed amendments and the Government has decided it is inappropriate to proceed down that path. However, we have looked at other alternatives and on behalf of the Government I can say that we have decided to proceed with this in principle, and suitable amendments to other Acts are being drafted. I will now make a brief statement that has been agreed by the Ministry.

Concerns have been expressed about the safety of children who are involved in door-to-door selling. In light of these concerns I gave an undertaking to look at options, including amending the Child Protection Act, to provide protection for children involved in this activity. The employment of children in door-to-door selling is primarily an industrial issue but, given the nature of the work and the reported age of children involved in the industry, clearly child protection and safety issues are involved. Currently no laws deal specifically with this group of children.

Following examination of various options I wish to advise the House that State Cabinet has now agreed to amend the

Industrial and Employee Relations Act to prohibit the employment of children under 14 years of age in door-to-door sales for commercial purposes. I stress that this is for commercial purposes. It does not affect children selling raffle tickets to their neighbours for scouts or for a school or some other purpose like that. This is on a commercial basis where a specific commission is paid to the children as part of a commercial operation and where there is clearly an employer employee relationship.

Furthermore, in order to ensure that children above 14 years of age employed in this industry are provided with appropriate adult supervision, regulations will be developed under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986. The development of the amendments to the Act and the new regulations will be prepared by my colleague the Minister for Government Enterprises. It is therefore finally up to that Minister to bring both the amendments to the Employee Relations Act and the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act regulations before this Parliament. I acknowledge the importance of this issue. It has taken the Government a while to work through how best to present it to Parliament; I acknowledge that.

Ms Key interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I acknowledge that, but we prepared amendments heading down one path and then found some potential legal loopholes with them, so we have gone back and reviewed the whole area and are now heading down another path.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am sure the member for Torrens will be pursuing the Minister on this. I acknowledge the fact that we as a Government share the concern of the member for Torrens, we appreciate the work she has done, we support the principle of what she is doing and we will bring in suitable amendments to deal with it. We even looked at whether there should be a separate Act, as the honourable member has proposed. We think it is not in the interests of good Government in the broader sense to have an Act which is so very narrowly focused and for which it will be difficult to allocate responsibility. We think it is best to deal with it through mechanisms in existing legislation to implement the supervision that would be then required for this. So, while I will not support the proposal before the House, we certainly support the principle, and the Government hopes that this issue is resolved as quickly as possible.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION (MENTAL INCAPACITY) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 November. Page 443.)

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): I support this Bill. I have been inundated with literature in relation to this amendment, most of which is not at all relevant to it. There have been all sorts of claims about the fact that this would open the floodgates for stress related illnesses and the rest of it. Quite frankly, most of the literature provided to me has been provided by people who have not taken the time to read the amendment.

The amendment is quite clear and specific. It aims to capture those people with a permanent disability not of a physical nature but of a psychiatric nature within the overall

ambit of the Act, being mindful that this injury must be caused at work and, again, an independent specialist must diagnose the illness and loss of mental capacity as part of the illness. Literature provided to me, on the one hand, also states that, under the amendments to the Workers Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 1992, it appeared that there was an unintentional omission that meant that permanent psychiatric disability would not be compensated in the same way as would permanent physical disability—and I believe that to be the case although, in other argument to me, it has now been suggested that it was all engineered. It has been suggested that it was not an accident: it was engineered. I suggest it was more by good luck than good management that people found themselves in this predicament. It was an unintentional outcome, as a result of which a very small number of people have been gravely disadvantaged.

I believe that we should close the loophole. I do not accept the argument that it will open the floodgates and break the State. It is a very significant matter for a very small number of people who can prove by independent diagnosis that they have suffered a permanent psychological disorder as an outcome of an incident at work. I think we do need to close that loophole. We do need to return to those people that right that I believe was accidentally taken away from them. We ought to address that wrong and get on with it, and I appeal to the Parliament to support this minor amendment to the Bill.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): This issue is very close to me and my experience as a lawyer who has practised in the area of workers' compensation. As has been succinctly pointed out by the member for Gordon, people with permanent psychiatric disabilities are not currently eligible for workers' compensation in terms of a lump sum for their injuries even though people who are physically disabled by a work injury are entitled to such compensation. It is discriminatory and it is wrong. There is no justification for that discrimination.

It is worth briefly going over the history, once again, as adverted to by the member for Gordon. The Speaker at the time, Mr Norm Peterson, brought in amendments to the Workers Compensation Bill then before Parliament. He stated that his intention was that, even with his amendments, all those with permanent disabilities would nonetheless be able to receive lump sum compensation. He brought in a new schedule, the third schedule to the Workers Compensation Act, in which the word "mental" had been deleted as compared with the existing legislation. There was absolutely no debate about the significance of the deletion of that word.

Yet, when the Supreme Court came to consider the matter in the case of Hann, the judges looked not at the *Hansard* but at the legislation—the black and white provisions that resulted from Norm Peterson's amendments—and said that these words clearly show an intention to remove an entitlement to lump sum compensation for those who suffer a permanent psychiatric disability. It is certainly unclear from looking at the *Hansard* at the time that that was the intention of Parliament. It may be that one or two people did engineer that amendment's going through Parliament with the intention of cutting costs and excluding certain people unfairly from the workers' compensation scheme. But for the most part, given the complete lack of debate on the significant point, it looks as if it slipped through Parliament. Members here will know that this happens not infrequently.

I point out that the College of Psychiatrists, the South Australian branch of the AMA and the Law Society's Accident Compensation Committee, together with the Labor

Lawyers Association (of which I am National President), all support the position that the Labor Party now takes. The Chairperson of the Law Society's Accident Compensation Committee (Mr Geoff Britton), in a press release dated 29 August 1994, summed it up very well when he said:

The principle that the integrity of a workers compensation system can only be maintained if there is no distinction made between compensation being paid for some injuries but not for others should be affirmed. To deny this principle would create hardship and injustice, and bring the WorkCover system into disrepute.

Certainly, those workers who have suffered at the hands of those Peterson amendments by being excluded from lump sum compensation are disgusted and naturally feel that they have been very harshly treated by the Parliament. There is a great irony, of course, in the current legislation in that people who suffer permanent psychiatric disabilities as a result of work injuries are very often highly traumatised as a result of their work injury experience. Whether it be a hold-up in a bank or witnessing some horrible carnage on the roads that leads to the permanent psychiatric disability, many of those people have at times felt suicidal. Ironically, if they were to carry out those intentions and commit suicide, their spouse (if they have one) would be able to collect under the Workers Compensation Act; but because they feel suicidal but do not do it, they miss out on compensation. That is absurd.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: You're not advocating that they do it, I suppose.

Mr HANNA: I am not sure that the member for Stuart is advocating that they do go the full way, but I certainly would not agree with that. I would like to point out that the workers most likely to benefit from this amendment, those who are most likely to be unjustly discriminated against by the current provisions, are workers who serve the public in various ways: by being bank tellers and looking after people's accounts; police who attend road accident scenes; or bus drivers and truck drivers who from time to time might be involved in horrific accidents—in other words, people who serve the public in different ways.

Ms Key: Firefighters?

Mr HANNA: Firefighters is another excellent example, as the member for Hanson suggests; they are often called to horrific scenes of carnage. We are not talking about someone who simply has what was tagged a stress claim. We are not talking about someone who has a bit of anxiety about going to work because they have had a bit of a blue with the boss. Rather, we are talking about something much more striking and much more traumatic than that, because it is something that must lead to a permanent psychiatric disability.

This leads to my next point, namely, that it is not for this Parliament to say that no-one can have a permanent psychiatric disability as a result of a workplace incident. It is up to the psychiatrists, the professionals, the experts in the field, to assess whether or not an individual worker has sustained so severe an injury. We should leave the door open for those experts to make those assessments in individual cases and, whether there are a few dozen or a few hundred workers who might be entitled to lump sum compensation accordingly, that opportunity should be available.

The current situation is woefully discriminatory. We have a situation whereby, if there is a bank hold-up and one of the bank tellers is shot by an armed robber, they will receive compensation for the bullet wound. However, if their best mate who is working next to them is horrified and permanently traumatised by what he or she witnessed, with their colleague dying or being badly scarred as a result of that

incident, that person will not receive lump sum compensation. How can we have it for one but not the other? It is not fair, and all members should support this measure.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH 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,

which Mr Hill has moved to amend by leaving 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 inserting in lieu thereof the following words, 'Premier include the member for Mitchell, as the local member, 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'.

(Continued from 26 November. Page 448.)

Mr HILL (Kaurna): The force of the argument is that the member for Mitchell, as the local member, should be included on the committee that investigates what happens to a very large parcel of land in his electorate. It is a project that he has promoted locally for some time now. It is an outrage that he has been left off the committee. Any sensible Government would include him on it, and I heartily recommend the amendment to the House.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I note with interest that the member for Kaurna has moved to amend the original motion by one of his own colleagues, and this makes it more specific in ensuring that the local member is on any committee that is established by the Premier, to ensure that he is able to be represented in consideration of a proposal for a wine industry training centre on the site. The committee will be able to consider the Premier's public statement that there would be no housing development on the site; the value placed on open space by the local community; and the historic and cultural significance of the site.

I understand the concerns that have been put forward and perhaps the issue whether a local member should always be included on a committee that has been established to look at a particular issue in his or her electorate. At the end of last year, a situation arose in my own electorate where the Premier decided to set up a working group to look at the tourism infrastructure on Yorke Peninsula.

I was delighted that the Premier agreed to such a proposal and his announcing the members of that group. Those members are Mr Roger Cook, Chairman, South Australian Tourism Commission; Mr Michael Geddes, Principal Infrastructure Planner, SA Tourism Commission; Mr Warwick Welsh, CEO, Yorke Regional Development Board; Mr John Shane, CEO, District Council of the Copper Coast; and Mr Rick Wilkinson, who at that time was the Acting CEO of the District Council of Yorke Peninsula. In this argument, we could ask, 'Who is missing from that

committee?" The answer obviously would be, 'The local member, John Meier.' I do not see that as a problem or an issue, because a member can be too close to what is going on and show a biased view—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I wish you would listen in!

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MEIER: No, if I wanted to adjourn it, I could adjourn it here and now. However, I would like to make a contribution, because it is worthwhile for a member to make a contribution regarding his or her own area. This working group, established by the Premier, sought evidence again only this week.

Ms Key interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Yes, we were elected to do so. Right! A group should be put there and, if a member wants to give evidence, he should do so. That is exactly what is occurring in the case of the Yorke Peninsula working group. On Monday of this week, I was delighted to give evidence. I gave verbal evidence, and I was also invited to give written evidence. However, I did not accept that invitation, as I covered all the topics that I wanted to cover in the half hour that was allocated to me. Surely this is the more common-sense way to go, because that will give a member a full opportunity to make all his or her views known to the committee so that it can weigh them up.

The Botanic Wine Centre committee is another committee that has been established recently. Should the member for Adelaide have been on it? Again, members opposite would say, 'Yes, he should have been on it.' Should the member for Adelaide have been on the Convention Centre committee, as well? Members would agree that the local member should have an input. That is undoubtedly and without question the case, and I will not argue it for one moment. However, it is much better to ensure that an unbiased view is presented and a committee does not have to include the local member. In this case I can see that the local member is seeking to lobby as hard as he can; in fact, he is seeking to get his members right on side as well. It was interesting hear the member for Bright, who is also Minister for Year 2000 Compliance, say that his electorate adjoins the Glenthorne Farm proposal. From my discussions with the member for Bright—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Is that right? The member for Fisher's electorate also adjoins the Glenthorne Farm proposal. The member for Bright apparently has a lot of constituents right there. I believe—and the member for Mitchell can correct me if I am wrong—that the member for Bright has constituents who will be affected by any development, because it is right on their doorstep. However, the member for Mitchell does not have constituents in as close a proximity as are some of those of the member for Bright. Again, if we are to use the argument of members opposite, surely the member for Bright should be on this committee as well. The Minister for Police interjected that the member for Fisher's electorate also adjoined the proposal. Given that, we should include the member for Fisher so that they all have an equal input into an area that either adjoins their electorate or, in the case of the electorate of Mitchell, is part of it.

An honourable member: Totally in it!

Mr MEIER: It is totally in it. Right! I would have thought it sensible for the member to give verbal and written evidence to any committee that has been established.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: Only if it is constructive.

Mr MEIER: Well, I would even go so far as to say, 'Even if it was not constructive.' If the member for Mitchell wants to give non-constructive evidence, so be it. But I will not for one moment suggest that of the member for Mitchell. In that respect I have great problems in terms of supporting the member for Kaurna's amendment to the member for Mitchell's original motion.

Debate adjourned.

COONGIE LAKES

Mr HILL (Kaurna): I move:

That this House calls on the Minister for Environment and Heritage to ensure that applications to grant wilderness status to the Coongie Lakes wetlands be processed forthwith, and calls on the Minister to ensure that Coongie Lakes wetlands be given the highest possible level of environmental protection once the exploration licences for the area expire in February 1999.

Coongie Lakes are part of the Innamincka Regional Reserve in the Far North of this State—quite close in fact to the Queensland border. The lakes are part of a 647 square kilometre control zone known as the Coongie Lakes Control Zone. The area is part of Santos's Cooper Basin petroleum exploration licence, a licence which Santos has held since 1954. This is a unique part of our State's natural heritage. It was made a RAMSAR listed wetland site in 1987 and has been listed on the register of the National Estate. It is also a wetland in the driest part of the world's driest inhabited continent. It is a transient desert wetland and, as such, a unique and a rich refuge for biodiversity. For example, it is home to at least 80 water bird species. It is also home to many native fish, raptor and plant species. I refer to page nine of the RAMSAR Management Plan for Coongie Lakes Wetlands Document where it describes in some detail the biodiversity therein. The document states:

The diversity of habitats in Coongie is reflected in the diversity of birdlife. About 80 species of waterbirds have been recorded in the area. The waterfowl, of which 13 species occur in the area, comprise swans and ducks. The shorebirds, of which there are 20 species in the region, include lapwings, plovers, dotterels, sandpipers, stilts, snipe, greenshank, godwits, stints and avocets. Some of these birds are overseas migrants and are likely to be present only in the southern summer; while others are resident in Australia, though also mobile in habits. Other species of waterbird to be found in Coongie include broilga, grebes, coot, cormorants, herons, ibis, spoonbills and terns.

At least 103 species of terrestrial birds were present in the area during 1986-8, with breeding recorded for 57 species. Coongie is especially important for the feeding and breeding of diurnal and nocturnal raptors, with 17 species having been recorded, all of which may be presumed to breed. Coongie also provides breeding and possibly breeding habitat for the Australian Bustard, which is rare in South Australia.

At least 20 000 waterfowl occupied Coongie Lakes for most of 1987 (as well as in 1979 and 1996). . . with the maximum number being 35 000 in that year. Large concentrations of waterbirds have been recorded: e.g. 12 000 Grey Teal and 16 000 Pink-eared Duck were counted from the Coongie Lakes in 1996 and 5 000 Australian Pelicans were reported from Lake Goyder over the summer of 1986-87.

It is an area rich in diversity and an absolutely important area for birds in Australia. It is also an area of great aesthetic value. In appearance, it is not unlike the Kakadu wetlands. If it were close to Adelaide it would be one of the State's premium tourist destinations—there is absolutely no doubt about that. As it is, many intrepid tourists make the journey to the north-east of the State to visit Cooper Creek, Coongie and the small settlement at Innamincka.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: Have you been there?

Mr HILL: I have been there, and it is absolutely beautiful. I know that the member for Mawson is a keen bushwalker and he would enjoy the area as well. This is a landscape that inspires. It is well vegetated, particularly at the moment after higher than average winter rains and a vastly reduced rabbit population.

I was pleased to attend the launch of Wet Dry at the University of Adelaide late last year. Wet Dry is a software package that will allow for greater understanding of the hydrology of the region. It was developed by the Department of Zoology under the leadership of Jim Puckridge. The package was launched by the Minister for the Environment who gave a good speech, I think, highlighting the uniqueness of the area. Having heard that speech, I hope she will support this motion and act quickly on its advice.

Applications have been with Governments for a number of years now to have the wetlands proclaimed as a wilderness area under the State's Wilderness Protection Act, an Act introduced in 1992 but barely used by this timid Government. We have a unique opportunity, now that the exploration rights to the area are about to be freed up, to protect a unique part of our State and nation. Before the area can be gobbled up by a new oil or gas exploration company, the Government should act, and I can assure the Government of bipartisan support.

My motion does not specify what level of protection, because that is up to scientific analysis acting under the provisions of the Act, but I would encourage the Government to act quickly to ensure the highest possible level of protection is provided to this unique and important part of South Australia.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I oppose the motion. This area is in my electorate. We sat here until after midnight last night talking about the ability to create long-term jobs for the unemployed, and I am absolutely amazed that the honourable member who has leadership ambitions and wants to lead the Labor Party into government in this State would put before the Parliament a motion that will deny the people of South Australia the ability to exploit the resources which we have in this State. It is in my view nothing short of the height of irresponsibility and parish pump politics related to a narrow mean-spirited minority of irrational groups who have no regard for the welfare of the people of South Australia, and know nothing about economics or the responsible exploitation of our resources to benefit current and future generations of South Australians.

From reading this motion, I can see that what the honourable member has put to the House this afternoon is that we should have this area declared a wilderness area and allow irrational people like Vera Hughes and her group to conduct a masquerade around the State and stop any development. This particular area of South Australia has been contained in the Kidman Pastoral Company lease for generations. They have been good corporate citizens. They have cooperated with government, and they have ensured that responsible management practices have been put into place.

Santos, one of South Australia's success stories, has developed an excellent mining and extraction facility in the Moomba area. It has been an outstanding corporate citizen. Not only has it provided the best facilities for the people that are employed there, but also it has been highly responsible in the manner in which it has gone about developing those resources, which are absolutely essential for the future

economic development of South Australia. It is absolutely imperative that we continue to find more gas and oil.

People are concerned about the greenhouse effect. However, we could generate more electricity using the gas that we find in that part of the State. To tie up these areas and prevent exploration would be the height of stupidity. I am just amazed that the honourable member, on a regular basis, comes into this Chamber and moves motions purely at the behest of a narrow focus group who are the leaders of the anti-development organisations in this State and nation, who are the sort of people who want to live in tents with candles and ride pushbikes. About 98 per cent of the community do not want to be involved in that nonsense.

They do not have the political wisdom or foresight to allow proper exploration at the Yumbarra Park. They do not have the political courage to put South Australia first. They have just hooked on to the coat-tails of this fringe minority because they think they might get a few Democrat votes. That in itself is absolutely unbelievable. The honourable member comes into this Chamber and moves this motion in the very week when David Noonan made the most irresponsible, inaccurate and misleading statements on radio that I have ever been unfortunate enough to hear.

Fortunately, the Deputy Premier was able to go on the radio and correct the nonsense. If Mr Noonan, who purports to represent the Australian Conservation Foundation, is its official spokesman then I wonder what sort of future it wants for South Australia. My understanding is that all the groups involved, the Kidman Pastoral Company, Santos, and other conservation groups, have been working with the Minister and the Government to ensure that a sensible protocol is put in place. The honourable member wants to jump on the bandwagon and put up this motion in the hope of attracting some support from these fringe elements.

I am absolutely amazed that they have so little regard for the future welfare and employment base in this State that they would be party to this sort of nonsense, because it is no good exploring in areas where there is no gas or oil.

Mr Hill interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: We do not know until we carry out the survey.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: We realise, listening to the member for Elizabeth's speech last night, that she cannot add up with a calculator. However, one would have thought that they would want to know—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: When you've come here 10 times I will take notice of you. Let me say to the honourable member that to deny the people of this State the ability to have put before them what is in those areas is absolute nonsense and irresponsibility. As the local member, let me make it very clear—

Mr Hill interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That clearly demonstrates the naivety and irresponsibility of the honourable member. It is the role of Government and members of Parliament to put the long-term best interests of the people of this State first. It is in the long-term interests of the people to carry out this exploration program as quickly and effectively as possible. If the honourable member comes into this place and tries to be part of tomorrow's headlines then the honourable member is acting in a manner contrary to the best interests of all South Australians.

This particular escapade is purely the result of urgings from these fringe groups. Surely, the honourable member has the ability or the wit and the wisdom to talk to a few other groups, because it appears that every motion the honourable member has put to the House since he has been here has been to try to stop people doing things for South Australia. In every motion the honourable member has gone down the track of the anti-developers: 'We want to make South Australia a closed shop. We do not want anything to happen here.' Yet, on the other hand, he and his colleagues are on their feet in this place demanding we spend more money and do a lot more things, but they do not want Government or the community to have access to revenue or opportunities so we can improve the lot of the average South Australian.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: You do not know until you carry out exploration. I would take more notice of Santos than I would the bleatings of the member for Elizabeth. If Santos thinks exploration should be carried out in this area, then I am prepared to accept its judgment before Mr Noonan and the member for Elizabeth because it has a fine record of responsibly exploring in this State. What we need in this State are more companies like Santos, Roxby Downs and the Kidman Pastoral Company that have developed businesses, paid taxes and created opportunities for thousands of South Australians. This motion will hold back South Australia, stop adequate development and it is contrary to the best interests of the people of South Australia. I ask the House to reject it out of hand as quickly as possible.

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

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

FIREFIGHTERS, LINTON

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I move:

That this House sends condolences to the families of the five firefighters who died in the fire at Linton in Victoria on Wednesday 2 December 1998 and commends the good and dangerous work that both volunteer and paid firefighters perform and recognises the risks that they take.

The untimely deaths of five young men is a sobering reminder to us all of the debt we owe to those who risk their life in protecting private and public property throughout the bushfire season. Fire is a part of the Australian landscape and its dangers are always in the mind of rural people at this time of year. To negate this danger the Country Fire Service was formed. First named the Emergency Fire Service, this organisation of volunteers has been successfully operational for more than 50 years, a tribute to the approach and response to volunteering that is found in rural districts where volunteering is more a way of life than in the metropolitan areas.

Our present Country Fire Service system was initiated in the latter half of the 1940s. An ample supply of mobile fire pumps was available after the Second World War, thus a scheme was proposed to use these throughout the country in peace time for firefighting. The scheme was to be administered by the Police Department, therefore Mr Tom Meaney was transferred from the Metropolitan Fire Brigade to the Police Department to set up and administer the Emergency Fire Service. On Eyre Peninsula, the first brigade was set up at Cummins in 1945 under the leadership of Mr Doug Blacker who was appointed the first organiser for zone six, which is Eyre Peninsula.

It is difficult for people today to appreciate that equipment at that time was scarce and quite often so well used that much of it was on the point of scrap. Nevertheless, perseverance and the recognition of the need for protection against fire led to the development of the Country Fire Service that we have today. For more than half a century most of this State has been protected through the voluntary efforts of people who give their time willingly to train so that they are ready to cope with any emergency, but all the training cannot overcome poor equipment or just bad luck that puts lives in danger. We must give our firefighters the very best equipment and training that we can for them to carry out the dangerous work that they do and the risk they take of necessity. The general public must also take responsibility for ensuring that lives are not put at risk unnecessarily by minimising the risk of fire that is within their control.

At this time of year, when grass is dry and the weather hot and often windy, there are enough natural causes with lightning strikes and sometimes even glass causing fires without people adding to the potential. It is up to all citizens to ensure that grass is cut, trees are lopped, barbecues are conducted safely and cigarettes disposed of carefully. Most people who live on the land have a healthy respect for fire, having experienced it first hand, and I know that most will have firebreaks where needed and many, as always happened at home, will have put the sheep in the house paddock.

Many precautions can be taken to prevent or reduce the damage caused by fire. It would be impossible for any Government to pay for the amount of manpower required to cover this State in the bushfire season. The Liberal Party is a strong supporter of volunteering and of promoting community spirit that encourages members of the public to serve their communities as volunteers. But it is the individual decision of each member of our emergency services to take the risks and responsibility of serving their communities and I thank them. There is always the danger of injury and death. In the case of the five Victorian CFS crew, it is not too dramatic to say that they gave their lives for their community. It is the ultimate sacrifice that anyone can make. I commend this motion to the House.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I am pleased to stand up here this afternoon and support the member for Flinders on what is a very important motion. First, I publicly offer my condolences to all the families of the firefighters who died in the Linton fire in Victoria and as Minister, on behalf of the South Australian community, I have written to them expressing my condolences. We are well aware of the difficulties and the trauma and tragedy that occurred for the fire service there, and particularly for the families who lost their loved ones.

It is important in saying that to also pick up the point made by the member for Flinders in relation to volunteering. South Australia probably leads at least Australia when it comes to the fantastic goodwill of volunteering and volunteerism across the spectrum. In my own area of emergency service we have the CFS in which there are 17 400 volunteers, 900 of which are cadets. In the SES there are 5 000 volunteers. Surf Lifesaving, which will receive some support through the new Emergency Services Funding Act, has approximately 4 000 volunteers. The Sea Rescue Squadron and Volunteer Coast Guard have around 2 500 or 3 000 volunteers, I understand.

In the police portfolio and in Neighbourhood Watch alone there are about 5 000 volunteers. In the areas in which I am involved as Minister there are in excess of 30 000 volunteers, which is fantastic. As the member for Flinders also pointed out, even if we lived in the Utopia that those of us in Government desire, with a recurrent surplus budget and no core debt, we would still never be in a position where we could provide emergency services in such a professional, well equipped and logistically located situation as we do now. We would never be able to pay for that service.

Volunteers will always be vital in South Australia. One of the great things about the emergency services administration unit is that for the first time from any Government there is a specific line within the formation and structure of that emergency services unit that deals with volunteer support services.

I know how difficult it is for families and volunteers to put in the hours required. Today in the CFS we have highly trained competent professional firefighters who risk their lives on occasions when they go out to an emergency. I also acknowledge the people who support those volunteers, namely, their spouses, partners and children because it often eats into an enormous amount of their private time. It is important that all South Australians realise and appreciate what happens with volunteers. I would like the South Australian community to remember that when these people go out to an emergency scene they are often sacrificing income or, if they are not, certainly their employers are.

I further support this motion by saying how much I appreciate the support in cash and in kind of those small businesses. Some businesses in rural areas—and I have them in my electorate—effectively close their businesses and go out with the people they work with to attend those emergency scenes.

Today we see a growing role for the SES and the CFS in the peri-urban area, and for the SES in the entire metropolitan area. In rural and regional areas we see an expanding role for both the SES and the CFS as they attend accident scenes and all sorts of rescues. All members should pause to think about the horrendous road fatalities that have occurred in the South-East in recent times and the impact they have had on the volunteers who encountered those difficult circumstances. I conclude by saying that this is a fantastic motion and I strongly support it. I thank and appreciate all the volunteers who do such a wonderful job for South Australia.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I commend this motion and I support it. I agree with everything that has been said in the contributions made so far. Being a member of the farming community, representing a largely rural electorate and being a long-time member of the CFS, I can say that the tragedy that happened in Victoria is very near to me. I have survived wildfire and I understand the trauma that is associated with that situation. However, there is one comment that I would like to make, and I am pleased that the Minister for Emergency Services is present because this comment is directed to him.

This tragedy was caused by a basic design fault in fire appliances, and the same design fault occurs in fire appliances in this State. When I was involved in local government and we were considering the purchase of fire appliances, particularly after the Ash Wednesday fires in 1983, we discussed this problem. Having discussed the situation with CFS volunteers in my electorate recently, I became aware that the

design fault remains in our appliances and it is still being talked about.

The modern pumps on CFS units used on a fire ground or fire scene are built to provide extremely high pressure, for very good reason. However, if the nozzles are set incorrectly, they empty the tank very rapidly, and therein lies the design problem: they empty the tank so that no water remains. It has been discussed for at least 15 or 16 years that there should be a reservoir in the tank or that the suction pipe should not go to the bottom of the tank so that the personnel on the truck have to physically open another tap to extract the last, say, 100 or 200 litres of water from the tank. In that way the firefighters would be very conscious of how little water they have left.

If the situation turns nasty and becomes life threatening, the unit would have a reserve of water and a fog nozzle could be applied over the area where they are taking shelter. It is my understanding that two trucks were caught in this situation and that they were very close together. One had water on board and was able to use the high pressure pump and a fog nozzle, and the personnel on that truck survived. The other truck had emptied its reserve of water and consequently the tragedy occurred. I hope that the Minister takes that on board and refers it to the CFS, so that the situation can be remedied very soon. I commend the motion.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I thank the member for Flinders for moving this most worthy motion, which I fully support. I wish to pay a tribute to all the firefighters—both paid and volunteer—who put their lives at risk to protect other people and their property. Communities throughout South Australia owe an enormous and unrepayable debt to the firefighters who risk their lives for others and for other peoples' property. The tragedy of the loss of the five lives at Linton brings home to us all how vulnerable we are to fire, particularly in country areas. No words can repay the debt that the community owes to these firefighters who have given their lives or to their families. I am sure that all members of the House support the motion and, on behalf of my colleagues and myself, I express our sincere condolences to the families and friends of all the brave young people who lost their lives.

Motion carried.

McINTOSH, Mr GARRY

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I move:

That this House congratulates Garry McIntosh on his outstanding service, commitment and loyalty to the Norwood Football Club and the South Australian National Football League and wishes him all the best in his retirement.

Today I wish to speak about one of Norwood's favourite sons, although I have to say that this week, with the event of Don Dunstan's death, it is probably a little sad to be talking about another Norwood person in a different light. However, I would like to acknowledge Garry's unique contribution to football in South Australia. Garry McIntosh is revered by everyone at Norwood and football will never be quite the same without him. Watching the team go out onto the field without him this year will certainly be a sad occasion.

Garry started his career at Norwood in 1979 when he was invited to train with Norwood's under 15s special squad. Former Norwood President, Nerio Ferraro, who watched him develop over a period of 20 years, said that there was a special quality about Garry from the very beginning: it was obvious that he was born to be a leader. He is an anachronism

because, although he is very shy, he is fearless, relentless and aggressive in attacking the ball and this made him stand out from the rest of the pack. He learned many of his skills from his father Denis, who was a rugby player in New South Wales and who taught him to always go straight for the ball.

Garry dominated the under 17 competition to such an extent that in his second season he won the McCallum medal as the fairest and most brilliant player in the competition. He was so good that Neil Balme included him in the league team in the following season and Garry was able to experience the thrill of winning a premiership in his first season.

Neil Kerley always said that Garry's tough approach to the body and ball, his leadership skills and his quick passing abilities made him the first choice for any State team, and he was also the most sought after player by both the VFL and later the AFL. His words to the Victorians, when they approached him to join them, have now become part of football folklore. I am not sure that I can repeat them, even under parliamentary privilege. Garry hated the Victorians with such great passion that when, after one of the many memorable clashes between South Australia and Victoria someone offered him a VB, Garry's response was, 'I don't drink Victorian shit.' Next day a goodly amount of South Australian beer was delivered to the Norwood Football Club for him.

Neil Kerley also tried to entice Garry to sign up to play with the Adelaide Crows. He got the same short, sharp response that the Victorians got, with perhaps fewer expletives: 'Not interested.' Garry just wanted to play for Norwood. Neil Kerley maintains that from Norwood's point of view it was fantastic but that Garry denied himself the opportunity to pit himself in the major competition and to secure financial benefit for himself. Garry's unshakeable principle has always been loyalty, first and foremost, to his mates and his beloved Norwood Football Club. Neil Craig, who played with Garry and who also coached him, acknowledges his unswerving loyalty to him, his team mates and the club and said, 'He was fantastic for me and always supported me both on and off the field. It is fitting that he is the most decorated player at Norwood. He is a captain's captain.' That is great praise from someone who is considered to be one of the world's most highly respected fitness coaches.

Phil Gallagher, a current board member who played with Garry, reinforces those sentiments by saying, 'The interesting thing about Garry is that I am yet to hear any of his peers express anything but the utmost respect for him.' This was borne out on a football trip to Tasmania in 1995 when speaking to players from opposition clubs. They were in absolute awe of Garry and there is no greater accolade than complete respect from your peer group. Peter Rhode, our current Norwood coach, also has enormous respect for him and says that Garry is the most loyal person he has ever known. He reinforces to everyone else what has been said about him. He puts the club and his team mates before himself. 'He is very humble, one of the most genuinely humble people I have ever met.' Peter, who coached Garry at the end of his career, admires his single mindedness, good mind and courage. In the past few years, despite having been hampered by many serious physical injuries, Garry has overcome everything through his courage and determination.

Garry's courage and principle have been very evident in the face adversity. Many people are unaware that, before he played a magnificent game against Central District at Football Park, he had spent all night at the Royal Adelaide Hospital where his partner Zia was fighting for her life, suffering from

a brain tumour. His son Dylan was born that night three months prematurely, because the prognosis for Zia was very bad. Thankfully, both pulled through and since then there has been another addition to the family. Again, that certainly impressed his team mates, who knew what he was suffering when he was playing that game.

He is from proud working class stock. When Garry first became captain, many felt he would not fit into the traditional role of Norwood captain. Mike Coward, a one-eyed Norwood supporter and author of the book *Men of Norwood, the Red and Blue Blooded*, says:

So strong was his commitment to the club that servants and silvertails alike happily made allowances for his foibles and flaws and embraced him as a man for all seasons.

An honourable member: Is it in the Parliamentary Library?

Ms CICCARELLO: No, darling, it's mine and it has lots of autographs. Garry now often wears a T-shirt and shoes at official functions in place of the singlet and thongs that he always used to wear, and very occasionally he has even been encouraged to make speeches at the club. Garry never wants attention focused on himself, because as far as he is concerned football is and always will be a team game, and premierships count for more than a Magarey Medal.

I am sure he was bitterly disappointed to have missed playing in the great 1997 grand final after suffering what in my opinion was a very questionable suspension for one game. When there was a suggestion that the club would fight the decision, Garry would not allow it, because he wanted nothing to distract his team mates from their ultimate goal, the premiership. It is now history that Norwood did defeat Port Adelaide in the 1997 grand final.

Members interjecting:

Ms CICCARELLO: Well, we won by about 14. Many Port supporters (including Bucky Cunningham) have given Garry what must be the ultimate accolade in saying that he should have played for Port Adelaide. Garry wore the now famous number 14 guernsey. He played 371 games and 12 State games; he kicked 180 goals; and he played the most games for Norwood, playing 344 games. He won two Magarey Medals and could have won four. He was an outstanding contributor to our football. I feel very privileged to have known Garry McIntosh. I wish him and his family all the best in his retirement, and I hope he can continue to contribute in some way to football in South Australia.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I support the member for Norwood's motion and join her in congratulating Garry McIntosh on his fine accomplishment. One of his most famous accomplishments, of course, was ensuring that Norwood has provided good competition for the Sturt football club in numerous games when Sturt has convincingly and decisively dealt with Norwood on the field, leading up to the grand final in 1998, when it was unfortunately robbed of a premiership by a rejuvenated Port Adelaide (dare I say stacked?) team at the very final hour.

As the member for Norwood has explained, Garry McIntosh typifies the calibre of our young people who get out there on the field every weekend and demonstrate those fantastic attributes that we are accustomed to seeing from Aussies in the AFL all around the country. What has happened to AFL football over the past 10 years is exciting. It has gone from being the dominant sport in the southern States to being a truly national sport. It has developed and will continue to grow. It is something which is uniquely

Australian, and Garry typifies all the values that we hold high in that most Australian of sports.

I look forward to seeing the Sturt juggernaut charge forward in 1999 and to many interesting games between Norwood and Sturt, those two traditional adversaries. I feel quietly confident that Sturt, rejuvenated as it is, will do more than account for itself on the battlefield and, no doubt, will have an exciting season. It is a credit to the member for Norwood that she has moved this motion. Norwood is a great club and a great representative club for South Australia.

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): I also would like to speak to the motion and, and in doing so, congratulate the member for Norwood for a wonderful and fulsome tribute to Garry McIntosh. I echo a few of the comments that the member for Norwood made. As a longstanding supporter of the Norwood Football Club, I have followed closely Garry's involvement at the club. However, perhaps we should look beyond that, because Garry McIntosh has epitomised what Australian Rules Football is all about, that is, the ethos of camaraderie, of courage, of putting your body on the line and of supporting the team.

During my time of following football in South Australia, no-one has done it better than Garry McIntosh. Garry McIntosh symbolises the great patriotism that many of us have for South Australian football. Many overtures were made to Garry McIntosh in his early days—even, as the member for Norwood said, during the early days when the Crows became established. Garry has an outstanding record, and we should be grateful for the support he has given to the South Australian National Football League competition.

Norwood supporters feel especially privileged because he was prepared to stay in the South Australian National Football League competition. I remember back in the early days when North Melbourne was bidding strongly for his services. This was at a time when a lot of other South Australian footballers—and no discredit to them—were looking at the dollars, looking at the appeal of the then VFL competition and crossing the border, and we were losing them from our competition here in South Australia. But, that did not happen with Garry McIntosh; he would not have a bar of that and he remained very loyal to South Australian football.

I personally believe that he is probably the greatest club champion that the Norwood Football Club has ever had. That is a huge statement when you look at some of the players who have worn the red and blue guernsey. We have had outstanding champions at Norwood, including John Lill, Bill Wedding, Ron Kneebone, Michael Aish and Michael Taylor; the list goes on and on. Garry McIntosh has stood the test of time. He has played 371 league games, and he holds the record for being club captain at Norwood, which is an outstanding achievement. Year in and year out he has put his body on the line. He has been what club football should be all about.

The member for Norwood has highlighted that Garry McIntosh won the McCallum Medal for the under 17 competition in 1981, but there were a number of other outstanding personal achievements—although Garry would not want to be remembered for these, I might add: he would want to be remembered for the team victories that occurred. In addition to the McCallum Medal, as has been highlighted already, Garry won the Magarey Medal in 1994 and 1995. Unfortunately, another Magarey Medal was taken away from him in 1987 for a minor misdemeanour which probably would not even get reported by the umpires these days, let

alone result in a suspension. Ironically, Andrew Jarman won the medal in that year. But if Garry McIntosh had not been suspended in 1987 he would have won the medal by about 10 votes, if my memory serves me correctly. He was also club champion of the Norwood Football Club in 1987 and 1991.

But, it is not for the personal achievements that Garry McIntosh played football; it is not for the personal achievements that Garry McIntosh would want to be remembered. He was all about putting his body on the line and ensuring that the Norwood Football Club as a team was successful. It is the team results that I believe Garry McIntosh would treasure now, including the two premierships in which he played in 1982 and 1984. Cruelly, he had taken from him the opportunity of leading the Norwood Football Club to its great victory in 1997, when Norwood not only beat Port but actually thrashed it. The only down side of the game was when Port kicked its first goal in the last quarter! Notwithstanding that, I acknowledge that the Port Adelaide Football Club is also a great club. These are the two outstanding clubs in the South Australian National Football League competition: all the others have to strive to reach that pinnacle, and good luck to them as they go about it.

Garry McIntosh was State captain in 1992, 1995 and 1997. As a State representative, he won the Fos Williams medal in 1984, 1992 and 1995. He holds the record for the greatest number of games played for the Norwood Football Club and, as I said before, is the longest serving captain of that club. This is an outstanding individual who has given not only a lot to his club but also a lot to the game—and the game is the better for having a person like Garry McIntosh play it. We also are much the better for it.

Over the years some people in the football community have incorrectly said that Garry McIntosh is a dirty footballer. Nothing could be further from the truth. What you have in Garry McIntosh is one of the strongest but fairest players who have ever played the game. When the ball was there and two players were coming from opposite directions, you could always rely on Garry McIntosh going 100 per cent flat-out straight at the ball. Not all footballers do that. Garry McIntosh, if not the most courageous footballer who has graced the turf in recent years, is certainly one of the most courageous.

I now pick up one of the earlier interjections: I think that Garry McIntosh can be put in the same bracket as (although I would not say he is better than or even as good as) and can be talked about in the same breath as some of our former champions such as Barrie Robran and Russell Ebert. When you are talking about that calibre of player, you are talking about the very best who have played here in South Australia. Garry McIntosh is certainly in that league.

Motion carried.

TOUR DOWN UNDER CYCLING RACE

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I move:

That this House congratulates the organisers, competitors and sponsors involved in the inaugural Tour Down Under international cycling event on its outstanding success, recognises the strong support given to the event by the people of South Australia and our local media organisations and acknowledges the enormous benefits a unique event of this nature offers our State.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the Government and the South Australian public on the phenomenal success of the first Tour Down Under. The sight of the 13 eight-man teams spinning through some of the State's most picturesque

countryside on national TV news and sports programs was simply extraordinary. Suddenly, Adelaide and South Australia were once again in the international spotlight, reinforcing our reputation for staging world class events. Particularly after our loss of the Grand Prix, it is great to see that we can do it like this, and it is certainly a great forerunner for the V8 race in a few weeks time.

Adelaide is a clean, green, young, vibrant city, as we all know, and is particularly well suited to host this elite international cycling race. My wife and I ventured down to the east parklands after a reception by the Lord Mayor for the Interstate Parliamentary Bowls Carnival, and we were wonderfully surprised to see the number of people there. They were six deep all around the course and in very high spirits. A few minutes later when the action started, we were all part of that: the car coming round, the police coming round, the sirens, the acrobatic cameraman on the motorcycle, and then the riders. It was a real buzz, and we were quite taken aback. We could understand exactly why the public got so involved.

We are already well known internationally for the Festival of Arts. The recent success of the *Ring* cycle was followed up nicely with Australia's biggest international cycling event, the now famous Tour Down Under. As I said, we still have the V8 race to come, and it is all go in Sensational Adelaide. The Tour Down Under race is now widely touted by the international sports media as a world-class race. This is in no small part due to the natural beauty of Adelaide and regional South Australia. I also congratulate the Government which, through Australian Major Events, organised a race that won praise from all the 13 teams and the local, national and international media. Race commentator Phil Liggett claimed that it was the like clockwork organisation and the support of the South Australian crowds that generated the commitment to include Tour Down Under on the international cycling race program.

As the member for Schubert, I cannot tell members how proud I was to see the Barossa Valley sparkle and shine in the national and international media. I welcomed members—in particular, the member for Norwood was there, and I welcomed her. I look forward next year to welcoming international tourists who will travel here for what is now the start of the cycling season. On the day, the local folk did themselves proud, decking out the towns that the race passed through with balloons, banners and ribbons. At the very start of the race were the barons of the Barossa and the mayor, flagging them off, and there were the parties, the tents and the bands—it was all part of the picture. It was absolutely magnificent, and everyone got into the spirit of it. They gathered early in the morning near the start line in Nuriootpa for the 11.15 race in anticipation of an exciting spectacle, and they were not disappointed. The gruelling, more than 160 kilometre race through, arguably, some of the most beautiful country in the world (and I am not being biased) delivered on its promise, and the crowd all caught the tour fever.

The laps were around the famous towns of the Barossa and three times riding up the gruelling Menglers Hill (and I find it hard enough driving up there in my car, let alone pushing a bike up it), where there are spectacular views at the top. Although the peloton was quite spread out, the pace was phenomenal right to the very end, and that hill claimed quite a few victims. Each time I saw the race director's car go whizzing by, heralding the riders just behind it with the sirens, I could not help but think that the gentleman in the

back seat looked remarkably like our Premier, enjoying the action in the fabulous Barossa sunshine. I understand that the Premier was due to get out after the first lap but I know he stayed there for all the laps and certainly was part of the action. He enjoyed it and, like the rest of us, got a tremendous buzz.

This fifth stage of the race was the toughest, but local lad Stuart O'Grady showed just what he is made of in this make or break leg to pull off a sweet victory, which effectively set him up to claim the inaugural Tour Down Under crown. I would like to think that the roar of the Barossa crowds helped him find that extra something in the legs on the steep hills just when he needed it—in fact, I know that it did, because I was standing right there as they charged the finishing line. I know that when he got off that bike he was absolutely spent but, with the cheer as he came up that hill, no wonder he found the extra power. We were all very pleased that we were there to witness that spectacle and see the local lad win the race. It is guaranteed that the crowd participation next year will be as strong.

As I said, the spectators put on quite a show and, along with the sunshine, the smell of the wurst cooking and the welcoming glasses of wine, the finish line at Tanunda was uniquely Barossian. The coffee shops, the restaurants and the hotels all enjoyed the mini economic boom that the tour brought—the tents, the parties and the bands. Even the police joined in—without dobbing them in. As the bikes came past the music was striking up, and I noticed one officer conducting the band—I believe that the bike was not moving very fast, but it was still moving. I congratulate the police for the spirit in which they joined in the situation. They were doing all sorts of rain dances on their bikes, and I believe that it was certainly all part of the spectacle. I congratulate them. We can all be flexible: we know that some things that were done were not by the book, but we understand and appreciate the mood and the manner in which they did it.

One bakery, for example, reported that business was frantic: 'It was like a cyclone, a storm in the beginning, then it went quiet as the race came through, then there was a storm at the end again,' one shopkeeper said. Many local hills hospitality providers reported a doubling of trade for the race. Indeed, the crowd numbers were beyond the wildest dreams for what was, we must remember, the first event.

I understand that the Tour Down Under represented one of the best returns on investment, and this is not surprising, given the capacity of events such as Tour Down Under to attract tourists and generate economic growth. I congratulate the Government for having the foresight to back this event and look forward to next year's event, which I am sure will be even bigger and better. The loss of the Grand Prix left a vacuum, and a lot of us felt negative and empty about that. Here we have an event that sounded like a great idea, and many of us thought, 'Oh, yes! A bike race.' However, none of us would have believed that it would be the spectacle it was.

The member for Norwood was there, and I met her friend who owns the bike shop. In fact, I have bought some products there since. I was caught up in the spirit of it all, because the event crossed all political boundaries. All involvement, whether it be by politician or local trader, made this spectacle what it was. On a more practical note, I am also pleased to report that many traders reported a dramatic increase in their trade and was delighted to learn that the charms of the valley would be presented to millions of viewers across the world. Indeed, they were, because people have reported from

overseas that they saw the towns. As I looked out from the winners' dais, where Tour Down Under entertainment kept the crowd on their toes, waiting for the winners to appear, the people from the Barossa all seemed to be in the main street of Tanunda. Just as South Australians turned out in their droves to support the event, so did the Barossa, and I applaud people for the enthusiasm with which they embraced this previously unknown quantity.

I also appreciate the other regions of the State—McLaren Vale, Victor Harbor and Norwood—for the effort they put in. It was all part of the total picture which was uniquely Australian and uniquely Adelaide. I know it is unusual for politicians to say nice things about the media, but the manner in which the Adelaide media promoted the Tour Down Under must be congratulated. They helped inspire the crowds to turn out, and I applaud them for their good work.

In closing, I once again congratulate the many people who supported this particularly Australian initiative and made it such a success. I congratulate all those who thought of it and all those who made it happen; in particular, I congratulate our Minister, the Hon. Joan Hall, who supported the event right through, even by wearing a yellow T-shirt on the last day. I thought it was uniquely Mrs Hall. All I can say to all involved is, 'Well done! You did South Australia proud.'

Ms CICCARELLO secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION (ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND) AMENDMENT BILL

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

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

KINDERGARTEN ADMINISTRATIVE TIME

In reply to **Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens)** 5 November 1998.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I wish to advise the member that presently about 25 per cent of preschool services administered by the Department of Education, Training and Employment are located on school sites and are part of the administrative arrangement of the school. This arrangement means that the department is aware of the administrative issues facing preschools which are already located on school sites or which may be located on school sites in the future.

Voluntary relocation of preschools to school sites is a matter for consideration within the current Department of Education, Training and Employment enterprise agreement negotiations. Administrative time allocated to these services will be considered and resolved as part of any relocation of preschool services to school sites. Where individual relocations of preschools have been negotiated in recent years it has not been the practice of the department to withdraw administrative funding or support. Negotiation has occurred on an individual basis regarding the management model most suited to the community and context of the preschool and school. In some instances the preschool director position has been maintained. Where alternative leadership configurations have been negotiated as a result of a preschool and school amalgamation the department has provided appropriate administrative support to the school.

ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Ms RANKINE (Wright)** 5 November 1998.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I am advised that the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs will shortly be receiving advice from the Electrical Advisory Panel, established by the Office of Business and Consumer Affairs, on an appropriate business course for electrical contractors. I understand that a course offered by the Regency Institute of TAFE is to be recommended. An alternative course comprising nationally recognised electrical modules which could be offered by public or private Registered Training Organisations will also be recommended.

Subject to the approval of these courses by the Commissioner, electrical contractors who have been licensed on the basis of an undertaking to complete this course will be required to meet their obligations. As there are some 2000 contractors in this position, there will be transition arrangements to ensure all have a reasonable opportunity to complete the course as places become available. I anticipate that these courses will be available from early 1999.

WATER SUPPLY, CHLORAMINATION

In reply to **Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens)** 29 October 1998.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: Chloramination has been introduced into the Adelaide Hills water distribution system supplied by the new Summit Storage Water Treatment Plant.

Chloramination is a safe, widely used method of disinfecting water supplies which is particularly successful in ensuring water quality in systems like the Adelaide Hills where water travels long distances from the plant to consumers at the ends of the distribution systems.

Other chloraminated systems in South Australia include:

- Tailem Bend/Keith and the upper South-East (since the mid 1980's)
- Morgan/Whyalla system serving the mid-North, Yorke Peninsula and upper Spencer Gulf (since 1986)
- Swan Reach/Stockwell system serving the Barossa Valley and mid-North (since 1983)

The Environment Protection Authority (EPA) has issued a set of guidelines dictating the level and chloramine content of water, which can be disposed of into natural watercourses. It states that 'there must be no residual chlorine levels and ammonia must be no more than 0.5 mg/L'.

Field testing in the Adelaide Hills has found the level of residual ammonia to be no more than 0.2 mg/L, well below the EPA guidelines.

It would be unusual for large quantities of treated, chloraminated water to be discharged into any watercourse as the reticulated water network and natural streams are quite separate.

SA Water undertook an extensive community education and information campaign to inform residents of the introduction of chloraminated water and its effects on fish and about the associated mains cleaning program.

Action taken included:

- a brochure sent to every Hills dwelling prior to the introduction of chloramination last September detailing the program and advising of toxicity for fish;
- a repeat delivery of the brochure at the time of mains cleaning in individual areas;
- briefings for local councils;
- briefings for regional media (resulting in several articles highlighting the issue);
- a weekly advertising campaign in regional newspapers;
- preparation and distribution of fish care fact sheets;
- preparation and distribution of chloramination fact sheets;
- preparation and distribution of mains cleaning fact sheets;
- personal letters to hardware/aquarium/pet shops advising of the program and providing fact sheets on fish care;
- personal letters to businesses dependent on water as integral to their trade advising them of potential disruption to supply;
- establishment of a Hotline for businesses;
- establishment and promotion of a Freecall number;
- establishment and promotion of a fish care Hotline;
- formation of a mobile taskforce to assist residents/businesses who may strike difficulties with their supply; and
- availability of SA Water technical staff to provide advice and/or assistance to customers.

SA Water made every endeavour to ensure that relevant information was widely circulated and available to all Hills residents prior to and throughout the program.

Many residents have contacted SA Water and obtained the fish care fact sheet.

SA Water will continue to conduct community education and information campaigns for future initiatives.

GAMBLING INDUSTRY BILL

A petition signed by 26 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to oppose the passage of a Gambling Industry Bill was presented by Mrs Penfold.

Petition received.

FIREFIGHTERS

A petition signed by 17 851 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to support the South Australian Metropolitan Firefighters wages claim, to oppose any proposal to relocate the communication centre and to direct any fiscal savings back into further improving South Australian emergency services was presented by the Hon. M.D. Rann.

Petition received.

WOMEN'S STUDY RESOURCE CENTRE

A petition signed by 878 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to maintain a level of funding to the Women's Study Resource Centre for the purpose of retaining the Coordinator position was presented by Ms White.

Petition received.

CRAMOND REPORT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: There is little doubt that the Cramond report which I tabled on Tuesday raises some serious issues about the processes of Government. Today I intend to outline to the House the measures my Government has taken in the last two years in ensuring the processes of Government are adhered to and that there can be no repeat of what occurred in this particular instance. As I said on Tuesday in my ministerial statement, Government is found deficient in not ensuring that some of its department processes were well organised and managed as it moved into Government after the 1993 election.

Clearly, at the time there was a breakdown in communication between two key Government departments. Following the 1997 election I made a conscious decision to implement some significant changes. Therefore the issues raised by Mr Cramond, which occurred in 1994, cannot be repeated.

The issues raised in this report have been addressed with restructuring of the Public Service and better communication. A senior management council was established. This group of 10 CEOs meet once a week. Chaired by the CEO of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, it is designed to ensure whole of Government planning processes and decisions. The result is far greater and more effective communication than we have had in the past.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: In addition to that, the Government has established the Prudential Management Group. This group was established as part of the Government's response in 1996 to issues raised by the Auditor-General. The group comprises the Chief Executive of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, the Chief Executive of the Department of Justice and the Under Treasurer. The group is directly responsible to Cabinet for the provision of advice and assistance to agencies on the integrity of processes used in the delivery of projects and arrangements with the private sector.

The Government has also established an acquittal office to ensure that any matter brought before the Public Works Committee of the Parliament has followed due process under section 12c of the Parliamentary Committees Act. This covers legal, financial and probity issues, and has special regard for the public benefits of projects. I am satisfied that these measures have already ensured there has not been and will not be a breakdown in the process as has occurred in 1994. However, as an added measure, I have asked the Prudential Management Group to provide a report to me on what, if any, policy and management issues need to be addressed further to improve processes of Government. I will report further to the House.

Mr Foley: You will blame anyone but yourself.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Foley interjecting:

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

QUESTION TIME

MATTERS OF PRIVILEGE

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): My question is directed to you, Mr Speaker. Do you agree that the ruling you gave yesterday on a matter of privilege could lower the standards of ministerial responsibility to the House and encourage Ministers to be negligent in checking the accuracy of answers they give to the House? An editorial published in a leading Australian newspaper today states that the ruling given by you yesterday, namely—

Mr Conlon: I would not be laughing at it, John; it is not good for you.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair would like to hear the question.

Mr ATKINSON:—that the doctrine that those found guilty of misleading Parliament should resign deals with those found guilty of deliberately misleading and is not to be confused with those being tripped up by contradictory remarks is an invitation to politicians to lie. The editorial states that the Cramond report found that the Premier gave false, misleading and inaccurate answers to Parliament concerning the Motorola deal, and states that the Premier's evidence failed the test of objective truth, was false and misleading and, in commonly accepted language was, and I quote the *Australian*, 'a lie'. The editorial also states:

It was part of a pattern—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: You really do well on those stakes, don't you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ATKINSON:—that Mr Olsen has developed in his Administration. He deserves to be brought to account.

The SPEAKER: I say to the House and to the member for Spence, if he would like to hear my reply, that the Editor

of the *Australian* newspaper does not write history. In my statement to the House—and those who have studied these subjects over many years would know this—I was referring to a whole raft of matters of privilege that had come to us over the past 14 months and I highlighted the underlying fact that ran through the whole of the presentations, namely, that the charge that has to be proven is that a member deliberately misled the House. I am not interested in this particular case whether it was in reference to allegations concerning the Premier, any Ministers or former Ministers, or anyone else for that matter, but to put on the public record in South Australia that the test is to deliberately mislead the House. I believe that everyone in this Chamber who has seriously studied these subjects and who has referred to Erskine May understands that.

I can also say, for those who want to take it further, that the subject was raised at the last Presiding Officers' conference. Without exception, every Speaker and Presiding Officer of all political persuasions came away with exactly the same view. I refer members back to the statement yesterday that the test is that a Minister has deliberately misled the House.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The honourable member in his own readings of Erskine May would also concur with the ruling I made yesterday.

YOUTH PATHWAYS PROGRAM

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): My question is directed to the Premier. How will the Government's Youth Pathways pilot program announced yesterday better prepare young people to enter the work force?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I thank the honourable member for his question. The Youth Pathways program is an important new way of delivering education, training and employment pathways for young people whose needs may not be met by the more traditional arrangements. I was pleased to note the endorsement of the program in today's *Advertiser* by Ian Harrison of the Employers' Chamber. As we all know, youth unemployment is a particular challenge for Governments. It is vital that we have the appropriate programs in place to tackle that problem. Despite what youth unemployment figures say, the overwhelming majority of young people are in education and training. In fact, in January some 8 700 youths in the 15 to 19 years category were looking for work—a small drop from the figure of 9 200 the previous month.

However, this group is one of the most disadvantaged in the labour force. The fewer skills a person has, the less likely they are to find a job. This can put young people in a particularly difficult situation—a situation that has taken on a new dimension in recent times following the introduction of the Commonwealth youth allowance by the Commonwealth Government. That requires young people to be in some form of education or training to receive benefits. The Prime Minister's announcement late last month that unemployed people will need to meet certain literacy requirements if they are to receive social security also makes it more important to ensure that we meet the needs of young people. That is why the Youth Pathways program announced yesterday is so important.

Most young people in this State pass through the school system into further training or work. The Youth Pathways program will help ensure that none of them—

The SPEAKER: Order! I direct attention to the camera crews, who must understand the arrangement that their editors have entered into with the Parliament regarding the scanning of members not on their feet.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Youth Pathways program will help make sure that none of these young people fall through the cracks, so to speak. It will make sure that young people are better equipped to meet the challenge of finding a place in the work force. The Youth Pathways program involves thinking laterally or outside the circle. It involves taking a new approach to tackling the needs of some of the people in our community who are most vulnerable to the threat of long-term unemployment. The program will diminish the risk of young people who do not receive suitable assistance from the traditional education system becoming and staying unemployed by offering different forms of training.

The pathways program will offer these young people an alternative education program with both academic and practical skill development components. The program will aim to help these people enter or re-enter studies towards the South Australian Certificate of Education, apprenticeships, traineeships, further education, training or employment. Participants will be able to gain credit at both secondary school and tertiary levels as well as gaining work relevant skills through work-based projects. It will ensure, in effect, that they are not left behind.

As I indicated yesterday, initially it will be piloted in the southern suburbs, and the Government is currently also developing another employment and training program with local government. It is anticipated that the program will advance to the northern Adelaide region—Belair Athol and The Parks—and that eventually a significant number of young people in those areas will also be able to participate.

If we are to make serious inroads into unemployment, we must provide people of all ages with the appropriate skills and retraining so that their skills match the emerging job opportunities. That is particularly vital for young people looking for their first job. The Youth Pathways program will be a practical way of helping young people who might otherwise face significant disadvantage in the labour market to gain skills they will need to find work. Unemployment causes social isolation and damages health, both mentally and physically. That makes it even more important to ensure that young people do not fall into its grip.

The Youth Pathways program will help young people who are most at risk. It will be sensitive to their needs rather than putting them into a bureaucratic too-hard basket. It will make sure that they can receive financial support from the Federal Government, and nothing is more fundamental to ensuring that everyone can lead a fulfilling life than having a job and the self-worth that that job brings to people. The Youth Pathways program will give young people at risk a better shot at that goal.

UNITED WATER

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Given the Premier's concerns outlined today in his ministerial statement about serious issues in the processes of Government, can the Premier explain why Cabinet, just days before the 1997 State election was called, varied the terms of the water privatisation contract with United Water to allow United Water to take on a large portion of the \$210 million environment improvement

program of our sewerage works without its going to competitive tender? With your concurrence, Mr Speaker, and that of the House—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There has been enough of that on my right.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Okay: we know what your credibility is like. You know—20 years on the back bench.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will explain his question or I will withdraw leave.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: In the Public Works Committee recently it was revealed that State Cabinet in early September 1997 approved a 'variation agreement' attached to the United Water contract. According to the project manager of the Bolivar upgrade (and we all remember that), Mr Rob Thomas, this agreement allowed United Water to design, project manage and construction manage the capital works projects for the environment improvement program for metropolitan sewerage works. The \$210 million program was announced by the Premier during the election campaign in October 1997—it was fixed.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader was commenting at the end. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: There is no doubt that environmental improvement programs for our waste water treatment plants are urgently needed. I can well remember the Opposition on a number of occasions highlighting that need. This Government worked to put in place a proper environmental program that is being implemented. That environmental program was worked on for a number of years, bringing different proponents together, subsequent to which it went to Cabinet for consideration to sign off in terms of financial commitment. I would have thought that there ought to be an acknowledgment from the Opposition that, over the last five years, the environmental push in this State has been second to none.

The way in which we have tackled the environment and its maintenance to ensure that there is no further degradation of the environment and our waterways is something for which the member for Heysen and the current Minister can take a lot of credit. We have benchmarked a policy direction second to none with any other State in Australia. In relation to the specific question of the Leader, I will get the details and report to the House.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Shonky deal!

The SPEAKER: I warn the Leader. The member for Bragg.

JOBS WORKSHOPS

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): Has the Minister for Employment received any reaction to the outrageous statement made in this Parliament yesterday by the member for Hart when he referred to the jobs workshop as 'one of the most boring, irrelevant discussion sessions that have taken place'? It has been put to me that the member for Hart is at serious odds with his comrade and mate, the UTLC secretary Chris White. I am advised that the UTLC secretary actually developed the idea of the employment council which was submitted by him through the workshops program and which the Premier announced yesterday.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I thank the honourable member for his question. It is important that this House understand just how much the member for Hart fails to grasp—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Peake.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: —in his contributions to debates in this House. He fails to grasp that the jobs workshop was one component of a three pronged consultation process aimed at developing sound ideas to assist job creation for South Australians.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Hart.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: If the member for Hart learnt how to use that CD it might be a start. I am reliably informed that he thought it was me talking on it and did not realise that it is a CD that goes into a computer and is a database.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will come back to his reply.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I will, Sir.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: That is not true. The consultation process has been repeatedly outlined over recent months and reinforced in Parliament yesterday. It included the involvement of hundreds of South Australians right across the State in jobs workshops. More than 3 000 individual ideas were submitted to this Government as a result of the consultative process. I note particularly that, in giving advice to the Leader of the Opposition, Terry Plane actually wrote two or three weeks ago that the Leader of the Opposition should take up the initiative of 'Labor Listens' and get out there and listen to the people of South Australia about jobs. What Mr Plane failed to mention or realise—and I am not surprised at this either—is that in fact that is exactly what the Government has been doing for the past three months and what in this Chamber I acknowledge that many members on both sides of this House have bothered to participate in. That fact is lost on not only the member for Hart and Mr Plane but also the Leader of the Opposition.

Thirdly, many months ago the Government initiated a bipartisan debate over the critical job creation issue in this State in an effort to act as an incubator for new ideas and further develop thousands of proposals put up by South Australians who, unlike the member for Hart, had the drive and compassion to participate in the jobs workshops. If the member for Hart—

Mr Foley: No-one turned up.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The member for Hart said no-one turned up at his: he must have got the wrong time, date and venue, and that is not unusual for the member for Hart.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Put it on a CD and send it to him.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: We will put it on a CD and send it to him. It seems that the member for Hart advocates excluding the people of South Australia and members of this House from participating in the debate. It does please me enormously that the trade unions and UTLC in particular have made such a positive contribution to the jobs workshops process. I particularly pay tribute to Chris White on what he has done in a positive way to work with this Government for the benefit of the employment of South Australians. Yesterday the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Elder.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Yesterday one of the members opposite said he was an honest man and gave credit where it was due. I will return the compliment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for the second time.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: And he was not looking well, Sir. In fact the UTLC submitted the idea for the employment council, yet the member for Hart was unable to find time to attend even one job creation workshop. The member for Hart's disregard of the unemployed seems to be somewhat terminal, for he, like every member in this House, was given—

Mr CONLON: On a point of order, this matter was debated for some seven hours last night when the member for Hart made his comments. I suggest that the Minister had more than his go last night.

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

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Like every member of this House, he was given the opportunity to contribute to this debate, but he chose after eight minutes to sit down and say that it was all a waste of time, or similar words. Given that this House and the people of South Australia have known for many months that this debate would take place, I am surprised—no, astonished—that the Opposition has no more to contribute than some of the rhetoric I heard coming from some members, such as the member for Hart. I acknowledge some very positive contributions, some good ideas from those opposite, and I promise that we will analyse the good ideas that came from members opposite, include them with our own and unscrupulously use them for the good of people in this State.

I found it sad that the Leader of the Opposition actually admitted that he and his Party were (presumably blissfully) unaware of some of the outstanding initiatives that the Government had already put in place in terms of the jobs statement. The Premier yesterday noted that something like 42 000 jobs have been created. Again, I congratulate the people of South Australia for their positive contribution to the jobs debate and I take my hat off to the UTLC for the development of the Employment Council initiative, not so dissimilar to the initiative called for by the honourable Leader, although he seems not to take note of that. The people of South Australia would be far better off if the Opposition in this House were as open minded and as prepared to contribute to the jobs debate.

In closing I note that today is an important day because, once again, the employment figures have been released. We are at question 3 and counting, and the Opposition members, who yesterday said that jobs was the number 1 issue facing South Australians, are more keen to question the Speaker, on a matter of privilege, or the Premier, going down some other burrow, than to actually worry about the unemployment figures of South Australia. It is a disgrace that the Opposition in this place stands and says one thing and then does another.

Mr FOLEY: On a point of order, the Minister is now clearly debating the question and I ask that you rule accordingly.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order in that over the last three or four sentences the Minister has moved into the area of debate and I ask him to come back to the question and wind up.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I always find your rulings wise, Sir, and I conclude my remarks.

UNITED WATER

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Government Enterprises now confirm that United Water will receive approximately \$63 million worth of design and project management work from the Environmental Improvement Program without that work going to open, competitive tender? The Public Works Committee recently heard from the Bolivar project upgrade director (Mr Rob Thomas) that United Water's share of the program would be about 30 per cent of the contract value, or about \$63 million. Before the variation agreement, the water contract allowed United Water to charge the Government project management fees for capital works of only 7 per cent—not the 30 per cent it will take now.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: In answer to a previous question, the Premier has already stated that he will get back to the House about that, but the most important thing about the whole of the Environmental Improvement Program is that all along the coast, with the waste water treatment plants, for years, including the decade in which the previous Labor administration was holding the South Australian reins, there was the opportunity to do something and nothing was done. One of the first things that I did as Minister for Government Enterprises was to formally announce the beginning of work on the Environmental Improvement Program at Bolivar, which is an extraordinarily good project for South Australians for many reasons.

There are a number of things about this project that South Australians collectively think are fantastic. They include things such as the amount of discharge into the gulf being decreased dramatically—and not only the quantity of the discharge but also the discharge itself, with the amount of nitrates and other such chemicals being decreased as well. What that obviously means is the opportunity for the seagrasses, and so on, to grow and, hence, the breeding stock for our fish is greatly increased. And that is not only at Bolivar: that is all the way along the coast.

Obviously, the Opposition chooses not to focus on the Virginia project and the dissolved air flotation filtration plant, which is allowing purified water to be piped to Virginia, and to increase the quantity of production from the Virginia land by huge numbers of per cent. I would have thought that the Leader of the Opposition, given that his electorate is in that area (if he was ever in the Chamber), would have been nodding to say how good that is. I would have thought that the member for Taylor and the member for Elizabeth would have been delighted about the increased economic activity that the whole of the environmental improvement program is bringing to South Australia.

SCHOOL WORK FORCE PROGRAMS

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training advise the House of the programs in place in our schools that will assist students to be better prepared to enter the work force?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: One of the things that we need to realise more and more is that students in our schools are taking advantage of post secondary training options much more now than they ever have in the past. I am pleased to say that our schools are responding to this in terms of setting up programs that directly link with industries and also with TAFE institutes. Students in our secondary schools are now studying courses that give them credit not only in the South

Australian Certificate of Education but also in courses that they will take on in a TAFE institute and, further to that, those courses that they undertake can then be used for accreditation into degrees upon entering university as well. So, we are getting an excellent linkage between secondary schools, TAFE institutes and flowing on to university degrees. So, if a student does not perhaps get the TER score that he or she needs—

The SPEAKER: If members want to converse, they can retire to the lobby at the rear of the Chamber.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: —to enter university on the first occasion, they can still get there via the TAFE institutes—and many are taking that option, might I say. This is quite a breakthrough, because previously those linkages have not been there at all, and it is the outcome of the amalgamation of the old DECS department to include TAFE. The amount of communication and work that has gone on between officers within the department and teachers and lecturers has been excellent to develop these programs.

Young people now, while they are at school, are being trained in the hospitality industry, engineering, aquaculture, agriculture, tourism and information technology, just to name a few. A number of memorandums of agreement have been signed between TAFE institutes and secondary schools, both independent and Government, particularly in information technology, that will give those young people accreditation when they move into a TAFE institute and take up an IT course, for instance. It just goes to show that the money that we are spending on the Ready, Set, Go program—some \$11.6 million—is being well used.

It was interesting to see a report of the Productivity Commission in the *Advertiser* today that highlights the level of money that is being spent on education in South Australia. That report, in fact, highlighted the fact that some \$5 931 per student is spent on education in South Australia, which compares with the national average of \$5 770. So, in fact, we are spending \$150 more on education per student in South Australia than the national average. Not only that, this is an independent report.

The student-staff ratios are interesting to note as well. We often hear the union carping about class sizes. The class size in South Australia for all schools (Government and non-Government) is 11.7 students per staff member, against a national average of 12.1. When we look at Government schools it is 11.2 in South Australia compared with 12 nationally. So, we are doing well in that area.

In addition, the level of cooperation between industry is really being highlighted now. I was at Mitsubishi before Christmas. Mitsubishi actually selects students from a southern group of schools to undertake a two week training course at its factory. The student works on the shop floor and ends up undertaking a range of different jobs while at Mitsubishi. It is an excellent program. The young person who undertakes that program has a very good view of the industry and soon realises, if they want to get into that industry, what sort of requirements are needed and what sort of career path is there for them. I commend Mitsubishi on its initiative in undertaking that program. I think that some 10 students undertook that program last year.

Further, as the students have undertaken that program, the industries which feed into and which supply services to Mitsubishi have also become involved in this, because a graphic design company took on a trainee as a result of Mitsubishi's involvement. So, the program has spread even wider. Some 8 000 young people have taken advantage of this

type of education and this type of cooperation between industry and our school system. In taking that up, they have moved into TAFE and are getting excellent results. As I mentioned yesterday, some 80 per cent of 1997 TAFE graduates gained employment by May 1998. So, this program is working extremely well, and I encourage young people to get involved because there are certainly job outcomes in this for our young people.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): What action has the Minister for Government Enterprises taken to ensure the probity of the United Water contract to project manage the \$210 million environmental improvement program, given a potential conflict of interest surrounding the Government's independent auditors? In the Public Works Committee recently it was revealed that a private international company of quantity surveyors, Currie and Brown, had been employed by SA Water to independently audit United Water's contract for the Bolivar capital works upgrade project. The Bolivar upgrade project manager, Mr Steve Rose, told the committee that Currie and Brown was also employed by United Water on some occasions.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am absolutely unclear as to what the significance of that last point might be. I do not happen to know this person, and I am unaware of what was said in the committee. I take it that this is a person in the private sector who does what a lot of private sector consultants do: they sometimes work for different people. Is that the substance of the question? It seemed to be the allegation. I am unclear about the implication of what that allegation was meant to mean; however, I will look at that.

I repeat in response to this question that the Government was addressing the issue of environmental improvement in an extraordinarily long-needed environmental improvement program, as the Minister for the Environment indicates, which had been ignored. I can remember well and truly before I entered Parliament, before I was even interested in politics, that people used to say to me regularly how terrible it was that people used to be able to go regularly to the jetties and fish and catch whiting.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: When was the last time you caught a good whiting from a jetty?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The last time I went fishing was about 10 days ago. I am happy to tell members that I did not catch as many as I wanted to.

Mr Foley: How long were they?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: They were all legal.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: It was not on a jetty.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: It was exactly according to the thing on the boat. I am also happy to tell members that, unfortunately, I did not catch the boat limit.

Mr CONLON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I do not know what the Minister's country estate has to do with this matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! Every time the honourable member gets up to speak he turns to the gallery. His voice was smothered and I hardly heard any of his point of order. Would the honourable member care to speak to the Chair and repeat his point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I do not need assistance from members on my right, either. Could I have the honourable member's point of order, this time facing the Chair.

Mr CONLON: It's all right; I withdraw, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: For the information of members opposite, who I know will be interested, I was actually fishing on Kangaroo Island as part of the Kangaroo Island tourism effort. I paid a contractor, who is delighted to have international people going over there. As for this usual drivel that comes from the member for Elder, who delights in this personal abuse, it just shows how wrong he actually is. The environmental improvement project in relation to our waste water treatment plants is a great success story for this Government and for South Australians. I look forward to a continual roll out of these environmental improvement projects as they occur, because every single time they are coming on stream all South Australians are benefiting. I am very happy to ask all of the doubting Thomases on the other side to join me in celebrating these new plants as they come on stream.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Will the Deputy Premier explain the effect on South Australia's primary industries if the New South Wales Government either exceeded the cap on diversions from the Murray-Darling Basin or proceeded with the construction of new dams?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thank the member for Heysen for the question and acknowledge his role over several years on the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council on which several of us sit. Certainly, it is a body which is very important to the future of South Australia. Last week, an announcement by the Nationals in New South Wales prompted some comments in the media. For some time the Minister for the Environment and I have been very concerned at the possibility of a New South Wales election shaking that State's commitment to the cap and its responsibilities under the cap on water diversions from the Murray-Darling Basin.

The issue certainly received a high profile last week when the National New South Wales Leader, George Souris, made some statements that should be of concern to all South Australians and, indeed, to all Australians. For that, George Souris and the Nationals received much attention. Members of this House need to be aware of concerns which I and my colleague the Minister for the Environment have shared for some time not just about what might happen with the Nationals in the lead up to an election but with the ALP Government's stance on the cap in New South Wales.

Late last year, the Murray-Darling Basin Commission met in Adelaide. At that meeting Minister Amery raised some issues in relation to different management whereby questions were asked about flexibility and about averaging over a number of years, but, with a cap, to take out more water in dry years would be a disaster for the whole basin. We put considerable pressure on New South Wales and, as a result, were able to get an assurance from the New South Wales Ministers as to their commitment to the cap. That evening we were very surprised by a press release issued by New South Wales which gave the impression that New South Wales had achieved greater flexibility for the cap at that meeting.

That was somewhat at odds with the statement released by the Minister for Environment and me in which we were very happy to report the New South Wales Minister's unequivocal

recommitment to the cap. In a press release last week responding to the Nats, Minister Amery, Minister for Agriculture and Minister for Land and Water Conservation, gave me further reason for concern. The Minister's press release states:

... other issues flagged by the State's Opposition water rally today in Deniliquin appeared to plagiarise statements made in the Carr Government's water policy documents.

In response to so-called policy promises, Mr Amery said:

We have already negotiated and achieved a new approach to the way we administer the Murray-Darling Basin cap in New South Wales.

That seems to be a bit of a revisit of the press release of that same night. Perhaps the New South Wales Minister should read the minutes of the meeting held in Adelaide of the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council, which states:

... it is important to maintain commitment to the cap as a historic benchmark and guarantee level, and not to provide any public perception or suggestion of weakening resolve to the cap and its complex implementation arrangements.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: That recommendation was unanimous, as the Minister for Environment interjects. I ask all members to be aware of the threat of the weakening New South Wales' position and the threat that that would place on the Murray-Darling Basin if such actions took place. It is all about considerable pressure coming from irrigators, mainly in the north of the State, and their demands for further water. I do not think that any of us are against further development in New South Wales but it must come from the New South Wales Government, whichever Party is in government, addressing its current weaknesses, which it has not done.

It has not been good at improving its system. Currently in that State there is much flood irrigation and leaking channels, which can be addressed. It is about time that State got moving on some progress with rehabilitation and efficiency of use. If that is done, not only can it have the extra development but those of us on this end of the system will be a lot better off.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Will the Minister for Human Services explain why his claim that Healthscope had agreed to reinstate the original physiotherapy service at the Modbury Public Hospital has been contradicted by the General Manager of the hospital? Yesterday the Minister told the House that Healthscope has a contractual obligation to maintain services that were previously provided and that, at the Minister's request, Healthscope had agreed to reinstate the original physiotherapy service cut by Healthscope. An article published on 10 February 1999 (yesterday) states:

Hospital General Manager, Jill Michelson, confirmed the physio positions cut in January would not be reinstated.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am delighted that the member for Elizabeth has raised this issue—absolutely delighted—because, as I said to the House yesterday, the Managing Director of Healthscope rang me late last week and assured me that the service would be reinstated. It would appear that he told me before he told the manager of his own hospital because, in fact, I received a letter of confirmation of that yesterday under the name of Bruce Dixon, that is, that two additional physiotherapists will be taken on to bring the number back to the original six. The point raised by the honourable member is wrong. There will be six physiothera-

pists and the service which was provided previously and which was cut about two weeks ago will be fully reinstated.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The hospital knows about it, yes.

COMMUNICATIONS CENTRE

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): Will the Minister for Emergency Services respond to claims by the Ambulance Employees Association that the Ambulance Board is opposed to the new communications centre, and will he respond to a claim by the union 'that the centre would be a waste of taxpayers' money.'

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I gather from the honourable member's question that he might have been listening to the radio at 7.45 this morning, as was I. It is pretty disappointing when a union or an ambulance association make statements that are completely unfounded. Advice given to me, and as I understand the position, is that the Ambulance Board in no way whatsoever is opposed to considerations regarding where a new second common computer-aided dispatch communications centre may be located. In fact, I understand that the Ambulance Board is very supportive of the fact that it is a great initiative of the Government to bring in this state-of-the-art information technology that will actually improve services not only for those people who provide the services, the workers, but, as importantly, for the community of South Australia.

Clearly what is happening is that, like the Opposition, unions are either not prepared to listen or are not interested in supporting initiatives that are in the best interests of South Australians. There is no waste of taxpayers' money whatsoever in relation to the new common computer-aided dispatch technology. In fact, I would suggest that, if it is going to assist in saving life and in trauma, that investment will be a very good one.

I also highlight that the association claimed that \$1 million had been spent recently in relocating the communications centre from the Ambulance Service headquarters on Greenhill Road, Eastwood, to Wakefield Street. Again, it has got that information wrong. I know that members opposite would not be interested in this sort of information but the simple fact is—

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for the third and last time.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:—that the Ambulance Employees Association has got it wrong. I am advised that the amount to relocate was approximately \$450 000. The more important fact is that the organisation has been located there for about a year. I understand that it will be at least two years before the new computer-aided dispatch network is in place. At that time, irrespective of the ultimate and final decision concerning a second communications centre, this particular equipment will not be suitable if we are to have state-of-the-art, common information technology equipment for dispatch at a communications centre. I place those facts on the record and I trust that the Opposition will read them carefully.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): Given the Premier's statement to the Parliament yesterday that 'we are out-performing other

States' and that the Government would not call a jobs summit, will the Premier explain the latest ABS job figures which show that South Australia has lost 5 500 jobs over the past month; our unemployment rate has increased to 9.5 per cent, compared with 7.5 per cent nationally; the number of unemployed increased by 2 300 in January; South Australia has the equal highest youth unemployment rate in the country; and we have lost 7 500 full-time jobs since September last year?

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: At last the Opposition asks a question about which South Australia might be interested. Can we explain it? No, we cannot explain it. Are we doing all we can to fix it? The answer is 'Yes.' As a matter of fact, however, youth unemployment is much lower than it was when the current Leader of the Opposition was Minister for Employment. Similarly it is that in January 1998 the comparable figure was 10 per cent: we are now below that figure. It is not as good as we would like but, for the past seven months, the trend towards continuing employment growth in South Australia is increasing.

We are not happy with the results. Can we explain them? They can be partly explained by the fact, I believe, that in the December period there is a remarkable increase in sectors such as retailing and hospitality. It is a casual type of employment and many of those jobs are shed in the January period. The January period is also exacerbated by school leavers coming onto the jobs market. It has ever been thus. Our relative position is much the same as it has been but we are improving.

The Premier has given an unqualified commitment to working on this, but the Premier and I have said repeatedly that we do not have all the answers. I noticed that a journalist in the media this morning asked, 'Why don't you come clean and admit you can't fix it on your own?' I ask where that journalist has been, because we have been saying repeatedly in this House that we can do the best that we can do. We are expected to do everything at our disposal in this State and will continue to do so: we will continue to work with the Commonwealth and we will continue to work in the community. However, at the end of the day, South Australia and the South Australian community alone cannot fix this problem.

Even the Australian Government working with us cannot solve a problem that tends to be a worldwide problem. But can we do our best? Yes. Will we continue to try to do our best? Yes. Is that why we had jobs workshops for the past three months to try to get new ideas? Is that why we have sat down with members opposite to try to listen and see what we can do better? The answer is 'Yes.' We take no particular joy in figures that show a glitch, in another one person in this State being unemployed.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Unlike the member for Hart, who again tries to trivialise this matter and turn it into some sort of joke, I find it a serious matter, and I do take heart that other members opposite do not play Party politics in this but join with me, the Premier and every other member on this side of the House in trying to fix it.

RIVER FISHERY STRUCTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mrs MAYWALD (Chaffey): Will the Minister for Primary Industries advise what role the River Fishery Structural Adjustment Advisory Committee plays in the

decision making process in respect of inland commercial fisheries management and what consideration has been given to community concerns about proposed changes to the commercial fishery management? A recent press release from the Minister for Primary Industries, which outlined planned changes to the River Murray commercial fishery, has resulted in a number of constituents contacting me to raise concerns that community input to this committee has been ignored.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thank the honourable member for her question and for the way in which she has sought knowledge of what has happened. There has been confusion in the Riverland as to what has happened in the past couple of days. It goes back to a considerable misunderstanding of the process. The member for Chaffey asked in her question about the role of the River Fishery Structural Adjustment Advisory Committee. In the past few days we have announced the management changes that have come about as a result of that committee. Some people in that area are thinking that it is a major decision as to the future of the river fishery, whereas in fact that decision was made about 12 months ago and was announced at that time. Much of that was put in place.

The advisory committee was put there because councils had raised some issues and we were not able to come to agreement on them. This committee was set up with narrow terms of reference to try to work through those issues, the major one being the task of restructuring the 30 remaining commercial fishery reaches on the river. There were arguments about whether they should be two kilometres this way or that way. There were also issues about individual species in back waters. The short terms of reference are as follows:

1. To provide community based input into decisions on relocation of commercial fishing reaches and fishing access arrangements in back waters; and,
2. To advise the Director of Fisheries on proposals as part of a structural adjustment of the river fishery.

While the terms are reasonably narrow—and the release put out this week is not about the big issues but about some of the management issues—there has been a bit of noise up there. Forgetting the technical arguments, the real issue is the old issue of commercial versus recreational fisheries and the sharing of the resource. Some people up there would like me to put those 30 people straight out of business. They have pushed the perception that the commercial fishers have been the big winners in the process. It is important to realise that the commercial fishers up there have given on rights in this whole process. There were 39 licences and the 30 remaining fishermen put up their money and brought out the other nine. Of the 38 kilometres of reach that that bought, they have used only 22 kilometres, so there is access to an extra 16 kilometres of river without commercial effort. They have nominated eight native species for protection, where they previously had access to those species. That is a plus for the resource.

A cap has been placed on gear allocations per licence with some fishers having considerable gear allocations removed from their licences. They were willing to work through with councils about the movement of reaches by one to two kilometres to accommodate other areas and other people who wanted to be part of it. This was essential.

I am aware that the ERD Committee is currently working on a reference about the sustainability of inland fisheries. I contend that the announcements made this week are very much not consistent with the reference before the ERD. Sure, if you talk about inland fisheries, there is some overlap.

People find it hard to believe that the Hon. Mike Elliott from another place criticised me this morning about pre-empting that report. He is obviously not aware of the decisions. The decisions that came out this week are specific. I look forward to the report of the ERD Committee, which has done a lot of work, gathered a lot of evidence and been up there to have a look. We look forward to and will respond to that report and, hopefully, it will be helpful to the future management of the fisheries.

RACING INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): My question is directed to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. What does the Government propose to do with the \$5.89 million accumulated surplus of the Racing Industry Development Authority? The report of the Racing Industry Development Authority, tabled by the Minister on Tuesday, shows an operating surplus of \$5.89 million racing industry money.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I thank the honourable member for his question. I understand that that money has been rolled over in relation to capital infrastructure pending the outcome of the venue rationalisation report. No decision will be taken on spending the money until the report is out.

NGARKAT NATIONAL PARK

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Will the Minister for Emergency Services inform the House whether section 54, in particular subsection (6), of the Country Fire Services Act gives the CFS and its officers ultimate responsibility for fire suppression in South Australia, including fires on Government reserves? Constituents of mine in the Upper South-East near the Ngarkat Conservation Park have questioned why their assets were recently put at risk and the park largely destroyed unnecessarily because the CFS was denied the opportunity to apply, in a timely manner, accepted fire suppression techniques.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I thank the member for MacKillop for his question. The relevant points on this issue are, first, that the National Parks and Wildlife Service has responsibility within its Act for land management. The National Parks and Wildlife Service gains its legal powers to combat fires through the Country Fire Services Act, including the equipping of their vehicles, the office of powers to combat and their relationship with CFS officers about consultation, advice and authority regarding fires. With respect to the question of section 54(6), it limits the exercising of the powers to require consultation where practicable with the officer of a Government reserve in the national park unless the CFS Chief Officer has delegated a controlling person for that fire.

There are a couple of important points worth noting. The National Parks and Wildlife Service and the forests have formed CFS brigades at the local levels and are fully integrated members of the local CFS groups. They are trained and integrated, and the consultation and coordination is facilitated by this local cooperation between the three agencies. The other important point is that the CFS parks and forests have all adopted the national interagency incident management system for managing fire and emergencies. I have been advised by CFS State Operations Centre that personnel from both CFS and the National Parks and Wildlife

Service were jointly involved in the operations through the duration of the fire at Ngarkat.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY CHAMBER

Mr HILL (Kaurna): My question is directed to you, Mr Speaker. Will you review the portraits hanging in this Chamber so as to better reflect the political history of this place? In particular, will you ensure that a portrait of Don Dunstan is hung in this Chamber? There are eight portraits in this Chamber. They are of Sir Richard Butler, who was a conservative; Sir J.C. Bray, who was an Independent; the Hon. G.C. Hawker, whose political affiliation is unknown, but I am assured that he was not a member of the Labor Party; the Hon. Sir F.W. Holder, a Liberal; the Hon. Sir Robert D. Nicholls, a member of the LCL; Thomas Playford, a member of the LCL; Hon. Sir Jenkin Coles, who was a free trader and a land reformer; and Archibald Peake, who was a Liberal. All those members were conservative.

The SPEAKER: I assure the honourable member that the matter he has raised is often discussed informally around the Chamber. It includes the tapestries. Some items are placed on the wall by resolution of the Chamber, others are not. It is my policy not to take a unilateral decision myself and replace anything without some sort of consultation with members generally. I make a commitment to initiate some discussions amongst appropriate members of the Chamber so that we can address the issue and see how we can progress it.

ABORIGINAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services. What are the Government's reasons for converting what was the Aboriginal funded unit in the Housing Trust into the Aboriginal Housing Authority and how will this benefit Aboriginal people?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yesterday we had the inaugural meeting of the board of the Aboriginal Housing Authority. This is a body and an action that been talked about in this State since 1973 whereby housing for Aboriginal communities around the State should be transferred to a specialist organisation, with Aboriginal representation on that organisation. After 25 years of talking about it, yesterday it was started and had its inaugural meeting. I am delighted to say that Charlie Jackson is the inaugural Chair of the authority.

Most important are the key priorities of that authority. The first is to make sure that suitable housing is available to Aboriginal communities throughout the State. It is also very important, and I stressed this when launching and officially declaring open the first meeting of the authority yesterday, that there is a key objective of making sure that they produce the health outcomes, the healthy environment in which Aboriginal people live, as a result of improving their housing. I see health issues for the Aboriginal communities as the biggest single issue that must be confronted. I see a link between Aboriginal housing and Aboriginal health which must be addressed.

The other key issue I stressed in launching this authority yesterday was the need to make sure that suitable housing is available for older people in Aboriginal communities. In particular, we need to make sure that such housing allows them to be very much part of their families but, at the same

time, allows them to have ready access to hospital services, which they so badly need. In the past there has been invariably an enormous link—

The SPEAKER: Order! The cameraman in the gallery may film only one member at the moment, and that is the Minister for Human Services.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Given the ageing population in Aboriginal communities, the problem is that suitable accommodation is not available so they can maintain their close links with their traditional families and, equally, have ready access to hospital services, which they so badly need. They are some of the key objectives.

Another important objective for the authority is to ensure that they achieve a better quality of maintenance and more suitable housing for Aboriginal communities. So often the houses that are built are better suited to the metropolitan area than the AP lands in the Far North West of South Australia. It was an historic occasion and a very important occasion in terms of better housing outcomes, and that means better health outcomes and better community care outcomes for the Aboriginal communities around South Australia. I look forward to strong support from this Parliament for the Aboriginal Housing Authority. Equally, I wish members of the authority the very best in the enormous task that they have ahead of them.

ARTS FUNDING AND REPORTING SYSTEMS

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): I table a ministerial statement made in another place today by the Minister for Transport, Urban Planning and the Arts on the simplification of arts funding and reporting systems.

FIRE SERVICE COMMUNICATIONS CENTRE

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I seek leave to make a brief ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE: Yesterday in answer to a question from the member for Elder, I mentioned that a business case was being developed in relation to the Emergency Services communications centre. On reading the *Hansard*, I see that I misheard the member's question in so far as it also related to the Government radio network. I have referred that part of the question to the Minister for Administrative Services in another place and I will bring back a reply as soon as possible.

MEMBER'S REMARKS

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr LEWIS: During the course of debate this morning on the Bill before the House which was introduced by the member for Hartley, I said that applicants for United States citizenship who were Australian citizens lost their Australian citizenship in consequence of making such an application, not because of anything the Australian Government did but because of what the American Government interpreted that action as meaning. Although members opposite, whom I am

not sure of by identification, claimed that to be false or at least misleading to the House, my checking of the situation reveals that it is indeed the case.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I wish to favour the House with the full text of the editorial from today's *Australian* newspaper, which was referred to in a question earlier today. The editorial is headed 'Parliamentary ruling an invitation to lie'. It states:

Sir Walter Scott once wrote: 'Oh, what a tangled web we weave, when first we practise to deceive.'

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member does not intend to reflect on the Chair.

Ms HURLEY: Certainly not, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member should be very cautious as she goes through this, whether she is quoting from a newspaper article or not. As I said, the Editor might have wanted to rewrite history, but I caution the member on reflecting on the Chair in the course of her remarks.

Ms HURLEY: It continues:

It is an admonition that the South Australian House of Assembly Speaker John Oswald may have cause to remember. He ruled yesterday that the Westminster tradition which says that those found guilty of misleading Parliament should resign deals with being deliberately misleading and is not to be confused with being tripped up by contradictory remarks. His ruling is an invitation to politicians to lie. It is an interpretation that the compilers of May's *Parliamentary Practice*, which explains the rules of the House of Commons on which the Westminster tradition of Parliament is drawn, would have difficulty accepting. It is incumbent on Ministers to ensure that the information given in Parliament is as truthful as it can possibly be. No other course is acceptable.

Mr Oswald said he was concerned that 'if the test becomes contradiction rather than as a result of wilful action, none of us can feel safe in the future.' No one will have much sympathy with his view: telling the truth has always been the test for MPs, and so it should remain. An untruth is an untruth and MPs who indulge in them should pay the penalty. The difficulty for Mr Oswald is that it is the South Australian Premier who is about to be judged by the Assembly on precisely this matter—a finding by a retired magistrate that John Olsen gave false, misleading and inaccurate answers to Parliament concerning a \$60 million deal with international electronics giant Motorola. Mr Olsen has crowed that he was cleared on 14 of 16 grounds investigated. That is not good enough: the charge was found proven on two counts. Mr Olsen's evidence failed the test of objective truth: it was false and misleading. In commonly accepted language, it was a lie.

The Premier has for far too long obfuscated over the Motorola deal. Since September 1994 he has on at least four occasions in Parliament denied he made any agreement with Motorola other than that covering the establishment of a software centre in Adelaide. *The Australian*, which made public the Cabinet documents that exposed Mr Olsen's duplicity, was criticised for its action. The Opposition was also vilified. If there was nothing untoward in the Motorola arrangements then Mr Olsen has chosen a strange way of defending them. It is clear Mr Olsen knew far more about the Motorola deal and its implications for South Australian taxpayers than he admitted to Parliament. Whatever Mr Oswald may believe, this was not inadvertence. It was part of a pattern that Mr Olsen has developed in his administration. He deserves to be brought to account.

I have nothing more to add.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I rise on a matter of privilege, Sir. I would ask that you consider and clarify for this House whether the reading of an editorial into the record of this House by the honourable member opposite without further comment in any way impinges on the rights of any member of this House to take a legal action outside this House.

The SPEAKER: It does not take away anything to do with the rights of members. It was a grievance debate. Whilst some members may or may not have appreciated the reading into *Hansard* of the form of words, because everyone has their own personal views about history and the attempts by the newspapers to rewrite history, the fact is that it was a grievance debate.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): Today I would like to address the issue of apprenticeships and traineeships. It is very pertinent and very much follows on from what the Premier has said in recent times about providing greater vocational opportunities for young people at school. Certainly, the Minister for Employment has highlighted some of the relevant issues surrounding this matter. Members would know that I have had a longstanding interest in training and education. I recently sourced detail in respect of the number of traineeships and apprenticeships in South Australia, both new commencements and recommencements over the past 10 years, and I will highlight some aspects before seeking leave to have the table incorporated.

In 1989 there were 1 093 traineeships in South Australia and in 1998 there were 11 404. That is a dramatic increase. It is true to say that the figure tapered off a bit in the early 1990s and in 1992 got down to 800 trainees and in 1993 increased slightly to 1 030. The opposite has happened with apprenticeships. In 1989 there were 3 990 apprenticeships in South Australia—either commencements or recommencements—and the most recent figure for 1998 shows 2 632. That is clearly a decline, so traineeships have gone up dramatically while apprenticeships have declined somewhat over time, although I do point out that apprenticeships in 1998 were significantly higher than in 1993. So, over that time there has been a gradual decline in apprenticeships and a dramatic increase in traineeships.

This is a reflection of the fact that traineeships are much more flexible than apprenticeships, but also it is disturbing in the sense that too many young people and too many parents disregard the opportunities that apprenticeships provide. An apprenticeship is a much longer term of training. It is subject to very strict legal requirements. By its nature a traineeship tends to be shorter in length and less intensive in terms of training, but still of great value. Members would recognise the importance of the State Government traineeship scheme, which started under the previous Labor Government, and I have always acknowledged that. It was dramatically boosted in the mid 1990s with additional support from the Federal Government and it continues to be a very strong program. Members should take comfort from the bipartisan support for that scheme which has produced great results not only for the public sector but also for the private sector, because we know that over 70 per cent of those State Government trainees go on to employment either in the public or private sector or else go on to full-time study.

But we still have a problem with apprenticeships, in that not enough young people are looking at the opportunities there, and we are facing a very serious skill shortage. It sounds somewhat like a record, because I was saying this three or four years ago and it is still being said by business and trade union leaders, but the message is not getting through to our young people. I have often said I have nothing against lawyers or doctors but we need plumbers, electricians, motor mechanics and chefs. To that end and to assist in this process, the Federal Government needs to provide greater assistance, especially for poorer members of the community,

to access some of those training programs which are available through TAFE and private providers. This week I wrote to the Prime Minister suggesting that very problem be addressed by way of greater financial support from the Federal Government.

Many poorer young people, even with family support, cannot afford, for example, a six month training course at TAFE in, say, commercial cookery. The cost of that is \$2 500 and that is without the cost of knives, uniforms and incidental expenses. Then on top of that you often have an administration fee. The only concession you get if you are unem-

ployed is off the administration fee. I think there is a great opportunity for the Federal Government to really assist some of the poorer members of our community, especially disadvantaged young people, to access training by assisting them to get into traineeships and courses at TAFE and private providers as well as continuing to boost apprenticeships. I seek the leave of the House to have inserted in *Hansard* a brief table, which is purely statistical, showing the total commencements and recommencements of traineeships and apprenticeships during the period 1989-98.

Leave granted.

Year	Total Commencements (Commencements and Recommencements) for the years 1989 to 1998									
	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Traineeships	1093	1203	605	800	1030	1444	1745	4337	6013	11404
Apprenticeships	3990	3762	2385	2423	2476	2929	2475	2527	2129	2632
Totals	5083	4965	2990	3223	3506	4373	4220	6864	8142	14036

Source: SA Contracts of Training Information System (as at 15-1-99)

The SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has now expired.

Ms KEY (Hanson): The grievance that I wish to present today is in relation to matters in my electorate where many of the residents live next door to industry. I noticed in the table that was produced yesterday by the member for Kaurna, the shadow spokesperson for the environment that, with the environmental improvement program notices that were issued, only two out of 113 have had voluntary improvement programs, one of them being the Castalloy factory. I wish to indicate my concerns to do with environmental pollution and not to comment on the work force or the very good product that is produced at Castalloy. This letter from a constituent and the constituent's grandson illustrates what I am advocating in this area.

The first letter is from the grandson, Aaron Rodwell of Eden Hills, who wrote to the *Advertiser* on 10 February 1998 as follows:

I'm writing about pollution from factories that are near residences. I think they should move from being near people, because they can kill. My grandmother is 60 years old and lives near factories at North Plympton. It's hard to visit her because the air in her suburb stinks like metals. She can't use her rainwater because of the pollution that falls on her roof every day. It tastes bad, and the authorities have told her and her neighbours not to drink it. On a nice day, when other people in Adelaide have their windows open, my grandmother has to keep hers closed, otherwise it stinks in the house and everything gets dusty.

When my grandmother prepares and eats food I'm worried that the metal dust will get into her body and harm her. The Government should close down factories near residences to protect people and help them have healthier lives. I don't want to see the people who work there lose their jobs, but the factory should be moved.

This is from a 12-year-old. I now read the letter that I received from the constituent herself, Mrs Margaret Cooper. She states:

I have lived in the North Plympton area for over 14 years. It was a pleasant area, halfway between the city and Glenelg, but the last six or so years have been a nightmare as we live in close proximity to the Castalloy factory, which has gradually expanded with no thought to their neighbours. When we first arrived I seem to recall that they only worked day shifts, which have increased to 24 hours a day, mostly seven days a week. The continual humming, whirring noise can be heard throughout the house with all doors and windows

closed. Banging and clanging, grinding and dragging of metals can be very irritating, especially when it starts around 10 p.m. and continues off and on all night.

If one is lucky enough to get to sleep it is not unusual to be awoken by the crashing, banging, clanging at 2 a.m., 3 a.m., 4 a.m. or 5 a.m. As for the disgusting, revolting, sickening odour that the factory emits, one has to smell it to believe how bad it is. The odours make you feel very ill indeed, making you feel nauseated and suffer from sore watery eyes, a mouth and tongue that tastes like metal, and headaches. We live in an area not only polluted by odour and emissions but covered in a bluish haze day and night. We cannot open our doors or windows to get fresh air or relief from the heat. At night we have to swelter because of the noise, odour and emissions, which seem to be heavier than during the day. It is years since we have been able to have a meal outside or even enjoy some gardening, because the odour can invade the area anytime.

The council upgraded a children's park in Kinkaid Avenue but because of noise and odour it is impossible for children to play there. My own grandchildren went there a couple of times but only stayed for a few minutes, saying, 'Nana, let's go home, it stinks too much here.' My family rarely visit because they do not want their small children exposed to the chemical cocktail that we residents are forced to breathe. The older children have more sense than to get out of their car if the odour is bad. I and all the residents of the western suburbs are entitled to breathe fresh, clean air, the same as residents in the eastern suburbs, Hills, beach and country areas, without wondering what the air we breathe is doing to our health.

Because of the shortness of time I will summarise the rest of the letter and say that Mrs Cooper has now had some blood tests that have shown that she has an unusually high level of metals in her system, and her medical adviser is very concerned about her condition.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I rise today concerning employment opportunities, particularly in the rural areas of the State. My electorate of Schubert is generally quite fortunate when it comes to employment statistics. The Barossa is booming, as everyone knows, and will continue to do so for some time. However, there are some areas in my electorate that are not quite so fortunate. Towns such as Mannum, Blanchetown, Sedan and Cambrai are examples of where employment opportunities are somewhat scarce, to say the least. Unfortunately, these towns have gone the way of so many other country towns. When the Horwood Bagshaw farm machinery plant at Mannum was in full swing in the 1950s and 1960s, it provided tremendous opportunities for local people. Unfortunately, in the 1980s United States

manufacturers flooded the market and, without any Australian support for R&D towards our own companies, the company closed down much of its production, particularly when it stopped making the Horwood Bagshaw PTO harvester—which was a pretty sad day, because it was the last harvester made in Australia. However, Mr Peter Sweeney, who bought the company a year or so ago, turned the operation around and is now providing employment opportunities in the town. That is great news for a town such as Mannum where other opportunities are very scarce, to say the least.

We all know the limited employment opportunities that face our school leavers in rural areas, particularly our females. If they are lucky, they will get a job in the local deli or newsagent. If they are exceptionally lucky, they may work at the chemist shop or the doctor's surgery. But there are only a couple of jobs in town like that: what about the others? They have to move away to bigger regional centres or to Adelaide to secure work—and that is if they are lucky. This can disrupt the family unit, and I have known of the whole family moving to larger centres to maintain their family unit. This only compounds the effects of the downward spiral in a small town's economy, with the all too evident results.

But as I said, the Barossa is booming; it is outperforming any other region in Australia. We have heard in the past few days that \$700 million will be spent on development in the Barossa in the next few months. It is an incredible figure, but it does not take long to do a quick tally and you realise that it is true and that it is happening. The region now is in urgent need of infrastructure, water, roads and electricity. The region is growing 20 per cent more quickly than predicted, and now we have a serious lack of infrastructure. We need to address this work urgently. That in itself will support growth in the region and provide jobs in a regional area. Some people are in real need of help, and I sincerely hope that the jobs debate will go towards helping them.

It is obvious that we need to do something quickly. The Minister for Employment, the Hon. Mark Brindal, is working toward this goal. I congratulate him on the work he has done, the documentation he has put out and also a particular CD that all members now have. I actually fired mine up today—

Ms Breuer interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I did it. Once you follow the text carefully, you can. So, the Government is showing that it really is putting its money where its mouth is, and I congratulate the Minister. We need to maintain and reinstate Government services back into country areas. We have seen so many Government services leave our regions all over. It has been happening for many years, not only under this Government but also under previous Governments. We need to further expand our burgeoning tourism industry, and where better to do this but in our rural areas? There has been particular success in the Barossa Valley. I have been witness to many TAFE courses teaching our young people in all the tourism industries, the hospitality industry, the wine industry and the catering industry, and the young people are doing it well.

And the rewards are now coming through, because we see our young people professionally trained and being recognised. I encourage them, and I also thank the people in TAFE who provide the venue for those people. Another area where untapped employment opportunities lie is in the farming sector, particularly in cereal crop farming, alongside the burgeoning wine industry. Those two make up the biggest primary industries in this State. I know that many landowners could employ many other people on their farms. You only

need to drive around our farms and have a look. All are in need of much extra labour.

Ms BREUER (Giles): We all know that this is a Government on the ropes. Its failure to listen, to act, to deliver for the people of this State is in contrast to its spineless attitude when it comes to working hand in glove with the Federal Government to sell out the people of South Australia, especially the people living in the north of the State. The petition that I tabled in December from the people of Coober Pedy in the Far North demonstrates the level of opposition to the proposal to establish a low level radioactive waste dump in the Billa Kalina region of the central north of South Australia.

If the Government were listening, it would know that the people living in the Billa Kalina area are opposed to their back yard being used for the development of a national radioactive waste depository. If the Government were listening, it would know that the people of South Australia do not want their State used as the nation's dumping ground. If the Government were listening, it would know that the Yankuntjatjara and the Antankirinja people are opposed to the waste dump. If it were listening, it would know that the Kokatha, the Kuyani, the Arabunna and the Bargala people are opposed to the waste dump. Once again, the wishes of the original inhabitants of this land are to be ignored. Has anything really changed since those not too distant days and those not too distant tests at Maralinga? The only difference now is that we go through the process of consulting before we ignore the wishes of the original custodians of the land.

As sure as night follows day, the setting up of a centralised facility in this State will lead to South Australia becoming the resting place for this nation's radioactive waste—and not just low level waste. Members might not have read the comments of Lesley Kemeny, the Australian delegate to the International Nuclear Energy Academy, which appeared in the *Financial Review* on 16 November. He expressed the view that Australia should be using its deserts not just to dump its own waste but also to take waste from around the world.

On 1 December, out of the woodwork came a proposal by a company called Pangea Resources, made up of American, British and Swiss interests, to use Australia as a dumping ground for radioactive waste from around the world. I was glad to see the *Advertiser* editorial come out in strong opposition to this proposal. The editorial states:

The interesting thing about the Pangea Resources video promoting South Australia as the ideal dumping ground for nuclear waste is that the company is United States based. Yet although the United States is the world's leading nuclear power, although it, too, has vast tracts of land and a stable political system and economic infrastructure, Pangea favours Australia not America.

The editorial further stated:

It is not just greens, of various hues, who are upset by this idea. All of us with a stake in the future of our neighbourhood must feel deeply uneasy. We want job development but not when the price is toxic. . .

I support uranium mining in my electorate but I draw the line at turning our State into a dumping ground for national and international radioactive waste. The Premier is quoted as saying that he will look at this proposal, but he will not even lift a finger to assist regional South Australia to become the home of a new gas-fired power station.

We know that radioactive waste currently is held at over 50 sites in Australia, mostly in the Eastern States. We know that the Department of Primary Industries and Energy has acknowledged that the waste is held in a safe manner at

various sites around the country. We know that the storage of waste can be improved and that there are no insurmountable technical barriers to prevent the improvement of current storage practices. Although radioactive waste is held at a number of sites, most of the waste is held at the Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation's facility at Lucas Heights. Well over 70 per cent of the waste that the Commonwealth wants to dump in South Australia comes from the Lucas Heights facility. Will the waste be just low level waste? There is a contract with the Dounrey facility in Scotland that covers the reprocessing of 1 300 fuel rods from ANSTO's Lucas Heights operation. The contract runs to the year 2005. Part of the contract stipulates the return to Australia of an amount of radioactive waste equivalent to that in the spent fuel rods.

It is time that this Government started to act in the interests of the people of South Australia. Advocacy for a waste depository does not further the interests of the people of South Australia. Time would be better spent in creating employment opportunities and providing decent services, especially for people in regional South Australia—people who have copped a disproportionate share of the cutbacks imposed by this Government. I ask the Government to listen to the message sent by the petitioners in Coober Pedy and to stop dumping on regional South Australia.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): The other day I referred to the opportunity for members to give evidence to the working group investigating tourism infrastructure on Yorke Peninsula. I was very pleased to have that opportunity last Monday and to identify to this House some of the key aspects as they related to the need for an upgrade of road infrastructure leading to, and on, Yorke Peninsula. Today I would like to highlight some of the aspects as they relate, first of all, to water infrastructure.

The irony is that, officially, Yorke Peninsula now has filtered water; we have a filtered supply from the key areas. However, that water comes to a holding dam at Paskeville—an earthen type dam. So, the good work that is done in filtering the water is, to a large extent, undone when it goes into an earthen dam and is reticulated through to the rest of the peninsula. So, that is a issue that I believe needs to be considered further and, hopefully, a liner will be placed in the dam sooner rather than later.

Another big issue with respect to water is the fact that, at the bottom end from Warooka down, properties are not connected to the major trunk lines: in fact, they get their water from the Para Wurlie Basin. The Para Wurlie Basin is already tapped to the maximum, so that people who are building new houses may have the pipeline running past their house but they are not allowed to tap into it. There is no doubt that, with some potential new developments at the bottom end—and I will not identify specific places at this stage but I have had a look at potential developments in recent times—we will have to open up possibly the Carrubie Basin (and the Carrubie Basin is next to the Para Wurlie basin) so that development can continue in that area.

If one looks at a place such as Corny Point, one sees that not only is it renowned for its great fishing but there are some magnificent mansions sited there. I believe that it is an area where people go to get right away from the rat race and, supposedly, where they have their complete privacy and freedom, and they are building some magnificent residences

down that way. However, it is not only at the bottom end that water is a problem. At Port Vincent, developments have been restricted because there is insufficient water to supply any new development area. The same applies at many of our coastal locations—be it Balgowan, Rogues Point or some of the other areas: there is insufficient water for new developments. So, an upgrade of the water system is needed and, hopefully, that is one of the factors that can be urgently considered by this working group looking into tourism infrastructure on Yorke Peninsula.

The third area that I wish to highlight is tourist accommodation on Yorke Peninsula—or, shall I say, the lack of it. We have some wonderful bed and breakfast places and smaller motels and hotels but we do not have any accommodation—with the possible exception of the motel at Moonta Bay—that can accommodate a bus load of people. This is a big problem for Yorke Peninsula and it is one of the key reasons why you hardly see a tourist bus moving around the peninsula. It takes the better part of 2½ hours to get to Yorke Peninsula and 2½ hours to get back to Adelaide, and there is five hours of your day gone: there is not much time left to look around. So, I emphasise to the working group that consideration should be given to a major centre at the bottom end, possibly at Marion Bay—and, unfortunately, we have had a knock-back there in the last six months but I know that there is an appeal against that. Port Vincent or Stansbury would be other good areas where further accommodation could be established—maybe central Yorke Peninsula, and certainly in the northern part as well, be it Wallaroo, Moonta or Kadina. Whilst private developers will have to undertake such a project, I hope that the Government will be able to assist with some of the infrastructure and perhaps help get some of the planning regulations out of the way much more quickly than currently occurs. Yorke Peninsula is a great place but there is a lot to be done by way of infrastructure to assist.

LOTTERY AND GAMING (TRADE PROMOTION LOTTERY LICENCE FEES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill seeks to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act to allow for the Lottery and Gaming Regulations to be amended to cater for a new fee structure in respect of trade promotion lotteries.

In September 1995, the Lottery and Gaming Regulations were amended to allow proof of purchase for entry to a trade promotion lottery and a licence system was introduced with an application fee of \$10. No fee was imposed in respect of granting a licence.

In 1995 the States were actively cooperating to achieve more uniformity including simplifying the application process for promoters seeking to conduct lotteries in more than one State. The arrangements introduced in September 1995 were generally consistent with the approach of other jurisdictions at that time. Since 1995 other States have implemented changes relating to trade promotion lotteries and, with the constantly changing business environment, there are now sound reasons to reconsider the application fee approach and arrangements that apply in this State. It is pro-

posed that the fee structure applicable in New South Wales be implemented and that the following apply:

- imposition (by regulation) of a graduated licence fee to be based on the total retail face value of the prizes in the lottery;
- where the licence application states the value of prizes that are to be allocated within this State, then the fee to be based on that value, otherwise the fee is to be based on the total value of all prizes;
- abolition of the current \$10 application fee.

The following matters are relevant in considering the proposed changes to the fee structure.

Non-profit organisations, i.e., clubs and associations, currently pay a 2 per cent licence fee on the gross proceeds of instant lotteries and 4 per cent on major lotteries. These organisations are generally experiencing strong competition from the Casino and poker machines, together with the pressure on overall funds because of the flat economy over recent years and declining support for such community based volunteer organisations. A licence fee structure for trade promotions at levels comparable with those applying to non-profit organisations would be more equitable and would be supported by non-profit organisations.

The \$10 application fee has not been increased since its introduction and given the nature and increased complexity of trade promotion lotteries it is now not considered to be an appropriate amount.

While the regulations require entry by participants to trade promotion lotteries to be free, the cost of a stamp or telephone call is permitted and, with respect to telephone calls, it is understood that revenue is derived from this method of entry and is shared between the promoter and the business being promoted (a third each). The entry volumes for national lotteries are potentially large and, with multiple entries encouraged, they have the capacity to generate significant contributions towards the cost of prizes. The cost of telephone entry is currently capped at 50 cents, the approximate cost of a stamp, but, to put this into context, assuming 4 million entries, a third share would be of the order of \$0.7 million.

Over recent years the emerging trend has been for large multinational companies to promote their businesses/products with high value prizes of \$1 million or more. These lotteries have the potential to be in competition with non-profit organisations. Trade promotion lotteries often have complex arrangements, and are time consuming in that they require greater assessment to ensure conformity to regulations and detailed communication with other jurisdictions to ensure uniformity of treatment. With the trend to gain an edge over competitors, there appears to be an increasing emphasis on publicity and promotional efforts. New promotions are emerging on a regular basis; for example, there appears to be a move towards conducting more trade promotions in order to increase business turnover. These innovations require greater resource input from Government to vet, clarify and process applications for licences.

Some applications are presented 8 to 10 months before the draw and it seems that, with such a lead time, and no cost penalties involved, promoters often seek to revise the terms and conditions of the proposed promotion prior to actually conducting the lottery. In some circumstances a number of separate applications are made to change the terms and conditions prior to the draw. It is proposed to restrict (in the regulations) the period within which an application for a licence can be made to 3 months before the proposed commencement date of the lottery and to impose a fee for variation of a licence.

While the more traditional lotteries conducted by non-profit organisations have been declining over recent years, the number of applications for trade promotion lotteries has increased. Currently, there are about 3 400 applications per year and indications are that they will continue to increase.

New South Wales, Victoria and the ACT have a licence/permit fee structure based on the value of the prizes. The Northern Territory is also considering the introduction of fees, based on the NSW structure.

On balance, it is considered easier to apply and administer a fee structure based on a set range rather than on a percentage arrangement. Therefore, consistent with seeking uniformity in trade promotion lotteries across jurisdictions, it is proposed that a licence fee be introduced, based on the fee structure applicable in New South Wales.

On the basis of the above approach and the current level of applications, the revenue from the new fee structure is estimated at \$0.5 million per annum. This compares with revenue of about

\$20 000 to \$30 000 collected under the current flat application fee structure.

It is considered to be unlikely that the larger promoters of trade promotion lotteries will increase the selling price of their products to cater for the change in the fee structure.

The main industry representative groups have been consulted. No group has raised any objection to the proposed fee structure.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 14B—Regulations

This clause does three things. First, it provides that fees may be prescribed by the regulations for the making of any application under the regulations. This would enable a fee to be imposed for an application to amend a licence. Second, it enables licence fees to be fixed on the basis of prize values. Third, it enables regulations to be made that vary in their application according to specified factors, thus enabling the setting of graduated fees.

Mr CONLON secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND FIRE PREVENTION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 November. Page 413.)

Mr CONLON (Elder): Very briefly, as the Minister explained, the Bill transfers from the Local Government Act to a variety of Acts—principally the Country Fires Act—some abilities of local governments to deal with undergrowth and inflammable substances likely to cause danger of fire. We see nothing remarkable in the changes. I was notified—because this matter has been around for a very long time—yesterday by some interested parties who had concerns but who today do not have concerns. It will be our intention to deal with the Bill by allowing it to pass through this House. If they really have worked out whether or not they have concerns, they can talk to us before it is dealt with in another place.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Local Government): Through the member for Elder as shadow Minister, I thank the Opposition for its constructive consideration of this matter. It is a pleasure to work with the member for Elder in his capacity as shadow Minister because, generally—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I don't mean to ruin his reputation. Generally, the honourable member considers matters fairly and on their merits and has always given the Government at least a fair hearing. I am sure that we will not always agree on everything, but the honourable member is quite fair in trying to interpret what is good for statute law in South Australia. Like the member for Elder, we have but one amendment to move. As the member for Elder said, this Bill has been around for three to four months and we, too, were dismayed a day or two ago to learn that an interested party may have thought there was a problem. As the member for Elder said, they have come back and said that now they do not think there is a problem.

I appreciate the Opposition's cooperation in this matter. If Parliament is to consider Bills—and we do put them out for consultation; we try to get informed opinion—it is not fair to this House if, having had three or four months, interested parties come in, literally at the last minute, and expect this House to rearrange its affairs because they could do not do what they needed to do in a timely fashion. I appreciate what the member for Elder has undertaken to do. I assure the honourable member that, if there is substance to any alter-

ation, the Government will not oppose anything he may choose to do in the Upper House because we only seek—

Mr Conlon: Can we re-open Barton Terrace?

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: We are talking about this matter, not the honourable member's fetishes. In conclusion, the member for Elder understands that this is the first of a number of Bills which seek to shift matters from the current Local Government Act 1934 and nest them into more appropriate legislation. Basically, that is all we seek to do. I thank the Opposition for its cooperation.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7.

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

Page 4, line 19—Leave out 'will' and insert:
may (but need not)

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Standing Committee reports set down for Wednesday 17 February to be taken into consideration forthwith for one hour.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr MEIER: I do not envisage this as a precedent but members would be aware that yesterday consideration of Standing Committee reports was adjourned simply because we wanted to debate the jobs program. Therefore, I feel it is only appropriate that, as some time remains this afternoon, we allow one hour of committee reports to proceed.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: PLAYFORD PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I move:

That the eighty-third report of the committee, on the Playford Primary School redevelopment, be noted.

The Playford Primary School was established in 1997 as a second primary school to assist in temporarily meeting the educational needs and accommodation for the increasing population of the Smithfield East catchment area. The Public Works Committee has been told that both schools in this area have experienced a steady growth in enrolments to the point where the current temporary facilities at Playford are no longer suitable to accommodate adequately the increasing educational demands of students and, in particular, to provide an educational environment conducive to student learning.

Members of the committee inspected the site and we agree with those views. The Department of Education, Training and Employment has proposed to construct the new permanent facilities for the school to develop it beyond its existing holding school or temporary buildings arrangement. It is envisaged that the permanent facilities will be constructed in two stages: stage 1 will address the current and immediate enrolments, while stage 2 will be constructed in the future as determined by enrolment growth. On looking at the demographic figures, I have no doubt that that will be sooner rather than later.

The total cost for both stages of the proposed new facilities is \$5.42 million in estimate, and it may escalate to

approximately \$5.5 million or \$5.6 million by the time it is completed. That amount will include an estimated contribution from the Catholic Education Office, because it is a shared campus, of \$740 000. The committee is told that, while the Catherine McAuley Primary School will not make any contribution to the capital cost of the land for the shared recreational facilities, the Catherine McAuley School is an equal partner in providing funds for the establishment of these facilities and the payment of all associated recurrent costs.

More importantly, while the joint use agreements provide that the Catholic Education Office has certain rights to the building and recreational facilities during the duration of the agreements, should there be no renewal the lands and buildings remain the property of the Minister in whose name the land title is currently vested. The committee is told further, based on the Department of Education's calculations, that the net present value, based on an assumed internal rate of return of 10 per cent for the preferred option is \$4.18 million. This compares with a revised net present calculation, using rammed earth walls, which indicates a minimum net benefit of \$27 245 at a 10 per cent discount rate.

It is anticipated that occupation of stage 1 facilities be for September 1999 while demographic projections indicate that stage 2 facilities will be required towards the end of 2002. As I have already said, it seems to me that that will be required sooner rather than later. In this instance, as a member of the committee, I noted the great benefit there is to the taxpayers of South Australia in having shared campus between private and public sector schools. I noted, too, that there are great benefits in having the two school system. It saves the taxpayers of South Australia quite a lot of money for, if we did not have a private school system, all those children would have to be educated at total State expense which per student is, to the taxpayer, a much higher cost than is the case where those students' parents choose to enrol them in a private school system. No-one giving evidence to the committee saw anything other than those benefits arising from the dual school system and arising then from the kind of arrangements which are entered into.

In summary, the proposed new facility includes construction of 16 classrooms on completion of all stages in solid accommodation providing for 450 to 480 students. There will be construction of joint facilities with the Catherine McAuley Primary School on the same area, which include a library resource centre, four specialist classrooms and the associated administration and support facilities.

The committee expressed concern during the course of its inquiries about car parking and traffic management issues at the site. Those issues had not been well addressed. This particularly relates to the provision of a safe area for children to be dropped off and collected. It should include, and we include in our remarks, the need for such facilities to provide short-term parking. The committee was told that these issues will be satisfactorily addressed and that they will be closely monitored in the future at that site. The committee relies on this assurance. However, we are disturbed that plans for traffic management have not been properly integrated into the design for use of this site and that it seems to us that other sites likewise are not being properly treated in their design and development phase with respect to this feature, namely, traffic management for the provision of a safe area in which children can be dropped off and collected at the completion of the school day.

It is not, in our opinion, nor in the opinion of thinking parents or anyone else of whom we asked questions, sensible to have a sudden rush for parking space along the kerb side adjacent to the school on the roadway, which is a thoroughfare adjacent to the school. Surely, in this day and age, when we are planning the development of new areas, we can include an adequate space of land into which a drop-off and collection area can be incorporated and a short-term car park accordingly to ensure that children are safe and that their parents are not involved in collisions with other vehicles or other children when their attention is inadvertently distracted by something that is going on during that process of either dropping off or collecting children.

The committee is told that discussions are continuing with the City of Playford and representatives of the Catholic Education Office with regard to the opportunities for developing those joint recreational facilities—which are an essential part of any school these days—on the site with a view to signing an appropriate joint use agreement.

We were disappointed that the City of Playford Council had not already committed to and indeed had a trigger arrangement in place such that when the development of the school was to begin it would provide the recreational facilities. There seemed to us to be some prevarication on its part about that. Whether or not it has been resolved I am not sure, and maybe the member for Napier, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in the course of her remarks on this matter, as she is the local member for the area in which the school is located, can let us know whether or not the City of Playford has come to the party and got on with the job that it must now do.

Current negotiations with the City of Playford, as we understood them at the time we provided our report to the Speaker, had not reached a satisfactory outcome in relation to the establishment of that joint school community oval and if it does not the department retains the right to sell any surplus land designated for this purpose. The local community and, more particularly, the city council needs to be appraised of that. In this event a standard school oval will be constructed for the sole use of the two schools. To my mind that would not only be sad, it would be tragic. There is a great benefit to be derived from the joint use of such facilities.

The committee acknowledges the necessity and importance of the proposed work to address the unsatisfactory nature of the existing temporary buildings so as to adequately accommodate the continued increase of student enrolments. Members of the committee agree that the construction of a permanent facility at Playford Primary School will make a significant and positive contribution to students, staff and family within the district and be of benefit to the community as a whole. Furthermore, the committee finds this new construction ensures that access and amenities are available for a number of people who have a range of disabilities. We are gratified that that is the case.

We note that the building design for the proposed project incorporates a wide range of ecologically sustainable design principles aimed at minimising energy consumption, providing as well active teaching tools for the curriculum, enabling exploration of alternative technologies and providing a healthy indoor environment in the school itself in the process. It also provides the Department of Education with a model for future benchmarking and development of such structures within the range of schools that it constructs. The committee is told further that the use of rammed earth walls

form part of a thermal comfort design system that will provide a significant reduction in energy costs, which will represent a major reduction in greenhouse gas production in an on-going way.

Committee members consider that the inclusion of these ecologically sustainable design features will enhance the educational program at the school by providing opportunities for both students and teachers to better understand and thereby evaluate and monitor the operations and effectiveness of these technologies and the initiatives included in the design and structure of the building and its surroundings. We point out that this is the first primary school in South Australia with a building system to include such features that are increasingly recognised as essential for ensuring that the Government can meet its objectives in reducing dependence on non-renewable energy resources and to achieve reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Moreover, the physical planning of the permanent buildings for Playford Primary School reflect the commitment to make this school the benchmark of best design practice and prepare a new school to meet the expected demands of education in the next century, which is next year in many people's minds, although I remind them that if they can properly count it will be on the first day of the first month of the first year in the next millennium, which is 2001. There was no zero day, zero month, zero year. That is illogical nonsense.

Notwithstanding the assurance given to the committee, and the ongoing negotiations being undertaken, the committee recommends that the Minister for Education and Children's Services and Training provide to the House within three months a satisfactory and acceptable agreement with respect to both traffic management issues and the joint use recreational facilities. In addition the committee recommends that the Minister review the policy with regard to traffic management in and around schools, recognising that this should fall within the department's responsibilities. I seek your leave, Sir, and that of the House to change the motion to not only note the report but adopt the recommendations, such that the motion would then read, after the word noted, 'and adopts the recommendations'.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The normal procedure is for leave to be granted earlier in proceedings. The Chair is prepared to accept the amendment in this form at this time, if leave of the House is given.

Leave granted; motion amended.

Mr LEWIS: Given the above, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to the Parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I will be reasonably brief, but want to point out several aspects of this project, one being the amount of interest it generated in that the committee heard evidence from 13 witnesses in the conduct of its inquiry. The witnesses related to the urgency of the project, the depth and complexity of the issue regarding car parking and the fact that parents are very resentful of the fact that they frequently incur heavy fines from the local council for dropping off their children in what they consider to be a safe manner but which does not comply with traffic ordinances. The need to examine the whole issue of safe drop off points at schools is quite urgent. In this case we have the benefit of being able to make appropriate arrangements before the school is built, but already when the matter came before the committee we were

faced with designs that did not allow for this safety measure to be taken.

When we inquired into the provisions under which the Education Department makes these decisions, in other words its policy, it clearly showed us that the Education Department has traditionally seen that this is the responsibility of the councils. This did not seem to be adequate to us in 1998. We could recognise that in some of the inner suburban schools where there was no choice in terms of the use of departmental land for a drop off point, negotiation with the council was appropriate, but for new schools in outer metropolitan areas and for existing schools in outer metropolitan areas a need exists for the department to look clearly at the safety concerns held by parents, many of whom have raised issues with me in my electorate as well as what we saw at the Playford Primary School.

Another notable feature of this project is the shared facilities with Catherine McAuley Catholic School and, hopefully, shared facilities with the community through the council as well. It was also obvious to us that the thinking on this matter within the department is not clear. We all agree on the desirability of making the most use possible of school facilities, having them open to the community and enabling several schools if necessary to share facilities, but the processes did not seem to be in place to enable this to be done in an orderly manner. At one stage the department was telling us that the joint facilities with the council were going to happen, and the council was telling us that there was no provision for that. We had to recall witnesses in order to get this matter clarified in some way.

The ecologically sustainable building project is also to be commended. The aspect of it that caused concern to us was that there had been no costing of this alternative building method. We all agree that we need to look at ecologically sustainable building, but we also need to know whether or not it costs additional revenue in the short term and in the long term. Are there savings or not? It is no good to say that we think it is a nice idea. If there are no savings, we need to make a clear decision that we are spending extra money in order to attain this important social and environmental objective. Once we asked the department to undertake a costing process, it was able to demonstrate that indeed there are savings, so it was disappointing that it did not have that information beforehand.

In terms of the issue of schools sharing facilities, the existing policy is that the second school, whether it be a catholic school or any other private school (we are not sure of the policy in relation to two Government schools) contributes to the capital costs of undertaking any works such as the construction of an oval or the construction of a library, and shares the cost of purchasing the equipment and maintenance. However, it makes no contribution to the cost of the land for the shared facilities. In the case of an oval, that is quite a large benefit. That has been the policy for quite some time and perhaps it was necessary in order to get this admirable policy going. However, I consider that it is time to review the policy to ensure that the State school system, which is sorely pressed for funds, is not subsidising the private sector in any way.

Those are the issues that were raised during our examination of the Playford Primary School. Overall, we were very glad that the project was happening because it was clear that it was already late. The community was suffering by having to send their children to be educated in temporary classrooms in a dust bowl, but now it is up and running and we did not

want to delay the project by furthering our inquiries about the joint use issue and the car parking. Hence the recommendation to the House that the Minister should follow up these matters and report back to the House.

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): First, I thank members of the Public Works Committee for the care and thoroughness with which they reviewed this proposal. Playford Primary School originally started life as Craigmores school. It is an area of new housing which is nestled in the foothills in the northern suburbs. It is a beautiful area. Many lovely houses are being built and many of the new residents moving into the area are keen to send their children to a good school. They were promised a good school years ago and, as time has dragged on and their children have been going to a school with transportable classrooms, they have become increasingly frustrated.

The students have been working in entirely unsatisfactory conditions. They have been working in temporary classrooms situated in either a dust bowl, as referred to by the member for Reynell, or a mud bowl, and anybody who knows anything about the red mud in the northern suburbs knows how pervasive, intrusive and difficult it is to wash out. In addition, because it was only a temporary school that was to be resited, parents could not provide adequate facilities for the children in terms of outdoor play equipment, shade, and a pleasant garden area. They could do none of those things and they were becoming very frustrated. They had raised funds, they had got together and they wanted to build a school and a school community of which they could be proud, but they were being frustrated in their endeavours by the continual delays in getting the solid school built.

Above all, they wanted a good education for their children, and that has been provided by the teachers at the school, and I commend the teachers for doing such an excellent job, despite their appalling working conditions and their difficulties in providing the students with a full curriculum because of the limitations of the outdoor environment. All the time that this was going on, Catherine McAuley College, which also started life as a couple of transportables in a dust bowl, was continually building its school and improving its grounds. People in the public school were looking next door at the Catholic school and seeing continual improvements and much commitment by the Catholic Education Office to the students of that school. They were beginning to wonder at the commitment of the State Government to public schooling in the light of those considerations. Fortunately the Public Works Committee has approved the building project and hopefully it will go ahead speedily.

I also commend the Public Works Committee for the two conditions it has asked the Minister to report back on. Hopefully having got the problems with the school behind them, parents are now faced with the traffic management considerations. I doubt that there would be a Lower House member who has had not had complaints about car parking around schools. It is a well known problem.

In my electorate, and adjacent to Playford school, is Blakeview Primary School, which is a shared facility with the Anglican Trinity College. Craigmores High School is just down the road in the same precinct. The traffic management problems there are simply appalling. They are horrendous. They impact on the residents around the schools and they impact on the parents taking children to school. I have seen parents park outside the school to wait to pick up their children more than an hour before the end of school in order

to get a car park near the school. They sit in their car reading books, knitting or whatever in order to get a head start on the throng of cars that arrives around that school. That is because there are no decent drop-off or pick-up facilities at that school. There has been some slight improvement but it absolutely staggers me that with this new school, which has enough land, the Education department has made no provision for what are essential facilities in this day and age. I would say that most parents in the Craigmare area, particularly in poor weather, that is, either hot or wet, drop off or pick up their children by car. We have to acknowledge that situation and build in traffic management facilities before the school is finished.

The recreational area is the second issue that was raised by the Public Works Committee and again it has identified one of the most serious problems. The council which commenced discussions on this was the former Munno Para council which has amalgamated with Elizabeth to form Playford council. It had negotiations with the developers of the area, who had proposed to build a road behind the school, and this road was to lead into the community and school recreational facilities. That road has still not been built, and it appears that in allowing the development the council did not have any specific requirements that that road would go ahead. Also, the current Playford council has been able to find no written record of Munno Para council agreeing to do the shared recreational facilities, and apparently neither is there any record within the Department for Education, Training and Employment of any such discussions.

Playford council, which has taken over responsibility for that area, has not budgeted for the amount of money required to build an oval. Playford council inherited many recreational facilities, including ovals all around the area and particularly the Elizabeth area, when the Housing Trust produced abundant recreational facilities for the area, which was newly developed in the 1950s and 1960s. That illustrates the point that it is eminently sensible for the school and community to share recreational facilities, instead of having two or three ovals in an area which are then difficult to maintain. Yet it appears that we may now be forced into the situation where the schools build their own ovals, and the council may well then be faced with the requirement of the residents moving into the area for community recreational facilities. Again, it would seem to be eminently sensible to try to resolve this situation before it goes too much further.

Everyone talks about new areas being provided with proper community infrastructure and facilities. No doubt it has been talked about ever since the suburbs of Adelaide were first begun, but it is very frustrating that over and over again with new development we see community facilities not being provided either before or at the time that the residents move in. In addition to the problems that those residents have with establishing their own houses and gardens and developing their own community, they have to fight these battles to get public infrastructure put in. It is just unfair when they have been promised that these facilities would be built. Parents have to devote a lot of time and effort to lobbying to get what was promised to them. Again, I thank the Public Works Committee for the time it spent consulting with residents of the Craigmare area and the parents of Playford school and so correctly identifying the critical issues. I am most pleased that the school will finally be built in a solid form, and I very much hope that the building works go speedily and smoothly and that the children and staff of Playford Primary School will finally get the facilities they deserve.

Motion as amended carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: BOTANIC WINE AND ROSE DEVELOPMENT

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I move:

That the eighty-fifth report of the committee, on the Botanic wine and rose development deferred works, be noted.

I point out to the House that we have already approved stage 1. However, we could not approve as much of the work as was necessary for stage 1 to be completed, because there was no certainty that Commonwealth Government funds were available at that time. In some respects, perhaps that has made our job a bit more complex in resolving our understanding of the issues abroad in people's minds, but in other respects that is why the Public Works Committee was put there—to ensure that the developments are in the public interest, among other things. This project involves incorporating those elements of the Botanic wine and rose development (perhaps that is a euphemistic term for what we otherwise know as the National Wine Centre) that were deferred at the time the Public Works Committee considered those elements of the first stage of the project in August last year. The value of these deferred works, the subject of this report to the House, is just over \$1.5 million.

The scope of the stage 1 works outlined in the committee's August report were, briefly:

- that the Botanic Gardens administration and education facilities are now to be housed in the refurbished Goodman Building;
- that the State Herbarium will be relocated to the refurbished Tram Barn A building;
- that the Herbarium's extensive collection will be housed on two levels and in improved storage conditions compared with the facilities provided in the current Herbarium;
- that the Adelaide International Rose Garden will be established to the north of the Tram Barn A and in front of the Bicentennial Tropical Conservatory;
- that the development will also incorporate the existing national rose trial garden; and
- that general site works, car parking and landscaping associated with the project elements can now be pursued.

Further, the committee was told that a number of project elements had been deferred as the Federal funding was not available at the time but, when it became available, would be undertaken after a review by Cabinet considered the approval for stage 2 of the proposed project. The deferred works include the landscaping of the Botanic site and rose garden; the tram barn's full slab extension; the additional compact unit necessary to accommodate the State Herbarium; the relocation of the shade house and its ancillary buildings; the relocation of the Black Hill Laboratories to the site; and the preparation of a business plan for the rose garden. As much as anything, that arose out of the inquiries the committee made in the first stage, when it failed to discover any consideration being given to business plans—surprise, surprise!

Too often we are provided with project information which does not contain what I would regard, and I am sure you, Sir, would regard, as a business plan—a very fundamental and necessary thing if you are to ensure that costs are properly managed and contained, that revenue streams are properly assessed and evaluated, and that the viability of the project can therefore be determined. The degree to which it will

succeed or fail in revenue terms is then clear to the proponents. But, no, this one did not have one, in so far as the rose garden was concerned. More emphasis has been placed on the National Wine Centre. That is unfortunate because, whilst at a personal level I do not expect that at any time soon the rose industry will be exporting \$1 billion or even several hundred million dollars worth of roses, I am quite sure nonetheless that it is a labour intensive industry that will be worth millions of dollars of export income to this State, because it has those ideal soils and climate. These are also ideal for wine grape production, olive production and other things of a similar nature that we have been doing here for years, such as rain fed agricultural pursuits in cereal production, pulses, grazing certain livestock and so on.

To return to the matter before the committee in the form of the project, on 2 December the committee was told that the major aspect of both stages of the project is an extensive consultation program canvassing both stages of the Botanic wine and rose development which had been initiated on 3 August last year, incorporating newsletters, staffed project displays and consultation forums with project staff. This consultation program was still proceeding at the time we heard the evidence.

On 26 August last year, the board of the National Wine Centre approved the design and scope of the works of the National Wine Centre at an estimated cost of \$20 million. On 2 September, the Federal Government announced a grant of \$12 million for the project. That money, together with an existing \$20.7 million, brings the total amount for the project to \$32.7 million, which is believed to be sufficient to cover the capital cost requirements of the total development, estimated at \$32.04 million. Tenders for stage 1 were called on 21 September and closed on 16 October. The construction contract was being finalised as we heard evidence on this extra section of work and any tender prices known to be within budget. Construction works associated with stage 1 were to have commenced in December last year and, indeed, that is the case.

Cabinet had approved the allocation of \$15 000 to fund the board of the Botanic Gardens to have a business plan prepared. Thank God for that—or whoever else was responsible! Detailed design of the Adelaide International Rose Garden has been completed and accepted by the key stakeholders, so-called (the people who are interested in what is happening on that land, for various reasons). With all that information in hand, and with both Cabinet approval and Commonwealth funding for the deferred elements of stage 1, it was up to us to take evidence about those deferred elements. We did so, and in so doing further identified the need for more consultation and a clearer understanding of how this National Wine Centre would impact on the site.

Whilst that is not the subject of this report, and whether or not the Government determines to proceed with it, it is still sensible to do as the Government has decided, that is, to relocate those elements of the Botanic Gardens to the new site. So, after examination of both written and verbal evidence provided and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to the Parliament that it notes the project update and recommends the deferred stage 1 works of the proposed public works. However, we have reported that early release of crucial information to the public in the consultative process will help reduce controversy.

Other proponent agencies should take note of this point, as illustrated by the understanding or, more importantly, the

misunderstanding of car parking proposals for this project. I believe that these matters are serious and that far greater clarity of the consequences of such developments needs to be put before the public by the proponent agency of the Government in the consultation process before approval is granted and before any claims are made by anyone that adequate consultation has taken place. Just because you want it to be so does not make it so. We live in a democracy, and part of that ensures that citizens and interest groups to which they belong have a right to be heard and understood, and they cannot be heard nor can they begin to formulate their views unless they have complete information before them. That is an aspect of this proposed works about which the committee has been continually disturbed.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I want to make two points. First, I point out that we have experienced—not in this project but in others—a view that, where Commonwealth money is involved, the same scrutiny processes are not required by the Public Works Committee. There has been a little bit of an indication that the Commonwealth provided the money, so have we not a nice bonanza. The Public Works Committee consistently takes the view that, it does not matter what the source of the money, it is the same taxpayer, and we want to see that taxpayers get good value for every single dollar spent in their name.

My second point is to echo the words of the member for Hammond in relation to the public consultation aspect of this project. This whole project for the National Wine Centre and rose garden involves considerable change of the use of the land concerned, traditionally known to us as the Botanic Gardens. Much of the area has not been generally used by the public, but there have been many who have hoped that it would eventually be reclaimed by the Botanic Gardens and turned into gardens in the traditional manner. However, we are looking at a major development, some of which involves commercial interests on this site. I do not want to say too much about matters that are still before the committee, other than to say that we have taken considerable evidence on this matter and heard a large number of witnesses—about 15 by now.

However, the witnesses and the correspondents that we have had, both to the committee and privately, have all been those traditionally interested in issues relating to parklands and the Botanic Gardens. Yet I know, from many years of listening to talkback radio, that any issue about the parklands, heritage buildings and the Botanic Gardens becomes a matter of great public interest, although often too late for suggestions from the general public to be made to influence the design of the project and too late for objections to be heard to enable the proponents to think again.

So, if any members of the media happen to be listening in their rooms, I would seek their support in enabling a wide discussion of these important developments that may occur in the Botanic Gardens to be held now rather than having people moving in and lying down in front of the bulldozers. The National Wine Centre and, indeed, the rose garden offer major opportunities for enhancement of this State. We want the development of this proposal to go ahead in a way that benefits us all and does not leave some with a horrible taste in their mouth. So please, media, do help us on this issue. In terms of the residual works from stage 1, it seems that they need to go ahead, so the committee has facilitated this.

Motion carried.

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ISLINGTON
LANDFILL REMEDIATION PROJECT**

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I move:

That the eighty-sixth report of the committee, on the Islington landfill remediation project, be noted.

For more than 100 years, the 60-hectare Islington workshops have been used for rail related activities, in particular the manufacture, maintenance and dismantling of locomotives and rolling stock. The Public Works Committee understands that, as a consequence of the operations, industrial waste—including friable asbestos—was dumped on two large mounds on landfill in the northern part of the site, which is located in close proximity to housing. This project involves the environmental management of the contaminated landfill site of the Islington workshops at Churchill Road, Kilburn, and their remediation.

This initiative will rehabilitate and make available for other beneficial uses a 12 hectare site that is currently derelict and unusable—including community open space and additional land for the adjacent railway operations of Australian Southern Railroad. The estimated total cost for this project is \$5.5 million, and it should be noted that funding for the project will be provided by the Commonwealth Government.

This project comes before the committee in consequence of the fact that it is on Crown land. I hope that the House notes that point. Let me explain that just a little. The same Crown land extends from Taillem Bend to Pinnaroo, and there is a railway built on that land that has just been rebuilt, in that it was broad gauge and it has now been standardised. That work thus far, now completed, was undertaken illegally, because it exceeded \$4 million and it is on Crown land.

However, to proceed with this matter, it should be noted that a report provided by the proposing agency, which analysed the cost of the project in terms of potential future commercial benefits, specifically commented that the proposed on site containment strategy is the most cost-effective solution, indicating a net present value of \$3.8 million compared with off site disposal, which gives a net present value of minus \$.82 million. So that the alternative strategies, when evaluated in this way, using the technique that this committee has insisted upon, clearly shows that there is \$12 million difference in the outcome for the public purse—for the State's economy. Is it any wonder, then, that the committee has continued to insist upon this technique for evaluating alternatives in determining which strategy to follow in achieving the desired outcomes in a project?

In addition to the foregoing measurable costs and benefits, there was a range of other benefits that we were unable to readily quantify, nor was the agency able to quantify them. They are the reduction in environmental and health risks to the community, the potential increase in property values and improvement in the amenity of the area—and I say as an aside that I was personally unsatisfied that it was not possible to determine that improvement in property value: it could have been done. However, we make haste slowly. Every time we try to do something, so long as we can get some gain in the process I suppose we will be happy to continue to sign off. Another benefit is that associated with the work of the remediation of asbestos laden soils on the southern site.

In summary, Transport SA, in conjunction with the Land Management Corporation, proposes to remediate the northern

end of the Islington workshops. The remediation program is based on consolidating the landfill material and constructing an engineered cap of clean soil at least one metre thick over it. The area then will be landscaped and made available to the community as an open space.

The committee is told that, at present, the airborne asbestos fibre levels at the site are minimal, provided that the surface remains undisturbed, and the health risks are, therefore, very low. However, it is difficult to maintain in the short term to long term due to the erosion of existing contaminated mounds. It is also unsatisfactory, as one never knows who will play in the soil. More importantly, members are told that asbestos risks are particularly significant because of the cancer known as mesothelioma, for which the only cause is exposure to airborne asbestos fibres. No other factor causes the problem. In addition to asbestos, the landfill site also contains levels of heavy metals and hydrocarbons that exceed the recommended safe levels for residential and/or industrial use of such land. Therefore, the committee considers that the landfill site presents a liability risk to the State, based on the potential for medical-legal claims if any residents in the vicinity were to be diagnosed with mesothelioma and able to link that to the fact that the friable asbestos occurs in that locality, and not as a result of exposure to asbestos in any other place. As such, the committee understands that the proposed consolidation of the contaminated material on the site, by constructing a mounded and landscaped buffer zone, capped by a meter of clean soil, is a very safe, practical and cost-effective solution in creating a safer environment for nearby residents and work force.

Additionally, the remediation program will also significantly reduce the risk of potential liability to the State from any off site impacts caused by the contaminated state of the land. Members of the committee quickly recognised that the proposed remediation of the Islington site will provide a number of environmental, economic and social benefits in that neighbourhood, best summarised perhaps by referring to the following points. The management of the contaminated landfill will ameliorate any potential liabilities and off site impact on the health of the nearby work force and residents and the local environment. The remediation plan is a commonsense solution to a longstanding and significant local issue and is a good illustration of the three tiers of Government working cooperatively with the immediate community to resolve such issues. The establishment of a 250 metre wide landscaped buffer zone at the northern end of the workshops will provide a visual and a sound barrier between the adjacent residential area and the rail operations of Australian Southern Railroad.

The remediation of the 12 hectare landfill site will result in seven hectares being used as landscaped buffer zone, while the remaining five will be remediated to a standard suitable for industrial use, which is expected to facilitate economic development and create employment opportunities in the industries that can be located there. Consolidating the contaminated soil of the landfill in a landscaped buffer zone provides a practical and cost-effective opportunity to also accommodate some of the asbestos laden soils from the remainder of the Islington workshops site.

The project is likely to generate interest among other communities elsewhere and other authorities, either within or outside Australia, where they are faced with similar issues associated with managing relatively large volumes of friable asbestos that are located within close proximity to a built-up area. Pursuant to section 12C of the Act, the Public Works

Committee reports to Parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): This project is an admirable example of turning a community blight into a community asset. A site that, at the moment, is degraded to an extent where it is an eyesore but, more importantly, a risk to people's health and is unable to be used in any useful manner as a result of this project will be available for both recreational and industrial purposes.

The site contains much asbestos as well as other heavy metals known to cause harm to humans, and the lessons for us with respect to the history of asbestos deserve a little consideration at this time. When it was first used widely in the 1950s and 1960s, it was regarded as an absolute wonder product. As we became more aware of the need for insulation, the properties of asbestos seemed to meet all our needs. But now it seems that we did not take adequate care in investigating just what this wonder product might do in the long run. And, particularly, we did not listen to workers who were raising concerns about their health. I have heard many stories about stevedores at Port Adelaide who would carry bags of asbestos on their shoulder. The bag would burst and they would be covered in asbestos dust. They would then carry the residual of this dust and fibres home to their families, who were then also exposed to this extremely dangerous substance which, as the member for Hammond has mentioned, is the only known cause of mesothelioma, a particularly horrible disease.

So, the lesson from asbestos use is that we need to listen to what workers say about things which affect their health, otherwise we end up with deaths and long-term community problems. This project was notable for the way the community was involved in establishing the key objectives for the remediation and sticking to them. We were told that the process of developing the key objectives was somewhat rocky but, once they were agreed, all parties consistently sought to implement them immediately.

I also want to recognise the efforts of Jack Watkins, who was involved in this project and who has long been the UTLC asbestos liaison officer. Jack has single-mindedly pursued the issue of asbestos now for approximately 20 years. He has ruffled many feathers, but with the knowledge we have now we can only thank him for his efforts and recognise that, single-handedly, he has no doubt saved many lives and much cost to the community. I thank you, Jack, for the efforts you have put in on behalf of our community. It is with great pleasure that we look forward to seeing a recreational and industrial park at Islington on the site of the former railway workshops—something that will be of value to the residents and the community as a whole.

The SPEAKER: Order! The time for consideration of Standing Committee reports has expired.

ROAD TRAFFIC (PROOF OF ACCURACY OF DEVICES) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Local Government): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I take this opportunity to put forward my views on job creation in this State. The regions of South Australia have a significant part to play in providing jobs for the unemployed and the under-employed people of this State. We have further potential for direct job expansion in the highly successful wine industry and in the aquaculture, tourism and mining industries. Support services in transport, packaging, education and training, equipment provision, accounting, legal, Government departments, research and the like will create further job opportunities, with thousands of these in the city as well as in the country—as is the case now. I believe this fact is under appreciated by many living in the city who have little contact with the country and who do not recognise the interconnection. Many see country regions as little more than nuisances—if they consider us at all.

We in the country see our role as absolutely necessary for our State's survival in the top level of the world economy. It is my view that it is the country regions that make much of the real wealth of South Australia with the export of our primary products and that many of the city jobs are created from the recycling of this money through support services. In addition, our exports provide the capacity through foreign exchange for us to import the consumer products from overseas that we all expect to enjoy in our everyday lives and, also, much of the capital equipment we need for our industries. It stands to reason that if we are to create more real wealth for South Australia—and therefore jobs—primary industries must be encouraged and people must want to go to the country to live.

Therefore, the quality of life in the country must be seen as equivalent to although different from that available in the city. After all, we have lots of fresh air and space and can easily go camping, fishing or surfing. Often, we live no more than five or 10 minutes from work. In the city you have wonderful events and easy access to world class venues that provide activities and entertainment which many in the country will never see—except on television. Probably the most necessary things that we in the country need if we are to achieve the quality of life and the potential for job creation that I believe we have are excellent telecommunications, water, power, roads and services.

Fortunately, the Minister for Transport in another place has significantly improved the roads in country regions over the last few years, with a total of \$41 million being spent in my electorate alone. However, still much more needs to be done, such as the neglect of country roads before this Liberal Government came to office. Many country businesses must be able to work directly with international markets so that we can tailor our products to fit them or value add our products as required to obtain the best prices.

Our businesses must be viable in terms of having enough profit to provide a reasonable quality of life. The expectation that country people will sacrifice quality of life, particularly in relation to the education and health of their children just to stay in the country, has gone. Communication is essential to education. In this modern age a narrow range of subjects or a limit on the level of education that can be obtained is unacceptable. Many often self-employed small business people in country regions, particularly in the fishing and farming industries, who have not had the opportunity to go to school past grade 7 are grappling with trading on the futures markets and selling overseas on the Internet and require an intimate knowledge of how exchange rates operate. I am often amazed by their level of understanding. Lifelong learning is here to stay, and those who are involved in

primary industries need it as much as anyone—and so do their children, who are often the entrepreneurs of the future.

This brings me to my next point in relation to the need for top-class telecommunications infrastructure and, of course, services. There is a need to bring and retain good teachers, doctors and other professionals to country regions. Without a doctor nearby, a country town is not seen as a good place to retire or to raise children—and without children the school will collapse. Communication at reasonable cost, so that professionals can communicate with their peers, is essential. Training and assistance now readily available by techniques such as a video conferencing and telemedicine can help reduce the isolation felt by many professionals. The country can often provide all round job experience in many fields—far better than most jobs in the city where people can specialise themselves or send clients to others who do. In the country you are often on your own. By necessity, you become a general practitioner in your particular field. While the work is often very rewarding, it can be very draining.

The single factor that I believe will prevent this State from reaching the potential that it has will be in not getting this State back on its economic feet. I understand that, while Queensland has over \$4 billion in the bank earning interest, we have over \$7 billion of debt that costs us around \$2 million per day in interest. As a State, our biggest income earners are payroll tax and fees and charges, obtained in large part from our major source of jobs—small to medium sized businesses. It does not take much imagination to work out which State will be in a position to reduce payroll tax and fees and charges first, if we do not get rid of our debt.

The money and the jobs will go where the overheads are lowest, where people can get more bang for their hard earned buck. So, let us sell ETSA and pay off at least as much debt at the State Bank disaster gave us before ETSA's value reduces as other States get private enterprise upgrading their power resources. Let us get on with making the State what it should be: the best State in Australia, arguably in the world, to live and work. Only then can I see a level of resources being spent that will provide the first-class communication essential to jobs in regions and all the other infrastructure projects and services that are also necessary for long-term job creation, particularly in regional Australia. Perhaps we may be able to remove some of the overheads on business such as the anti-job creation tax on payroll.

I am proud of the Liberal Government's record in the job market since we came to office. Real jobs have been created, with a consequent new hopefulness appearing in our State. I can certainly feel the optimism in my electorate in contrast with the pessimism that prevailed in 1993. I commend the Government's tackling of the intractable issue of unemployment by going to the public and seeking their views: those who take the risks and responsibilities of employing, those who are employees, those who are self employed and who have the potential to employ, the unemployed, and the retired. From their collective wisdom I believe will come worthwhile initiatives for future employment in our wonderful State. I thank them for taking the time to provide input to the job workshops and can assure them that their ideas are being considered carefully by the Minister and his department. The information will be collated and disseminated via the Internet, CD-ROM and books so that the necessary action can be taken.

I ask the Independent members and the Opposition to consider carefully their opposition to the sale of ETSA and the position in which this leaves our State. Queensland, and

soon Victoria, will be in a position to remove some of the significant overheads that are constraining the expansion of jobs. Their businesses will be more competitive on the world markets. Our businesses will languish or shift interstate. Do we want more jobs or not? If we want a vibrant economy in this State and the implementation of the many good ideas provided in the jobs workshops, then I believe that ETSA must be sold.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I have long advocated that members of the public defamed or smeared under parliamentary privilege should be given the right to reply. I believe now that the same rights should be given to victims of people who have deliberately and intentionally lied under a similar privilege awarded to them by a court of law. Until now I have resisted every temptation to speak out on allegations made by Miss Edith Pringle, but today it has become clear that things Miss Pringle has said in court, and outside court, are grotesque lies. Domestic violence is a terrible crime, but it must be prosecuted competently and people must tell the truth about it in and outside court.

Miss Pringle perjured herself in court repeatedly and, in doing so, received strong support from Government people for the most malicious political motives. But let us go back a little. The morning after the member for Ross Smith was charged with assault against Miss Pringle, she phoned my office demanding to speak with me. I returned her call and she told me she was withdrawing the charges against Ralph Clarke, and she criticised me for standing Ralph down from the shadow Cabinet. She said that this would ruin him politically and financially and that losing his portfolios was too high a price to pay.

She asked me to reinstate Mr Clarke to the shadow Cabinet. I would not and did not. Miss Pringle told me on several occasions that she intended withdrawing the charges and then asked me whether I thought she was doing the right thing in doing so. I told her that was something that I was not going to do. I said, and I quote, 'I cannot and will not ask you to drop charges because that is not my, my role. That is up to you to do. That is a decision for you to make.'

I also advised Miss Pringle to talk to a lawyer immediately. Miss Pringle has repeatedly lied about that conversation both inside and outside court and has been encouraged to do so, and that is when politics got involved. Indeed, I have grave fears that there has been political involvement in this case. The police were directed to investigate a single, unsubstantiated, unsourced allegation made in Parliament on 26 May last year by a Liberal member. That allegation related to whether or not 'there has been any political interference with or pressure on police or others in regard to the charges against the member for Ross Smith'.

Certainly, a Liberal member of Parliament and a Liberal staff member have been persistently briefing journalists in an off the record way about this case, spreading false and defamatory information along the lines of, 'If we get Ralph Clarke, we can get Rann.' Lie, after lie, after lie has been told to journalists in a vicious smear campaign which has had absolutely no basis in fact and has been proven so today. Before even the defence case started the prosecution stopped the case. What does that say about the veracity of Miss Pringle?

These people were delighted in Miss Pringle's perjury until it all came unstuck. I had been assured by the member for Ross Smith's lawyers that, following the blatant lies told

by Miss Pringle, I would be given the opportunity to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth about the matter in court. The extraordinary collapse of this case has denied me that opportunity, and I was disappointed with the assurances I was given by Mr Clarke's lawyers. That is why I am being forced to make this statement in Parliament today. I hope there was no political pressure for this case to be prosecuted; I hope there was no political involvement in this case; and I hope there was no attempt to encourage a witness to commit perjury in court.

If those things did occur, then it would raise grave fears about the administration of justice in this State. I will look

with interest to see whether Mr Rofe, so let down by the tawdry performance of his witness and his obvious doubts today about the truthfulness of Miss Pringle's answers and allegations which led to the collapse of the case, will now take an investigation into Miss Pringle's actions to decide whether a court action for perjury will be prosecuted, but somehow I doubt it.

Motion carried.

At 5.11 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 16 February at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 9 February 1999

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

LIQUOR SALES

20. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Are Local Councils able to ban the sale of liquor?

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I am advised as follows:

Under the Liquor Licensing Act, 1997 the licensing authority must not grant a licence unless it is satisfied that any required or relevant approvals, consents or exemptions required for carrying on of the proposed business from the premises have been obtained, including those issued by Councils.

A council in whose area licensed premises or proposed licensed premises are situated may intervene in proceedings before the licensing authority in order to introduce evidence or make representations on any matter before the authority.

Local councils are also able to intervene in 'one-off' applications for limited licences where a function may be proposed in a local hall, reserve or even in respect of residential or commercial premises if it is concerned about noise and disturbance issues and the likely effects of the grant of an application on the local community. In any proceedings involving large scale 'one-off' activities such as street fairs, festivals etc, the Liquor and Gaming Commissioner invites local councils and police to attend hearings of applications for limited licences to make representations.

In addition, any extension of a licensed area into an adjacent place under the control of a Council cannot be authorised unless the Council agrees.

In relation to existing licensed premises, where activities on, or noise emanating from licensed premises, or the behaviour of patrons making their way to or from licensed premises is considered unduly offensive, annoying, disturbing or inconvenient to nearby residents, workers or worshippers, a local council may lodge a complaint with the Liquor and Gaming Commissioner.

In summary, councils have considerable powers in relation to the sale of liquor under the Liquor Licensing Act.

SPEED CAMERAS

25. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Can the Government give assurances that in the future speed cameras will not be concealed from motorists and, if so, what are they?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I have been advised by the Commissioner of Police that the practice and policy of deploying speed cameras is contained in South Australia Police General Orders. There has not been any requirement nor is there any intention to alter these General Orders.

Visibility of speed cameras is affected by several factors. The location and placement of the equipment depends on where the operator is instructed to work. Issues, such as occupational health and safety, speed camera efficiency, on-road parking restrictions and the need to ensure the safety and amenity of all road users are taken into account.

VICTIM IMPACT STATEMENTS

30. **Mr ATKINSON:**

1. When will the Rules of Court for the Criminal Law (Sentencing)(Victim Impact Statements) Amendments Act be ready?

2. When will the reprint of the Victim Impact Statement Guidelines be ready and is this contingent on the Rules of Court being ready?

3. When will the Act passed by Parliament on 26 August 1998 be proclaimed?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The Attorney-General has provided the following response.

1. Following the passage of the Criminal Law (Sentencing) (Victim Impact Statements) Amendment Act on 27 August 1998, I wrote to the Chief Justice on 21 September 1998, drawing his attention to the passage of the legislation and requesting that he expedite the making of appropriate rules of court. He replied on 22 September

1998, stating that he had referred the matter to the Rules Committee. I have received no advice from the Chief Justice as to the precise date on which the rules will be ready.

2. The preparation of any new Victim Impact Statement guidelines must necessarily take into account any rules that the courts made about their form and content.

3. The Act will be proclaimed as soon as is possible after the content of the rules is known and after police and prosecuting authorities indicate that they can put them into practice.

INTERNET

32. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** What percentage of South Australian households have Internet access and why are we lagging behind New South Wales households (37 per cent)?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:

1. The Australian Bureau of Statistics, using data from its quarterly household surveys (February/May 1998) reports the following figures in relation to Internet access in South Australia:

Internet Access in SA Households overall 10.2 per cent (cf NSW 15.4 per cent); Internet Access in SA Capital City Households 11.6 per cent (cf NSW 20.3 per cent); Internet Access in SA Regional Households 6.5 per cent (cf NSW 7.8 per cent). While there is no simple explanation for this discrepancy, I would like to emphasise that these statistics must be seen as part of a wider South Australian profile. For example, a recent ABS business survey has revealed that SA businesses are accessing the Internet at a similar rate to that of businesses in NSW (21 per cent in SA compared with 22 per cent in NSW). This is also observed in Internet usage on farms in South Australia, which is approximately the same level as in NSW at 13 per cent. The proportion of households with personal computers is also roughly the same (SA 39.4 per cent, NSW 41.4 per cent).

These figures suggest that the differences in household Internet access between South Australia and New South Wales (and indeed other States) is a product of the demographics and average disposable income. South Australia's population is, on average, older than New South Wales' and the greatest users of the Internet are in the 18-24 age group (49 per cent of 18-24 year olds are regular users compared with 10 per cent of over 55 year olds).

Computer literacy, IT awareness, cost and interest are other factors influencing the level of use.

The South Australian Government recognises the importance that access to the Internet has in the online marketplace of the future. Accordingly, the Government has established the Information Economy Policy Office to ensure that South Australians are able to compete and participate in the new economy.

Given Internet access is a key to the community adoption of electronic commerce and other online services, the Office will be analysing and monitoring a variety of information economy indicators. An outcome of this will be enhancing the ability of the Government to identify specific community groups requiring support to take full advantage of new technologies.

HOUSING TRUST, EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE

35. **Mrs GERAGHTY:** With respect to the people seeking immediate emergency assistance from the South Australian Housing Trust or the Aboriginal Housing Unit during the past year—

(a) What was their family status?

(b) How many had children and what were the number of children and age groups; and

(c) How many were approved priority housing and how many were not approved and what were the reasons given?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:

(a)	Trust	AHU
Bond, Rent in Arrears, Rent in Advance		
Couples	3 122	77
Couples plus dependants	4 546	112
Extended Family	1 130	28
Group Other	6 340	112
Multiple Families	286	7
Single	13 302	424
Single Parent	8 069	154
Total assessed for 1997-98	36 794	914
Rent Relief	Trust	AHU
Couples	927	16

Couples plus dependants	1 867	26
Extended Family	394	10
Group Other	1 383	19
Multiple Families	171	3
Single	9 442	162
Single Parent	6 975	90
Rent Relief assessed during 1997-98	20 068	307

(b) Number of households with children seeking assistance during 1997-98 was 10 900. The numbers of children and age groups cannot be determined from the Trust's data.

(c) There were 1 497 priority allocations during the year. Of these 145 priority allocations were made by the Aboriginal Housing Unit. Trust data sets do not provide information about unsuccessful priority applications. New information systems are currently being developed which will provide better reporting on this issue.

35. Mrs GERAGHTY:

1. Does the South Australia Housing Trust or the Aboriginal Housing Unit provide emergency housing assistance separate from priority housing?

2. With respect to immediate emergency assistance provided by these organisations—

(a) How many requests were received for 1995, 1996, 1997 and 1998;

(b) How many of these requests were successful and how many were not; and

(c) What types of accommodation were provided to people seeking assistance?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:

1. The Housing Trust provides Bonds, Rent Relief, Rent in Advance and Rent in Arrears, for emergency cases in the private rental market. It also provides temporary housing in its own dwellings through the Short Term Lease program as well as support for motel or caravan accommodation in crisis situations where no other housing options (eg. Shelters etc.) are available.

2. (a) In 1997-98, 36 794 people were assessed for private rental assistance. There has been no discernible increase in requests for assistance from 1995 to the current year. The number of people assessed and assisted with Bonds, Rent in Advance and Rent in Arrears appears in the table below:

	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98
Assessed	34 898	33 444	35 388	36 794
Assisted	23 074	21 731	21 921	20 743

(b) Of all requests for private rental assistance 56 per cent (or 20 743 including 392 Aboriginal Housing Unit) were successful this year.

(c) In addition to private rental assistance, the number of people allocated priority housing or short term lease accommodation with the Housing Trust appears in the table below:

Program	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98
Priority Allocations	1 173	1 706	1 167	1 497
Short term lease	167	152	94	106

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELFARE

38. Mr KOUTSANTONIS: With respect to time and wage inspections and occupational health and safety inspections carried out by the Department of Industrial Affairs during the last 12 months—

(a) What were the number and details of the claims according to each category;

(b) How many claims resulted in legal proceedings being initiated by the department; and

(c) How many time and wage records were found to be illegal and in what industries did this occur?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I supply the following information:

(a) In the period 1 November 1997 to 31 October 1998 the Department for Administrative and Information Services, Workplace Services group (formerly the Department of Industrial Affairs), recorded the following information regarding time and wage investigations and occupational health and safety investigations:

Compliance Activity From 1 November 1997 to 31 October 1998	
Industrial Relations Matters	
Award matters	1500
Long Service Leave	80
Arrears Collected	\$600 000

Occupational Health and Safety	
Investigations	733
Workplace Inspections	6524

(b) Legal Proceedings

	1-7-97 to 30-6-98	1-7-98 to 31-10-98
OHS Act 1986		
- Complaints Laid	11	7
- Convictions Recorded	8	5
* Total Fines	\$201 500	\$100 000
LSL Act 1987		
- Complaints Laid	1*	-
- Convictions Recorded	-	-
* Total Fines	-	-
I&ER Act 1994		
- Complaints Laid	-	-
- Convictions Recorded	-	-
* Total Fines	-	-

* Workplace Services placed a section 12 order on the company to pay after complaint was received from a former employee with regard to Long Service Leave. The matter went to court in February 1998 and the decision was in the employee's favour. The company appealed the decision and the appeal case was heard in September 1998. The original magistrates decision of February 1998 was overturned.

(c) During the period 1 November 1997 to 31 October 1998 I can report that in respect to time and wage records no charges were laid or prosecutions recorded in an Industrial Magistrates Court.

Workplace Services inspectors encourage legislative compliance through the use of powers under the Industrial and Employee Relations Act 1994. In addition to these tools, inspectors encourage resolution of disputes through active industry liaison. The Department has had a long standing policy that prosecution in respect to time and wage complaints is a last resort, and disputes are better resolved through promoting goodwill in industry by negotiation and conflict resolution.

SMOKING

40. Mr KOUTSANTONIS: What percentage of South Australians between 15 and 29 years of age smoke and what are the interstate comparisons?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The most recent national survey of smoking prevalence, undertaken in 1995 by the Centre for Behavioural Research in Cancer in Victoria, provides State by State data for the age group 16-29 years.

The survey used a face to face household sampling methodology and included persons aged 16 years and older. Respondents were asked to choose from a list as to whether they were a current smoker, a past smoker, or never smoked. Owing to administrative requirements of the study, States other than South Australia are not able to be named, but are identified by numbers. Survey data for South Australia also include the Northern Territory, but since the NT population is so small, the sample is mostly South Australians. It should be noted there are small sample sizes in each State for the age group, so that while differences between States appear to be large, there is in fact no statistically significant difference in smoking prevalence by State among those aged 16-29 years.

Smoking prevalence aged 16-29 years, by State:	SA/NT					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
% smokers	24%	27%	34%	33%	30%	30%
Number surveyed	29	117	93	40	27	317

Source: Centre for Behavioural Research in Cancer, Anti-Cancer Council of Victoria, unpublished data, November 1998.

Data is also available from the 1995 National Health Survey undertaken by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. This survey used a face to face sampling methodology, and included those aged 18 years and older. For the age group 18-29 years, smoking prevalence by State, is detailed below, for the categories of 'regular smoker' and 'any smoking' (which includes casual or occasional smoking). Again, there are no significant differences by State.

Prevalence of smoking among those aged 18-29 years, by State	by State							Total	
	SA	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	Tas	ACT NT		
% regular	30%	31%	28%	32%	31%	29%	28%	32%	30%
% any	34%	34%	32%	34%	34%	33%	31%	33%	33%

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics, National Health Survey, 1995.

In South Australia, data is available from the South Australian Smoking and Health Project. A survey of South Australians aged 15 years and older using a face to face household sampling methodology found 15-29 year olds to have a smoking prevalence of 34 per cent in 1995. It should be noted that the question asked of respondents to indicate smoking status was: 'do you currently smoke at all?', with those indicating 'yes' or 'occasionally' being considered as smokers. This response therefore includes casual or occasional smokers.

DOMICILIARY CARE

41. **Mr ATKINSON:** Has the Government cut the transitional care and home support programs within domiciliary care in the western suburbs and, if so, why?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No, the State Government has not cut the Transitional Care and Home Support Program operated by the Western Domiciliary Care and Rehabilitation Service in the western suburbs of Adelaide. The program referred to was part of a national project, fully funded by the Commonwealth Government. There was only one such program for each State.

The program offered rehabilitation and post-acute care to eligible aged people who were at some risk of needing residential care.

The program and subsequent evaluation were completed and terminated by the Commonwealth Government on 30 June 1997.

SCHOOLS, SALE

42. **Mr ATKINSON:** Have the former sites of the Croydon Park Primary School and the Croydon Primary School or parts thereof been sold and, if so, to whom and for what intended use?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: Officers of Crown Lands SA are currently negotiating with the local councils concerning both properties, on a range of community issues, prior to placing the properties on the open market for sale.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

44. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** How many incident reports regarding air safety at the Adelaide Airport were received during each of the years 1992-93 to 1997-98, how were they acted upon and how many related to near misses?

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

The Minister for Transport and Urban Planning has advised that the regulation of air safety is the statutory responsibility of the Commonwealth. The State has no responsibilities in this area and keeps no statistics of air safety incidents.

The recording and investigation of air safety incidents (called occurrences) is the statutory responsibility of the Commonwealth Bureau of Air Safety Investigation (BASIS). There is no occurrence called a 'near miss'. Types of air safety occurrences are defined according to

Part 2A of the Commonwealth Air Navigation Act 1920, and the level of investigation involved in each case, if any, is dependent on BASIS's categorisation of the occurrence.

According to BASIS's categorisation, there were no air safety occurrences at Adelaide Airport during the period in question that indicated a serious safety deficiency. Most were primarily of statistical interest only and did not require investigation. Should the Member for Peake require more detailed information, it is suggested that he pursue his inquiries with BASIS.

JAPANESE TRADE

45. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:**

1. What percentage of South Australian Gross Domestic Product was exported to Japan during each of the years 1993-94 to 1997-98?

2. What is the impact of the Asian economic crisis on South Australian exports to Japan?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:

1. The following table provides the percentage of State Final Demand accounted for by exports to Japan. The State Final Demand figure has been used as the Gross State Product figure for 1997-98 has not been released.

Percentage of State Final Demand accounted for by Exports to Japan	
1993-1994	1.93%
1994-1995	1.96%
1995-1996	1.91%

1996-1997	1.67%
1997-1998	1.59%

The following table provides a breakdown of South Australian Exports to Japan and provides the percentage of South Australian exports to Japan compared to the total value of South Australian exports:

Year	Total SA Exports	Exports to Japan	Percentage of Total
1993-94	4286589278	625419165	14.59%
1994-95	4058421457	682406561	15.91%
1995-96	5139433430	679681208	13.22%
1996-97	5013256662	612072815	12.21%
1997-98	4987907321	612224000	12.27%

2. For South Australia, Japan is a \$612 million export market. The growth in South Australia's exports to Japan have been relatively slow, with Japan's overall share of South Australian exports declining over the last decade, albeit slowly. Japan is our second largest export market behind the United States. However unlike Australia overall, our exports to Japan are not dominated by mining, with our major category of exports being food and beverage manufacturing. Also of specific interest is the relative success of our car industry, which contributed 10.3% of our total exports to Japan in 1996-97.

The outlook for South Australia is brighter. Given that minerals are only a small part of SA's exports to Japan, it is unlikely that the process of Japanese industry moving offshore will affect our trade with Japan as significantly as it will for Australia as a whole. The most important thing to note in terms of South Australia-Japan trade is the recent high level of growth in Japanese imports. This is due to the liberalisation of Japanese trade and improvements in internal distribution networks. This is making access to the Japanese market easier and will be especially important for South Australia given that our leading sector in exports to Japan is food and beverages, traditionally one of Japan's more protected sectors.

BRADMAN, SIR DONALD

47. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Will the Government appoint a full-time secretary to assist in the public affairs of Sir Donald Bradman and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Government is not required to appoint a full time secretary as Sir Donald Bradman has secretarial assistance and the South Australian Cricket Association also provides support to Sir Donald.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY

48. **Mr HILL:** Will the Environment Protection Authority release its State of the Environment Report towards the end of 1998 and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: The report was tabled in Parliament on 26 November 1998.

ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT

49. **Mr HILL:** Why was an Environment Impact Assessment not conducted prior to the release of the Plan Amendment Report on the land south of Chandlers Hill Road adjacent to the Happy Valley Reservoir?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: As this matter comes under the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning's area of responsibilities, the Minister has provided the following information.

The proposed rezoning of the land concerned from rural to a combination of open space, residential and community use zoning has been subject to a comprehensive assessment of environmental impacts. In particular, a comprehensive analysis has been undertaken by independent consultants Golder Associates, for Planning SA, of the possible impacts of the rezoning upon groundwater quality and any possible effect upon the Happy Valley reservoir. Other environmental issues addressed include soil contamination by Golder Associates, stormwater management investigations carried out as part of the Field River Catchment Management Plan (1997) by BC Tonkin and Associates, traffic impacts by Transport SA and consultant Traffic Engineers Shane Foley and Associates, and an assessment of the existing flora and fauna by the Native Vegetation Conservation Section of the former Department of Environment and Natural Resources.

The results of this environmental assessment are summarised in the Plan Amendment Report (PAR). The Plan has been released for public comment by the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning

so that it can be scrutinised and debated as part of the public consultation process currently underway in relation to the rezoning proposal. To further assist in the interpretation and understanding of the PAR, the Golder report has also been made available to the public by Planning SA.

As the matter in question is not a development proposal or a major project, the Development Act does not provide for an "Environmental Impact Statement" to be prepared and exhibited under that name. Such documents have a formal statutory standing and can only be prepared in order to assess "development" or a "project", as defined under the Development Act, which is of major environmental, social or economic importance. These circumstances do not apply in relation to the rezoning proposal.

The Development Act provides very clear guidance as to the nature of investigations and assessment that should be undertaken in considering rezoning of land. The process includes a statutory minimum two month period of public consultation, and requires that interested parties be heard by the Development Policy Advisory Committee. The Committee must then advise the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning on the matters raised as a result of public consultation.

The PAR was released for public comment on 22 October 1998, with written submissions to be forwarded by 22 January 1999. A public hearing will be conducted on 8 February 1999 at the Aberfoyle Park High School. The hearing is open to all members of the community.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

50. **Mr HILL:** Will the Government investigate the proposition that the Royal Adelaide Hospital should be relocated adjacent to the former Queen Victoria Hospital as outlined by Mr K. Bailey of Port Noarlunga in his letter to the Editor of the *Advertiser* on 8 November 1998?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No, the Government will not investigate this proposition as this scenario was explored in the 1995 Master Planning Study for Royal Adelaide Hospital. This study found that re-locating the RAH would be significantly more expensive than re-developing the existing site, and could not be justified on either functional or economic grounds.

The position was endorsed by the Public Works Committee.

GRANTS FOR SENIORS

52. **Ms RANKINE:** From which year's budget are the grants for seniors announced on 30 June 1998 to be funded?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Grants for Seniors project approvals which were announced on 30 June 1998 were funded from the 1997-98 budget.

COBBLER CREEK

56. **Ms RANKINE:** What was the actual total cost of the police operation at the Cobbler Creek Recreation Park at Golden Grove on 16 October 1997, how many officers attended and what were their ranks?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I am advised by South Australia Police that this question has been answered by Question On Notice No. 35, and reported in Hansard, dated 19 February 1998.

POLICE, ABORIGINAL CULTURAL EDUCATION

57. **Ms RANKINE:** What proportion of training for prospective police officers is allocated for Aboriginal cultural education?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I am advised by the Commissioner of Police that prior to the release of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody report there was a one day segment of training within the Recruit Training Course on Aboriginal history and culture.

During 1992, this was increased to a four day segment of training to cover such issues as prejudice, discrimination, stereotyping, culture, racism, ethnocentrism and other related topics both relevant to Aboriginal history and cross cultural issues generally.

Following a review of the Recruit Training Course in 1997 a *multicultural module* was included as an integral part of the program and comprised 11 lessons covering issues such as prejudice, cultural issues, migration, police aides, Aboriginal culture as well as pertinent exercises. This module represents about 1 per cent of the total training received by police trainees. Trainees are examined on the content of these modules and their attitudes monitored during

practical training sessions and upon being introduced to sworn duties.

Following the release of the final report from the Royal Commission several lessons on the transporting, charging and custodial management of prisoners were also incorporated into the Recruit Training Course.

Aboriginal history and culture are also covered in SAPOL's educational programs qualifying police members for promotion to rank levels above constable.

As part of SAPOL's Indigenous Employment Strategy, a joint program funded by SAPOL and the Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs (Commonwealth), cross cultural awareness programs have been conducted for approximately 600 members, the majority being senior officers, and it is intended that this type of training will continue until all levels of the organisation are covered over the next three years. The program aims are:

- To enable reflection of Police/Aboriginal relationships through the prism of SAPOL's Code of Ethics and values
- To raise the awareness of the underlying issues in Police/Aboriginal relationships
- To invite participants to surface their assumption, values and practices and identify prevailing positive trends and reinforce these
- To enable looking back to see ahead; honouring the past; of Aboriginal community; of SAPOL; of individuals; and taking what is valued into their preferred future.

CROCKER, Mr J.

59. **Mr ATKINSON:**

1. What requirements must be fulfilled before the Coroner can call an inquest into a person's disappearance?

2. Is the Attorney-General or Coroner able to call an inquest into the disappearance of Mr James Crocker of North Plympton on 27 May 1994?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The Attorney-General has provided the following response:

Pursuant to section 12(1)(b) and or 12(1)(e) of the Coroners Act 1975 the Coroner has jurisdiction to conduct an inquest to ascertain the cause or circumstances leading to—

12(1)(b) the disappearance (from any place) of any person ordinarily resident within the State; or

...

(e) the disappearance from, or within, the State of any person; However, the powers of the Coroner to hold an inquest pursuant to the above sections are constrained by section 13(4) which states—

13(4) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (1), a coroner may not exercise the powers conferred by that subsection in relation to—

(a) the disappearance from, or within, the State of any person;

... unless the Attorney-General directs the coroner to do so.

There is nothing within the legislation to indicate what factors should be taken into account when exercising the discretion but obviously the decision as to whether or not to hold an inquest would normally be made in conjunction with South Australian Police so as to ensure that any such inquest does not interfere with Police investigation.

I have not been provided with any information relating to the disappearance of James Crocker and I cannot, therefore, make any comments as to the need for such an inquest in relation to the disappearance of James Crocker.

60. **Mr ATKINSON:** Did the police prepare a report for the Coroner on the 1994 disappearance of Mr James Crocker and, if so, will this report be available to Mr Crocker's parents?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: The Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services has been advised by the Police that a full investigation is being conducted in relation to the 1994 disappearance of Mr James Crocker. A report is in the process of being prepared which will be supplied and reviewed by the Coroner in the near future.

It will be at the Coroner's discretion as to whether an inquest will be conducted, and whether the report will be made available to Mr Crocker's parents.

CITIES FOR CLIMATE PROTECTION PROGRAM

62. **Mr HILL:**

1. Which councils have joined the Cities for Climate Protection program and how does the Government encourage councils to join this program?

2. What other measures are in place to support councils in reducing greenhouse gases?

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:

1. The following Councils have joined the Cities for Climate Protection Program: Unley, Marion, Onkaparinga, Charles Sturt, Adelaide, Mitcham, Port Adelaide Enfield, Tea Tree Gully, Playford and Salisbury.

In Australia the Cities for Climate Protection program is being delivered by the International Council for Local Environment Initiatives (ICLEI) in collaboration with the Australian Greenhouse Office. Environs Australia is the agent for ICLEI for Australia. All three agencies actively promote and encourage Councils to join the program. The Department for Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs encourages Councils to join the program through direct liaison both with council and with the Australian Greenhouse Office, continuing on from support given to Councils for Local Agenda 21 (LA21).

2. Cities for Climate Protection (CCP) requires commitment from Councils to achieve the following milestones: establish an inventory and forecast for key sources of greenhouse gas emissions in the council and community; set an emissions reduction goal; develop an action plan; implement the plan; and monitor and report on its achievement. In development of action plans by Councils, the Government provides support primarily through the Office of Energy Policy based on its own experience in such areas as energy end use efficiency in its own agencies. Those improvements by Government also contribute to the action plan for the Councils within which those agencies operate. Government through the Department for Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs also liaises closely with Councils to maximise the outcomes based on council plans to reduce emissions from industries in their community and those actions already in place by the Environment Protection Agency (EPA) through the Pollution Prevention Program and its partnership with industries involved in the Greenhouse Allies program. Other programs by the EPA such as the encouragement of increased use of land fill methane for electricity generation and reduction in green waste to land fill also provide support for Councils. This has extended the support that has already been provided for Local Agenda 21 (LA21), an environmental and sustainable planning tool which helps Councils to integrate an environmental strategy into their policy framework. LA21 has provided a sound base for joining the Cities for Climate Protection program. It continues to be supported through the provision of an LA21 co-ordinator from the

Environmental Policy Division of the Department for Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs.

HIRE CARS

63. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** How many hire cars are currently licensed in the following categories:

- (a) Metropolitan;
- (b) Non-metropolitan;
- (c) Traditional; and
- (d) special purpose?

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

Records at the Registration and Licensing Office currently indicate the following number of hire cars (small passenger vehicles) in each of the following accreditation categories:

(a) metropolitan	62
(b) non-metropolitan	51
(c) traditional	140
(d) special purpose	229
(e) not yet categorised	55
Total	537

In relation to the 229 vehicles in the special purpose category, the break down of vehicle numbers are as follows:

SV1 4WD Off Road Vehicles	41
SV2 Motor Cycle	24
SV3 Veteran, Vintage, Classic	152
SV4 Novelty	12
Total	229

By March 1999 the remaining 55 vehicles not yet categorised will be categorised through the Annual Instalment System.

ENVIRONMENT IMPROVEMENT PLANS

64. **Mr HILL:** How many Environment Improvement Plans are currently in place, which individuals and entities are covered and what are the time lines for each plan?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: There are currently 113 Environment Improvement Programs (EIPs).

Further, I table an indicative list of individuals and entities covered by the programs and, where applicable, their agreed start and finish times.

With respect to the timelines for each plan, more detailed timelines for specific actions referred to in the programs are available from the EPA. These agreements are extensive documents and by their nature developed specifically for the activity (or activities) concerned. In the majority of cases more detailed information is available if this is required under conditions of licence. This information is only available for mandatory EIPs. Information is not available for the two voluntary EIPs as the agreements are not a current requirement of licence and hence do not form part of the public register.

Environment Improvement Programs (EIP)

Authorisation Number	Organisation/Location	Mandatory/Voluntary	Type and Status	Start Date	Finish Date
1765	SA Water—Angaston—WWTP	Mandatory	EIP approved	Sep-96	December-99
1852	SA Water—Bird in Hand—WWTP	Mandatory	EIP draft	Jun-98	October-99
1534	SA Water—Bolivar—WWTP	Mandatory	EIP approved	November-97	Mar-01
1533	SA Water—Christies Beach—WWTP	Mandatory	EIP approved	November-97	Mar-01
1510	SA Water—Finger Point—WWTP	Mandatory	EIP approved	Jul-95	Mar-01
1560	SA Water—Glenelg—WWTP	Mandatory	Interim EIP approved	November-97	Mar-01
1853	SA Water—Heathfield—WWTP	Mandatory	EIP draft	Jun-98	August-99
1768	SA Water—Millicent—WWTP	Mandatory	EIP approved	December-96	Jun-99
1622	SA Water—Mt Burr—WWTP	Mandatory	EIP approved	December-96	December-99
1764	SA Water—Nangwarry—WWTP	Mandatory	EIP approved	December-96	Dec-99
1769	SA Water—WWTP	Mandatory	EIP approved	December-96	Jul-99
1536	SA Water—Port Adelaide—WWTP	Mandatory	EIP approved	November-97	Mar-01
1532	SA Water—Port Augusta—WWTP	Mandatory	EIP approved	Jul-95	Mar-01
1538	SA Water—Port Lincoln—WWTP	Mandatory	EIP approved	Jul-95	Mar-01
1530	SA Water—Port Pirie—WWTP	Mandatory	EIP approved	Jul-95	Mar-01

Environment Improvement Programs (EIP)

Authorisation Number	Organisation/Location	Mandatory/Voluntary	Type and Status	Start Date	Finish Date
1851	SA Water—Victor Harbor—WWTP	Mandatory	EIP draft	Mar-98	August-99
1531	SA Water—Whyalla—WWTP	Mandatory	EIP approved	Jul-95	Mar-01
1642	Birdwood STEDS	Mandatory	To be submitted	n/a	n/a
2372	Bordertown STEDS	Mandatory	EIP approved	Jul-98	Jun-01
2438	Echunga STEDS	Mandatory	To be submitted	n/a	n/a
2055	Jamestown STEDS	Mandatory	To be submitted	n/a	n/a
2558	Kapunda STEDS	Mandatory	To be submitted	n/a	n/a
1516	Kingscote STEDS	Mandatory	EIP approved	October-97	October-00
1912	Mt Barker STEDS	Mandatory	EIP approved	Jul-96	Jul-00
1917	Mt Pleasant STEDS	Mandatory	EIP approved	January-98	Jun-99
1915	Nairne STEDS	Mandatory	To be submitted	n/a	n/a
1647	Nuriootpa STEDS	Mandatory	To be submitted	n/a	August-00
2131	Pt Elliot STEDS	Mandatory	To be submitted	n/a	n/a
2368	Waikerie STEDS	Mandatory	EIP approved	Jul-98	December-99
1464	BP Australia	Mandatory	EIP approved	August-92	May-99
1471	Caltex	Mandatory	EIP approved	August-92	May-99
1485	ETSA Port Lincoln	Mandatory	EIP approved	January-95	Jun-00
1326	GOE Trading	Mandatory	EIP approved	Mar-93	December-99
1465	Mobil Oil Birkenhead	Mandatory	EIP approved	August-92	Apr-00
1473	Shell Birkenhead	Mandatory	EIP approved	Jun-96	February-00
2614	Shell Port Lincoln	Mandatory	EIP approved	Jun-96	February-00
1479	Australian Bight Fishermen P/L—Port Lincoln	Mandatory	EIP approved	Mar-93	Jun-99
1480	Australian Bluefin P/L—Port Lincoln	Mandatory	EIP approved	Mar-93	Jun-99
1475	Adelaide Brighton Cement—Stansbury	Mandatory	EIP approved	Mar-93	Jun-99
1478	Cheetham Salt—Price	Mandatory	EIP approved	Mar-93	Jun-99
1545	Karina Fisheries P/L—Port Lincoln	Mandatory	EIP approved	Mar-93	Jun-99
1481	Port Lincoln Tuna Processors	Mandatory	EIP approved	Mar-93	Jun-99
2418	D.C. Yorke Peninsula—Pt Vincent	Mandatory	EIP approved	Mar-93	Jun-99
1799	BRL Hardy—Clare	Mandatory	EIP approved	Sep-97	Sep-00
2247	Barossa Rovalley Estates—Rowland Flat	Mandatory	EIP approved	Sep-98	Sep-01
2306	FE Osborn & Sons, D'Arenberg—McLaren Vale	Mandatory	EIP approved	Jun-99	Jun-02
2277	Kay Brothers—McLaren Vale	Mandatory	EIP approved	Sep-98	Sep-01
2326	Maglieri Wines—McLaren Flat	Mandatory	EIP approved	Sep-99	Sep-02
2300	Normans Wines—Monash	Mandatory	EIP approved	Mar-98	Mar-01
1964	Orlando Wyndham, Richmond Grove	Mandatory	EIP approved	Jun-98	Jun-01
1197	BRL Hardy Renmark	Mandatory	EIP approved	Jun-98	Jun-01
1640	Lindner McLean Vineyards—Tanunda	Mandatory	EIP approved	Sep-99	Sep-02
1257	Angoves Renmark	Mandatory	EIP draft	Sep-97	Jun-00
2011	Mildara Blass Ltd—Krondorf Tanunda	Mandatory	EIP approved	Sep-97	Sep-99
2938	Langmeil P/L—Tanunda	Mandatory	EIP approved	Jun-98	Jun-01
2206	Mildara Blass Ltd—Wolf Blass, Nuriootpa	Mandatory	EIP approved	November-97	November-00
2582	AC Johnston Pirramimma—McLaren Vale	Mandatory	EIP approved	Sep-99	Sep-00
1238	Southcorp Wines Penfolds—Nuriootpa	Mandatory	EIP approved	Jul-97	Jul-00
699	Miland Nominees P/L	Mandatory	EIP approved	May-98	May-02
787	Penrice	Mandatory	EIP draft	Jul-98	Jul-01
1652	Mt Compass Bacon	Mandatory	EIP approved	Jun-97	Apr-02
2327	CR & S P/L Lower Light	Mandatory	EIP approved	Sep-98	Sep-02
1812	DJ & CP Price Paskeville	Mandatory	EIP approved	May-97	May-00
1132	Pivot Ltd Port Adelaide	Mandatory	EIP approved	Mar-97	Jun-99
1467	BHP Long Products Division—Whyalla	Mandatory	EIP approved	Mar-97	December-01
1872	Neutrog	Mandatory	EIP draft	Apr-99	December-99
1262	Optima Energy/Epic—Snuggery	Mandatory	To be submitted	99	2008
1188	Optima Energy/Epic—Dry Creek	Mandatory	To be submitted	99	2008
3000	Optima Energy/Epic—Port Lincoln	Mandatory	To be submitted	99	2008
390	Optima Energy/Epic—Mintaro	Mandatory	To be submitted	99	2008
1108/10712	Optima Energy/Epic—Playford	Mandatory	To be submitted	98	Mar-04

Environment Improvement Programs (EIP)

Authorisation Number	Organisation/Location	Mandatory/Voluntary	Type and Status	Start Date	Finish Date
1296	Optima Energy/Epic Nth Power Station	Mandatory	To be submitted	99	December-08
1537	Optima Energy/Epic—Torrens Island	Mandatory	To be submitted	99	2008
775	Pasminco	Mandatory	EIP approved	93	2001
35	Adelaide Brighton Cement—Angaston	Mandatory	EIP approved	ongoing	ongoing
1126	Adelaide Brighton Cement—Birkenhead	Mandatory	EIP approved	ongoing	ongoing
2485	Boral Resources—Murray Bridge Quarry	Mandatory	EIP approved	Jul-98	Jun-02
2332	Mantina Earthmovers	Mandatory	TBA	n/a	n/a
2318	Boral Resources—Gould Creek	Mandatory	EIP draft	n/a	n/a
2319	Boral Resources—Kapunda Quarry	Mandatory	EIP approved	Jul-98	Jun-02
2317	Boral Resources—Yatala	Mandatory	TBA	n/a	n/a
2245	Peninsula Quarries	Mandatory	TBA	n/a	n/a
2191	CSR Ltd—Castambul	Mandatory	EIP approved	n/a	3 yr
2176	Boral Resources—Salisbury East	Mandatory	TBA	98	98
2052	Southern Quarries—Sellicks Hill	Mandatory	EIP draft	n/a	3 yr
1855	Christies Sands P/L—Golden Grove	Mandatory	EIP draft	n/a	n/a
1856	Christies Sands P/L—Maslin Beach	Mandatory	EIP draft	n/a	n/a
1857	Gambier Earthmovers	Mandatory	TBA	n/a	n/a
1630	Boral Resources—Stonyfell	Mandatory	EIP draft	n/a	n/a
1359	Pioneer Concrete—Magill	Mandatory	EIP draft	n/a	n/a
1221	Boral Resources—Lobethal	Mandatory	EIP draft	n/a	n/a
1187	Boral Resources—Linwood Quarry	Mandatory	EIP draft	n/a	n/a
2228	Trenel P/L—Sandy Creek	Mandatory	EIP approved	n/a	n/a
2335	ACI Operations—Mt Compass	Mandatory	TBA	n/a	n/a
2333	Penrice—Angaston	Mandatory	EIP approved	96	97
2334	McLaren Vale Quarries—Willunga	Mandatory	EIP approved	n/a	n/a
2181	CSR-Readymix Group—Victor Harbor	Mandatory	EIP approved	n/a	n/a
1874	CSR Ltd—Gawler East	Mandatory	EIP approved	n/a	n/a
2343/10577	SA Water—Brukunga Mine Site	Mandatory	EIP draft	n/a	n/a
2555	Tandarnya Boarding Kennel	Voluntary	EIP draft	n/a	n/a
1149	Castalloy	Voluntary	TBA	Jun-97	Sep-00
1728	Jeffries Garden Soils	Mandatory	EIP draft	n/a	n/a
2283	Amatek-Rocla	Mandatory	EIP approved	98	99
226	Adelaide City Council—Wingfield	Mandatory	EIP approved	n/a	n/a
349	D.C. Robe	Mandatory	EIP approved	n/a	n/a
385	EastWaste—Highbury	Mandatory	EIP approved	n/a	n/a
2018	Regional Council Goyder—Mt Bryan East	Mandatory	EIP approved	n/a	n/a
1878	Nuriootpa P/L—Nuriootpa	Mandatory	EIP approved	n/a	n/a
1877	Waterloo Corner P/L	Mandatory	EIP approved	n/a	n/a
2385	Wattle Range Council—Penola	Mandatory	EIP approved	n/a	5 yr EIP
1064	Western Region Waste Management Authority	Mandatory	EIP approved	n/a	n/a
463	George Chapman P/L—Nairne	Mandatory	EIP approved	96	99
1623	Tatiara Meat Co. P/L—Bordertown	Mandatory	EIP approved	January-96	December-98

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION LICENCES

65. **Mr HILL:** Which individuals and entities have been issued Environment Protection Agency licences and in each case how much was paid and what is the nature and extent of pollution allowable under the licence?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: The identity of licence holders is readily available on the Public Register maintained by the EPA. There are currently 1800 licences issued under the Environment Protection Act 1993 with a further 6 800 (approximate) under the Water Resources Act. Of those issued under the Environment Protection Act—

- 340 licences have been issued to individuals.
- The balance of 1460 licenses have been issued to Entities (Companies, Councils, Government Departments, Clubs & Incorporated Organisations).
- The 340 individuals paid total licence fees of \$104 173.

• The 1460 entities paid total licence fees of \$2 341 137.

The nature of the activities which require licensing under the provisions of the Environment Protection Act 1993 are set out on Schedule 1 of the Act. The amount of licence fee payable is determined by the number of activities undertaken and the varying levels of activity are expressed in Schedule 3, Part A of the Environment Protection (Fees and Levies) Regulations 1994.

The level of permitted emissions is set under various Policy Schedules (Air Quality, Industrial Noise, Marine, etc) under the provisions of the Act.

AMBULANCE SERVICE FEES

66. **The Hon. M.D. RANN:** What increases have occurred for pensioner membership fees for the ambulance service since 1995, have those increases been linked to the consumer price index and, if not, why have the fees increased?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: The SA Ambulance Services has advised that the fees for ambulance cover between 1995 and 1998 are as follow:

Member category	1995	1996 (% increase)	1997 (% increase)	1998 (% increase)
Family	\$63.00	\$65.80 (4%)	\$66.60 (1%)	\$72.00 (8%)
Single	\$31.50	\$32.90 (4%)	\$33.30 (1%)	\$36.00 (8%)
Pensioner family	\$36.70	\$38.40 (4%)	\$38.90 (1%)	\$52.00 (33%)
Pensioner single	\$18.40	\$19.20 (4%)	\$19.45 (1%)	\$26.00 (33%)

The increases in fees for 1996 and 1997 were linked to CPI.

In 1998 Cabinet approved a marketing plan to ensure ambulance cover will breakeven in the year 2001-02. Previously ambulance cover had posted trading losses of \$3.49 million in 1995-96 and \$4.123 million in 1996-97. In 1997-98 the ambulance cover scheme returned a loss of \$3.987 million. These losses were directly related to the use of ambulances by the pensioner segment of ambulance cover.

In recent years the use of emergency ambulances has increased by approximately 7 per cent annually. This increase, in addition to annual CPI, has substantially increased the claims against ambulance cover by the pensioner segment and the fees do not recover the cost.

Furthermore, the losses have been exacerbated by the transfer of pensioners (60 000 members transferred in 1997) from private health insurers to ambulance cover

To that end Cabinet approved a five year plan to enable ambulance cover to break even. The plan allows for three areas of action; namely increases in fees, membership acquisition within the profitable membership segments and administrative efficiencies. To date, ambulance cover is on target to achieve the first year's outcome, however, future strategies will be reviewed in the new year.

MEDICAL TRAVEL ALLOWANCES

67. **The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Has the policy for providing travel expenses for both parents accompanying children interstate for cardiac surgery been amended to provide assistance to one parent only and, if so, will cases be reviewed where the child's life may be at risk?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The hospital applies established guidelines which guarantee assistance for both parents on the first referral interstate. For follow up visits one parent will be funded, but the funding of both parents will not be automatic as has been the case in the past. The Hospital has decided that the decision to authorise two escorts will be made on the basis of medical indications.

The criteria for funding both parents for subsequent visits take into account the seriousness of condition, the need to make decisions about treatment options and a range of situations that would be detrimental to the mother's physical or mental wellbeing.

Where the child is referred to an interstate facility for the first time or the child's condition falls within the critical medical status criterion for subsequent visits, the Hospital will continue to fund both parents.

COBBLER CREEK

69. **Ms RANKINE:** Which telecommunications companies have lease agreements for use of the Cobbler Creek Recreation Park, how much are they paying the Government, what is the revenue being used for and what guidelines are in place to ensure the revenue is not used to replace activities normally financed through the departmental budget?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: Lease agreements for the telecommunication site in Cobbler Creek Recreation Park involve Vodafone Pty Ltd and Telstra. Vodafone paid a set-up fee of \$10 000, and is paying an initial annual rental of \$5 000, increasing annually by 5 per cent. Telstra paid a set-up fee of \$5 000 (a lesser fee because the disturbance to the park was less than that of Vodafone) and will also pay an initial annual rental of \$5 000, increasing annually by 5 per cent.

The revenue generated by this initiative is being placed in the General Reserves Trust for use in the development and maintenance of the park, including animal and pest plant control, revegetation programs, walking trails and the provision of other visitor facilities. Some of the initial income has been used, in conjunction with

funding from the City of Salisbury and Planning SA, to engage a consultant to prepare a master plan for the park. The Friends of Cobbler Creek have been closely involved in this project, and opportunities have been provided for the local community to express their views on how the park should develop and be managed.

In April 1997, the former Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, Hon David Wotton, advised you by letter that funds from the lease would 'be directed to improve and/or sustain the management programs as outlined in the plan of management for the park'. This undertaking remains.

LANDFILL SITES

71. **Mr HILL:** How many applications for the development of landfill sites are currently subject to examination by the Environment Protection Agency and in each case which site is involved, who is the applicant and when will the application be resolved?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: One application for the development of a landfill site has been referred to the authority by the Development Assessment Commission (DAC).

The proposed site is Sect 597, Hundred of Alma. The applicant is Clare & Gilbert Valleys Council. The Environment Protection Agency is seeking additional information to allow a proper assessment of the proposal. Subject to the receipt of satisfactory advice, the authority will provide comments to the DAC.

PRISONERS, WORK RELEASE

74. **Mr ATKINSON:** Are prisoners serving time for murder allowed unsupervised work release and, if so, at what stage of their sentence are they allowed and will the Government give the registered next of kin of a murder victim a copy of the sentencing plan for the prisoner including notification of when the prisoner is moved to a different prison and, if not, why not?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: The Department for Correctional Services has advised offenders serving long prison sentences are often those who have committed violent offences, including murder. Experience has shown that where an offender is able to access the Department's pre-release work experience or employment programs, the risk of re-offending is lessened. In addition, these programs allow the Department to monitor the progress of an offender more closely in the community whilst he/she is still subject to the rules and regulations of a prison regime and prior to release to parole.

However, prisoners approved to participate in such programs must satisfy strict criteria including:

- continued good behaviour in prison;
- participation in relevant core programs in prison such as the alcohol and other drug program, anger management, cognitive skills, victim awareness, domestic violence and literacy and numeracy;
- compliance with referrals for psychological or psychiatric assessment and treatment;
- maintenance of a low 2 security classification; and
- evidence of previous successful escorted or accompanied leaves.

These prisoners are subject to frequent and random checks by staff and, where there are registered victims, the views of those victims are sought prior to approval of any unaccompanied leave program, including work release.

Usually eligible prisoners transfer to the Adelaide Pre Release Centre to undertake such programs. However, if they are local to a country prison, eligible offenders may seek to undertake such programs from that location. A prisoner's inclusion in external unaccompanied programs can only occur in the last 12 months of his/her sentence. In exceptional cases, for instance where full time employment is available, an offender may be considered for an extended period on the program.

I am satisfied that the current policy provides a balance between the needs of victims and the rehabilitative needs of prisoners and it is not my intention, at this stage, to ask that it be reviewed.

The chief executive of the Department for Correctional Services is currently arranging for registered victims of violent crime to be automatically advised when a prisoner involved is moved to a low security institution. Restricting this advice to transfers to low security institutions will avoid unnecessarily advising victims and risking additional trauma, whenever an administrative decision is made to transfer a prisoner from one high security regime to another.