HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 4 March 1999

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON WATER ALLOCATION IN THE SOUTH-EAST

Mr HILL (Kaurna): I move:

That Standing Order 339 be and remain so far suspended as to enable the Select Committee on Water Allocation in the South-East to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, on any evidence presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the House.

The select committee that was established by this House on the water allocation in the South-East has had a couple of meetings. At one of those meetings two weeks ago the committee agreed to the motion that is now before the House. I must say it was agreed to without dissent, so I am somewhat surprised that I am the one here moving this motion and not the Chair of the committee. I thought it appropriate that he move it on behalf of the committee, because clearly the committee itself believed this motion should be passed. The Standing Order that this motion refers to, 339, prevents reporting by anyone of the evidence that is given to the committee, even where the witnesses themselves are happy for that evidence to be published. It produces the crazy situation where a potential witness to the committee can make public statements as much as he or she likes about the evidence they are about to give, so they can say, 'This is what I will tell the committee' and make that public but, once they go into the committee room and give that evidence, they are prohibited themselves from telling anybody what they have said. That prohibition applies to every other person, including—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr HILL: I will let the member for Heysen speak for himself. It is possible for any witness to say what they will say prior to the meeting, say it at the meeting and then be prohibited from saying it outside. Of course, that prohibition applies to every member of the committee and applies to every person who is in attendance at the meeting.

That raises another point. The Standing Order immediately before 339 (338) allows the admission of strangers to the hearings of the committee. So, we have the absurd position where anybody in the State can be invited if the committee so desires—and at each of the meetings where witnesses have given evidence the committee has so decided. The committee can invite the whole of the State to listen the hearings, but those people are prohibited from telling others about what has happened. So, theoretically, the whole of South Australia could be in attendance and listening, but they cannot talk to each other about it once they leave the room.

It is clearly an absurd situation where these two Standing Orders work against each other. If journalists—and there were journalists at a number of the meetings—came into the hearing and recorded proceedings or breached the Standing Order, what would the penalty be? As I understand it they would eventually have to be brought before the Bar of the House. Clearly the House will not do that so, by allowing that Standing Order to be kept in place we are inviting the Standing Orders of this House to be brought into ridicule, I believe.

In general terms I am opposed to secret committees. I can compare the workings of the select committee to other committees of this House. I understand that most standing committees are open to the public and that the evidence given before them can be reported. I understand there is some dispute amongst members of some committees whether or not this is so, but I gather that the general rule is that standing committees allow evidence to be reported. The Parliament itself is an open committee and everything that is said in here can be reported, and the same goes for the court system in general terms.

If this motion of mine is passed, the committee will still have adequate protection. Currently procedures can allow witnesses to give evidence *in camera*, so we are not saying that any information that people want to remain confidential cannot be so. In fact, the committee can take evidence off the record, and both of these things are being done. I am not sure whether I am breaching the Standing Order when I advise the House that that is the case; I may well be, but I am talking about the technicalities.

In addition, this amendment gives discretion to the committee about whether or not evidence should be released. So, it is providing not that all the evidence will be released automatically but that the committee can determine that. Who else is better placed to determine what should be released than the committee itself and the people giving evidence? So, all the people are protected. There is no good reason why this motion should not be passed. There is a great deal of interest in this issue, particularly in the South-East. I think it produces the wrong kind of community feelings if the evidence is given in secret, because the people who are concerned about it want to know what is going on. If they cannot find out as the committee progresses they will assume the worst.

For the benefit of the House and those members who are unsure on how to vote on the issue, I advise that there are plenty of precedents for the suspension of this Standing Order. I understand that on 30 November 1995 the order was suspended in relation to a select committee on petrol multi-site franchising. That was conducted on the voices and no vote was taken, so I assume there was consent across the Chamber on that. Equally, on 20 April 1993 the House suspended Standing Order 339 with respect to a select committee on health administration. Once again that was done on the voices and no vote was taken. On 16 August 1990 once again Standing Order 339 was amended for a select committee on the Constitution (Electoral Boundaries Redistribution) Amendment Bill, and once again it was decided on the voices and not a vote.

On 2 December 1987 for a select committee on the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act Amendment Bill the Standing Order was suspended to enable the public to attend meetings and disclose or publish any evidence presented to the committee, except that the committee may at any time by resolution have excluded the public from a meeting. That is a similar kind of result that we are asking for here. Once again that was decided on the voices and no vote was taken.

So, there has been consensus across the Chamber at least three or four times when both Labor and Liberal Governments have been in power to allow the suspension of this select committee Standing Order. So, I believe there is no reason to oppose this. As I say, the committee itself supported this, I believe without dissent, so I find it strange now that it may well be challenged in this place. I urge the three

Independent members to vote with their conscience on this issue.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I oppose this proposition because the purpose of a select committee is to make recommendations to this House so that the House can fully and frankly debate the issue. What is the purpose of the select committee in question? It is to examine a difficult situation and to bring forward to this Parliament responsible solutions to solve the problem. I am sitting on this select committee for only one purpose, and that is to endeavour to resolve a difficult situation in the best interests of the people in the South-East and the best interests of the people of South Australia. That is the sole purpose. I for one am not interested in some sort of media circus which will be selectively reported and highlighted with no regard to the effect that might have on the people who are concerned to see a change of policy or a change of procedure in the interests of everyone.

The entire time that I have been in Parliament, I have sat on many select committees chaired by Labor Party members and not once did they attempt to change this provision. They ran those select committees very rigidly. If the honourable member or his colleagues are so concerned, why did they not change the Standing Orders when they were in Government? All this is an attempt—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Because I think that the Standing Orders are not only appropriate but in the best interests of getting sensible solutions to difficult problems. You have a choice: whether you want to solve the problem or whether you want selective media reporting, which will turn it into a media circus. The very first day the committee met, Labor Party press secretaries were outside briefing the media. We know what the game is. I have no objection to this coming before the House, but I think it would be detrimental to the workings of the committee.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That is a lot of nonsense. The honourable member has never had a headache in his life. It would also be detrimental to the long-term interests of this Parliament. The honourable member should come out and say, 'We want to turn this into a media circus. Let's not worry about the solutions. We want the media to come in and intimidate witnesses.' People will not come if—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: —they think they will be selectively reported. They have to live in these areas. When the Labor Party was in Government it was not necessary to do this, and it is not necessary in my view when it is in Opposition. It clearly demonstrates that the Labor Party has two sets of criteria: one when it is in Government; and one when it is in Opposition. The Labor Party is not genuinely concerned to see that there is a sensible solution to a difficult problem.

The time for debate and public discussion is when the evidence is tabled in this Chamber—all the evidence, not part of it—so anyone can examine it. There should not be some selective reporting to get a few seconds on television, trying to send someone up or trying to put a different connotation on it. I ask the House to reject this motion. If the Opposition wants to turn the committee into a media circus, I will have no more to do with it—I will not be interested in it. It will take a lot of time and effort, and I have better things to do with my time than be involved in a media circus at the behest of the Labor Party.

Mr HILL: Mr Speaker, I understand that I have a right of reply.

The SPEAKER: The member has four minutes to go for his summing up.

Mr WILLIAMS: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Only two speakers are allowed in this debate. I refer members to Standing Order 401 'Limitation of debate', which can be found in Chapter 29 'Suspension of Standing Orders'. That allows only one speaker on either side, and the lead speaker can sum up provided he includes his summing up as part of his 10 minutes. The member for Kaurna has four minutes in which to sum up.

Mr HILL (Kaurna): I appreciate the opportunity to sum up, and it is a very good Standing Order that allows me to do so. I found the speech just delivered by the Chair of the committee extraordinary because it is a speech that he did not make in the committee. I understood from his silence and from some of his more positive words in the committee that he supported the proposition when I brought it before the committee. Clearly he has been nobbled. I must say in passing that the honourable member has chaired the committee very well and in a very fair fashion, so I do not criticise his behaviour in the committee.

He made a couple of comments to which I would like to refer. He talked about selective reporting. One way of guaranteeing that the reporting is not selective is to allow the whole thing to be open to the public. That way it is not selective; it is universal reporting. He does not want the media to select, but he wants it to be for the committee, the Minister or himself to select what is reported to the media. I know that the Minister is very nervous about what is coming out. I cannot tell the House why but I know that she is very nervous about what is coming out. I hope that the media will let us know.

The honourable member said that in all his time on select committees he was not aware of any vote to overturn this Standing Order. I do not know where he was when the four select committees that I referred to had their Standing Orders suspended, but clearly there are adequate precedents, organised by both the Labor and Liberal sides of the House, to suspend Standing Orders to allow adequate reporting of what goes on. This is an important issue. It cannot be covered up.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

Mr HILL: You cannot keep the people in the dark, Minister. They want to know what you have been doing. They want to know what the Government has been doing on this issue, and they will find out. The member spoke about intimidation. I will tell the House about one case of intimidation. The Minister's adviser came into one meeting at which the committee was briefed by a public servant from the Minister's department. He sat in the back corner taking notes. If that is not an example of intimidation, I would like to know what is! I would be very surprised if the Minister's adviser did not tell her what the officer said. This is a silly provision and we should suspend it.

Ms Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Wright will come to order and go back to her place if she wishes to interject. I remind the honourable member that interjections are out of order.

Mr HILL: My final point is that the committee voted in favour of the suspension of this Standing Order. The committee is able to use it wisely to allow certain information to be protected if it is damaging to any witness or if the witness wants it to be kept in confidence. We have the ability to do that under this amendment and, in addition, under other Standing Orders.

The House divided on the motion:

AYES (23)

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

NOES (21)

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

PAIR(S)

De Laine, M. R.	Olsen, J. W.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

SAND-GLASS

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the attention of members to the sand-glass, which has recently been changed from a two minute to a three minute sand-glass by an Adelaide glassblower. I ask members when they come into the Chamber with visitors to refrain from handling it because it is very fragile. I guarantee members that it is now a three minute sand-glass to conform with our new Standing Orders. I am sure that members would be interested in that little bit of history.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I congratulate the Speaker on this technological innovation.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Leader's thanks is noted, and I shall pass that on to my committee.

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I understand that Standing Orders prevent members from seeking to intimidate other members after a vote has been taken.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the cameraman to bear the rules in mind.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, a few moments ago the member for Hart was pointing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. I ask all members to resume their seats.

Mr Wright interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will deal with the member for Lee's point of order in a second. We have a point of order from the member for Ross Smith.

Mr CLARKE: My point of order relates to the Standing Orders and members of this House attempting to intimidate other members with respect to the way in which they cast their vote in the recent division. It was clear that the member for Stuart and the member for Bragg were beating up on the member for Gordon and others with respect to their decision.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. I am sure that the member for Gordon is man enough, if he feels intimidated in this place, to get to his feet and do something about it. The member for Stuart.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: A few moments ago—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Hart. I will not have members continuing to interject when the House has been called to order.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: A few moments ago whilst in this Chamber the member for Hart was pointing to the media and encouraging them to film members. That is contrary to the rules that were put in place by Speaker McRae.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House should bear in mind that there are set rules under which the media must work. The media should not take any notice of what happens in the Chamber. If they do, the Chair will take a dim view of that. I do not uphold the point of order, but I make the point that the rules for the media must be upheld. Members are not to play to the gallery or even to acknowledge that the gallery exists. The member for Lee has a point of order.

Members interjecting:

Mr WRIGHT: Mr Speaker, I simply want to point out that the member for Stuart could not take a point of order when you were about to rule on a point of order from the member for Ross Smith.

The SPEAKER: Fair enough.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, regarding your last ruling, the member for Hart commented quite audibly 'Absolute bollocks.' I think that shows disrespect for the Chair, and he should withdraw that remark.

The SPEAKER: I did not hear the interjection. If I had, I might have responded.

CONSTITUTION (CITIZENSHIP) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 February. Page 846.)

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I support this Bill introduced by the member for Hartley. In Australia we have one of the most, if not the most, stable political systems in the world. We do not have to look far afield to realise the advantages that we enjoy. Therefore, anything we can do to strengthen our parliamentary system should be applauded.

Dual citizenship harks back to the days of colonial rule. This State is no longer a colony but a sovereign State in its

own right. Our laws should reflect our sovereignty along with the pride that we have. It is self-evident to me that members of Parliament should have allegiance only to Australia. I cannot see why anyone should object to that. In the Second World War, people of German descent were forcibly put into camps for the duration of the war. I understand that some of these people had Australian citizenship only, having been born and raised in Australia. Such was the insecurity felt by many Australians at that time.

Imagine, therefore, a situation where a member of Parliament held citizenship of a country with which Australia was at war. It cannot be said that this would never happen. However, this Bill removes the necessity for consideration of hypotheticals and anchors members of Parliament firmly in allegiance to their State. I believe that residents of this State should have no doubts as to the undivided loyalty of every member of Parliament to the State of South Australia.

This Bill ensures that the issue is faced and dealt with prior to someone's taking a seat in the House—not an unreasonable expectation. I was bemused to note that Opposition members made a miserable attempt to tie this Bill in with One Nation. It was the very law which the Bill proposes that stopped a woman in Queensland taking up her elected role as Senator for One Nation because she had dual citizenship.

It appears to me that conflict of interest from Opposition members in the matter of citizenship is stronger than commonsense or fact. It seems ludicrous that conflict of interest can be alleged to be of extraordinary effect in financial or business matters, to the extent that all my financial affairs and those of my husband and family are disclosed to the public in full each year but are of no effect at all in citizenship, and, therefore, allegiance to South Australia.

I commend the member for Hartley in describing Australia as a mosaic where backgrounds of so many nationalities make up our people. A mosaic is an entity consisting of diverse colours and textures welded together. That picturesquely describes multicultural Australia. With the increased mobility of people in today's world, this Bill takes on a significance that did not exist in earlier times. We hear a lot today about rights but not nearly so much about responsibilities. This Bill makes members of Parliament face and accept their responsibilities—not people in ordinary jobs, but people who have been chosen to lead. It involves 69 people who are responsible for the laws under which we live.

I can see no problem with dual citizenship for ordinary citizens but, where the interests of South Australia are paramount (and that should be the case with elected members of Parliament), it is quite a different matter and I would expect this Bill to be passed without dissent. I challenge every member of this House to support this Bill as a declaration of their undivided loyalty to South Australia and to the best long-term interests of this State.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): To my way of thinking, this is very much a commonsense Bill. It reflects—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Why have I changed my mind since I was a child? Why have I changed my mind since I was a teenager? Why do I reassess things from time to time? I do so because I am not staid in one rut for my whole life. Surely, I am allowed to evaluate and reassess things—not like the honourable member with Barton Road. The honourable member is in such a rut there that it is an embarrassment both to this Parliament and to the many people who live in that area.

Mr Atkinson: Not at all.

Mr MEIER: I would prefer to spend my time—

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

Mr MEIER: —making a contribution to this Bill. To me, it makes a lot of sense for this Bill to be enacted. For a start, it reflects in its entirety what occurs at Federal level, that is, if you want to enter Parliament and represent the people of Australia, then you will renounce all other citizenships that you may have except for Australian citizenship. And so it should be. It is commonsense. as some members have said, we are not talking about the ordinary person who may have dual citizenship—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder has the floor. Members have had an opportunity to make a contribution. If they want to make another one, we will be in the Committee stage shortly.

Mr MEIER: Certainly, if members of the general community want to have dual citizenship—or if they have that privilege—that is fine. If they have more than two, if they have three, that is fine, I have no problem with that at all. But, if any of those community people decide to stand for Parliament to represent South Australians (who are part of Australia), then let us make it very clear: they must show beyond any reasonable doubt that they are committed entirely to Australia. In this case, that will mean they have to renounce their other citizenships. It has applied in the Commonwealth for many years, and it is high time that it applied here in South Australia. I do not know why we are so far behind the times. It should have come in a long time ago.

I have been extremely disappointed with the contributions from some members opposite. I suspect it has a lot to do with the fact that their present Leader has, I believe, triple citizenship.

An honourable member: And a very good Leader.

Mr MEIER: Well, that's very good to hear. I know that at least two other members would like to take over that position shortly—and I will let the Labor Party determine that; I will not enter into that at all. At least I know that the Leader has one vote, so that is two in the Caucus room. But, I do not want to enter into that at all. This Bill will not affect the present Leader or any member here at present. This Bill is not retrospective, so they are entitled to take their seat here.

However, let us get it quite clear: if we believe that we should be representing the people of South Australia, then we should renounce other citizenships. What if we had a fictitious country near our shores, perhaps by the name of Austral? It is possibly to our northern shores or in the north-east. Perhaps there are some 50 million people living in that country of Austral and perhaps they are of a similar background to us, perhaps settled by Europeans in a similar way and have grown up over the years and have a higher population than we do. Perhaps we have had a lot of people come from Austral to live in Australia over time and many of them have retained their Austral citizenship and have their Australian citizenship—dual citizenship. Suppose some of those Austral people enter Parliament with two certificates of citizenship and suppose, unfortunately, we became enemies of that fictitious country of Austral.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I said north-east—I can't think of any country there: it is a fictitious country. Suppose we became their enemies. Let us hope it would never happen, but what

if we went to war with them. At that time we could find that there were half a dozen Australs sitting in this Parliament as citizens of Austral and citizens of Australia as well. What would be our reaction to those Australs? Would we have full confidence that they were looking after our interests?

Members interjecting:

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

Mr MEIER: Would we have full confidence that they were looking after our interests or would we suspect that perhaps they are half Australian and half Austral? If we had to make decisions relating to the war with Austral would we trust to their better judgment? The answer is obvious. You only have to look back at history in this very country to see what the attitude has been to people who have had citizenship of a different nationality and not even been in the Parliament. I am not talking of people in the general community but about those who make the decision to seek to enter Parliament. This Bill deserves full support. It is an obvious way to go and a clear indication that if people are to give a commitment to serve Parliament they also have to give a commitment that they will only retain the citizenship of Australia, and so it should be. I hope members will see that argument and give this Bill their support.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Environment and Heritage): Unfortunately, I rise not to support this Bill.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: Dual citizenship is something I have never sought. Being born in Scotland and coming to this country as a 10 year old, I believe I have always considered myself to be an Australian and the support of multiculturalism policies have encouraged each and every one of us to believe that our birthrights are recognised. Therefore, in my case, I am a Scottish Australian. We have encouraged all other ethnic groups to become Italian Australians or Australians from the many countries that support the wonderful situation we have in this country, whereby all citizens of all other countries can think about becoming Australian citizens, regardless of their origin.

This Bill I find somewhat offensive because it is discriminatory in its nature in that it is an attack specifically on members of Parliament born in other countries. I find it extremely difficult to accept the fact that I have never sworn allegiance to any country other than Australia, yet I would be asked in some form to renounce the country of my birth. I find that not only unconscionable but extremely unacceptable to me as an individual and a person. I find it objectionable in terms of discriminatory effect that this Bill does suggest that members of Parliament who were born in another country have their oath of allegiance questioned and no-one else in this country who has taken out citizenship is having their oath of allegiance questioned.

For all of those reasons, and for many that I have not even given thought to yet in this Bill, I do not support it. In this new global economy we live in there must be other far-reaching effects that this Bill could cause that I have not even stopped to think about. I can only deal with this one in this instance in a very personal way because, until this Bill was put before us, I do not believe I have ever had to confront the nature of the individual who I am or my birthright. All Australians are given the same right as most people in most democratic countries throughout the world, that is, they are given the birthright of the country in which they are born.

Australians do not have to swear allegiance or take out citizenship—it is their birthright. My birthright relates to another country and I find that I cannot in all conscience accept that I am going to be forced to renounce something, and the legal interpretation of nationality or citizenship may be quite different. Unfortunately, this is an emotional issue and I cannot separate the two. I find it totally objectionable to be asked in any way to renounce what is a birthright I have, but this country has supported me, my family and my children since I have been here. I also find it objectionable that the member for Hartley has intimidated—intimated—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: —I was thinking of an earlier debate—that if I speak on this Bill he will do what he has to do. I find that equally objectionable. For all those reasons I have just given, I cannot support this Bill.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Our democratic system is based on the Westminster system and it is based on intent. I know that the Minister's intention in opposing this Bill is honourable. I accept that. In doing what I have to do, it is with reluctance that I have to speak against one of my colleagues. I know the members opposite have no difficulty because they are in unison, even on an issue such as this which should be a conscience matter. This Bill is a conscience matter. If it is, I suspect that members opposite, some of them, would do as Liberal members do and cross the floor—but pigs will fly before that will happen.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

Mr SCALZI: In summing up, I thank members who have supported this Bill. Perhaps I can best sum up by reading a letter from one of my constituents. I have canvassed this Bill widely. I have written to the broad electorate and to the multicultural community, as has the Leader of the Opposition. If I wanted to be political I would have brought in such a Bill four or five weeks before the State election. I did not. I stand where I stood in 1994 and I stand here today. We must have—

Mr Atkinson: Voting the opposite way.

Mr SCALZI: It was on the voices.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Spence for interjecting after he has been called to order.

Mr SCALZI: There is a difference between citizenship and multiculturalism. Members opposite have confused the two issues. I support and am one of the greatest advocates of multiculturalism, but that is one thing. I accept that Australia is a mosaic, as the member for Flinders has said, but the mosaic will fall apart if you do not have the cement to keep all the pieces together. You cannot elevate multiculturalism without elevating citizenship, and the very thing that you want to protect will be endangered because one day we will have dual citizenship and this very place will be used as a platform to create hostilities overseas. Other countries—France, Germany and Latvia—do not accept dual citizenship if you are standing for Parliament.

A country that has over 150 different nationalities has no choice but to ensure that something binds us all together. The letter from my constituent says:

> I wish you speed and success with this Bill. I am amazed that parliamentarians hold dual citizenship whilst supporting me and my fellow Australians. I was not aware of the situation until I read your Bill.

Mr Rann's comments and his interjections are a nonsense and unworthy of a man of his position.

All honourable members should not feel in the slightest bit reluctant to renounce any allegiance to any other country whilst they hold their positions of power on behalf of Australian citizens.

I have proposed an amendment which takes out foreign nationality because some people, as with the Minister, are unclear about citizenship and nationality. In a passport citizenship and nationality are the same thing.

This Bill is in uniformity with Canberra. If the Leader of the Opposition, the champion of multiculturalism, was so frightened of this Bill, why did he protect his Federal members? I bet if he was offered a Federal seat he would quickly renounce it. Nick Bolkus and Martyn Evans did not have any trouble. What makes South Australia so special? We are Australians. This Bill brings uniformity to members' standing.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: Would the honourable member give up his parliamentary privilege? We get over $80 000 a year in this place to represent the general public. The public expects us to represent them and them only—citizens.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: I am not ashamed, but the member for Wright—

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

The House divided on the second reading:

AYES (23)

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

NOES (21)

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

PAIR(S)

Olsen, J. W.	De Laine, M. R.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2.

Mr ATKINSON: I am not sure how the Electoral Commission will apply this because, unlike other disqualifying provisions in the Constitution Act, this one is expressed to apply to people who are prospective members of Parliament. With the other disqualifications in the Constitution Act it is, I suppose, up to Parliament to act to enforce those disqualifications. Those disqualifications are expressed as 'his seat in the Council shall thereby become vacant' or 'his seat in the Assembly shall thereby become vacant'; but this is expressed differently.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman. I understand that the Committee is dealing with clause 2, which is about the commencement date of this Act—not about the effect it will have. That is dealt with under subsequent clauses, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN: No. I do not believe there is a point of order.

Mr ATKINSON: My point is exactly about the commencement date, because it comes into effect 14 days after the writs have been issued. This is not a Bill that needs to be proclaimed by the Government. It will receive royal assent if it passes both Houses, but its coming into effect is suspended until 14 days after the issuing of the writ for an election. That is the difficulty, because this Bill does not apply to members of Parliament: it applies to candidates for Parliament.

Everyone who is a candidate for the Legislative Council and for the House of Assembly—and that will be hundreds of people—will be subject to this Bill 14 days after the writs for the election have been issued. I do not know how the Electoral Commissioner will apply this provision, because it will fall to the Electoral Commissioner, presumably, to refuse the nomination of a whole range of people who are eligible for foreign citizenships. The difficulty I have with the whole principle of the Bill is that I was unaware that I was eligible for the citizenship of a foreign country until I was 21 years old. As an Australian, I had no reason to believe that any other country had conferred on me rights of citizenship.

Mr Condous: You're assuming that every candidate will have dual citizenship.

Mr ATKINSON: I don't assume that everyone will, but I assume that a very high proportion of them will. If you look at the South Australian population, you see that it is a lot more than 10 or 15 per cent; it is up around at least half. Certain countries such as my father's country of origin had very generous rules about citizenship. The Irish Republic says that, if your father or mother, or grandfather or grandmother were born in the Territory of the Irish Republic—not the *de facto* territory of the Irish Republic but the *de jure* territory, which includes the six counties of Northern Ireland that are part of the United Kingdom—you will acquire the citizenship of the Irish Republic. I was unaware of that until I looked into it at the age of 21. So if I had stood for the Parliament of South Australia at the age of 18—and people do stand for the Parliament of South Australia at the age of 18; I am sure that someone stood for the Democrats in Whyalla in the past few years—I would have been unaware that I was disqualified.

On what basis would the Electoral Commissioner look into my origins? How is he to know that I am ineligible? What will trigger the application of this Act? 'Atkinson' is not a particularly Irish name. I have difficulty with how this clause will apply, because the great majority of people who have entitlements to dual citizenship in Australia are not aware of their entitlement to dual citizenship, because it comes to them through a parent or a grandparent in the case of the Irish Republic. What the member for Hartley is doing by this clause is making the laws of countries overseas determine whether a person who lives in South Australia and is an Australian citizen is entitled to run for Parliament.

What if we were to have an independent Kurdistan which decided to make everyone in the world a citizen of independent Kurdistan by the operation of its constitution or its citizenship laws? We would all be ineligible to stand for Parliament. We are delegating the right to stand for the South Australian Parliament to any country which cares to make a law applying its citizenship to the citizens of Australia.

Mr Lewis: Nonsense!

Mr ATKINSON: It could well occur. I didn't ask for Irish citizenship.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman. The matter being canvassed by the honourable member is properly dealt with under clause 3. Notwithstanding the fact that it is illogical, it is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I uphold the point that the member for Hammond is making. It is a complicated area. Some of the debate that is now occurring could come under clause 3.

Mr ATKINSON: How will the Electoral Commissioner cope with applying this law 14 days after the issue of the writs, given that the disqualification may not be known to the thousands of South Australians who are subject to the disqualification?

Mr SCALZI: I can appreciate the honourable member's concern, as he has dual citizenship, but this is about general principle parameters for the 69 members of Parliament, provided they take reasonable steps. This legislation does determine not what claims people overseas have on Australian citizens but what steps an Australian citizen has taken to swear his or her allegiance to Australian citizenship.

Mr Atkinson: What if they do not know?

Mr SCALZI: If they do not they should not be in this place. In fact, if one reads the *Labor Herald* dated December 1998—and I think it is familiar to members opposite—one will find that the Labor Party, and other major Parties, take steps to ensure that their candidates and members are not disqualified from standing. The honourable member indicates that these countries have claims, but he is not aware that they have claims. I am told, for example, that the ALP national secretary is aware of the problem that section 44 poses to the Party and candidates in terms of a Federal election.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, Sir. Clause 2 is relevant only in the context of when the Act will come into operation. It states:

> This Act will come into operation 14 days after the day on which the House of Assembly is next dissolved or next expires after assent.

The debate should be about that clause alone. It should be about the time at which the Act will come into operation should the Bill pass, and I ask that you, Sir, rule accordingly. This debate is straying into matters, in my judgment, which are properly dealt with under clauses 3 and 4.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair has already indicated to the Committee that the matters that have been brought forward in this debate so far could be addressed in either clause 2 or clause 3. I uphold the member for Hammond's point of order in that there are matters that would be better dealt with under clause 3; but there are also matters raised by the member for Spence to which the member for Hartley is now replying that can best be dealt with under clause 2.

Mr SCALZI: I agree with the member for Hammond: it can be dealt with under clause 3. This period of 14 days is really to ensure that no-one is caught out: that is why it was specifically included. No such provision exists in the Federal situation. The period of 14 days precisely addresses the concerns raised by the member for Spence. In other words, when I drafted this Bill, I wanted to ensure that this did not become political and did not disfranchise any particular member. I wanted to ensure that every member and candidate had adequate time to make sure that they were not disqualified from being members of Parliament.

The 14 day provision, I believe, is important so that no-one is caught out. As the member for Spence is aware, that was not so in the Cleary case federally. Once members read clause 3, they will find that the emphasis is on the individual and not overseas claims. Provided a person takes reasonable steps, there is no problem.

Mr Atkinson: How can you take reasonable steps when you do not know?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Ms WHITE: My question relates to clause 2, how this operation of 14 days will work and how it will affect that half of the Legislative Council at any election that is not up for election. The provisions of clause 3 do disqualify some sitting members.

Mr SCALZI: The members of the Legislative Council are much more fortunate than are prospective candidates, because they have three years, knowing that this Bill is going through. They will not be disqualified provided that, once the election is announced, within 14 days they state in a statutory declaration, 'I renounce any other foreign citizenship.' Is that unreasonable?

Mr LEWIS: My contribution on this clause (which I recognise that in 15 minutes I have the opportunity to make some three times over—and I have no intention of exercising that) is to clarify the 'cloudy'—that is the kindest term I can find—construction which both members from the Opposition have placed on this clause to this point. The clause simply provides that, after the writs are issued, 14 days can elapse in which any person, whether currently a member of the House of Assembly seeking re-election or any other proposed candidate or person contemplating candidature for the House of Assembly or the Legislative Council, can renounce citizenship of any other country. Whether the other country choses to accept their decision is irrelevant. The fact is that, as long as they have sworn that they renounce allegiance to and citizenship of any other country, they are eligible to be candidates, and they must do that within 14 days of the day upon which the House of Assembly is next dissolved.

Mr Atkinson: What if the country came into existence recently, such as Croatia?

Mr LEWIS: It doesn't matter a damn, as long as they renounce—

Mr Atkinson: How will they know?

Mr LEWIS: I know it is not orderly to respond to interjections but, in the interests of expedition in getting through this furphy, it is as long as the proposed candidate themself renounces all other citizenship.

Mr Atkinson: How will they know—

Mr LEWIS: It does not matter, if they have never sworn allegiance to another country nor were they born there. It is not proper for me to canvass the issue under this clause but, if the nomination form simply requires that, in the process of nominating, a candidate renounce citizenship of any other country that may or may not confer it without their knowledge, the matter is addressed. It is not a problem for the Electoral Commissioner; it is not a flaw in this legislation. This proposal is far more elegant and simple than the legislation in the Federal arena, and it may equally be more elegant and simple than legislation elsewhere in other States.

I do not know; it does not matter. The fact is that it will be possible for every intending candidate for the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council from this day forward, at the time that they nominate, to sign their nomination form in which a statement is made that they renounce all other citizenship.

If they commit in the process some perjury, that is their problem, but by so signing they satisfy the law. They can then never be held accountable in any other constituency by the laws of extradition of this country. That is part of the problem that is being addressed by this legislation that no-one mentioned in the course of the second reading debate. It would be terrible for a member of Parliament in South Australia to find themselves unwittingly committing an offence as a citizen of another country with which Australia had extradition treaty, then charged and extradited from Australia without the Australian law and their role as members of Parliament having been taken into consideration in that context. There is no necessity for us to risk that. This is a way of avoiding that.

It is not a piece of legislation which is in any way mischievous. It simply requires people who want to be part of our tribe to say that they are part of our tribe and that they are not part of any other tribe. If as being part of our tribe they obtain other travel documents but not citizenship, that is another matter entirely. Indeed, Federal Ministers from this State can have travel documents provided by the United Nations, and I know of two who do, and that is not an abrogation of this proposed legislation, and it would not breach it.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Not at all. That is not what this legislation is about. It simply requires any one of us who wishes to be elected to make laws for the citizens of Australia who reside in South Australia to be unequivocally an Australian citizen and not to be able to prefer and not to be tempted to prefer allegiance to any other constitution, power or State. The appropriate time for the Act to come into operation is when next the House of Assembly is dissolved, plus 14 days thereafter. Clause 2 is about doing it that way, and we will avoid the expense of the silliness that we otherwise have had to go through in some States, and it happened here with Senator Ferris. There is absolutely no necessity for that or for anybody outside this Chamber and this Parliament to question the allegiance of any one or more members of this Parliament from the day this Bill becomes law. They will have renounced allegiance to all other constitutions if this Bill becomes law, and this clause is the most elegant way of dealing with a transition period.

Mr ATKINSON: I do not think the member for Hartley's answer to my question was adequate. The Electoral Commissioner is under enough pressure during a State election campaign without having to determine the true nationality of hundreds of candidates. This clause is a particularly unreasonable clause. It is administratively unworkable.

The member for Hartley has been unable satisfactorily to answer the question of what happens to the thousands of South Australians citizens—and it is thousands—who have an entitlement to citizenship of another country but are unaware of that entitlement. I will give the Committee just one illustration of that. When this matter first came to the attention of the House in 1992, and when Dale Baker, Harold Allison and I were under some pressure from the outcome in the Cleary case, a member of Parliament was joking about my imminent departure from the House on account of my Irish citizenship, when I asked him where his parents were born and he disclosed that his father was born in Newcastle upon Tyne.

It was only then that he realised that he was probably eligible for citizenship of the United Kingdom; that is, he was not only a subject of the Queen in right of Australia, but he was through his father a subject of the Queen in right of the United Kingdom, as the member for Newland is, and therefore he would be ineligible to be a member of the South Australian Parliament and ineligible to stand for Parliament under the law as the member for Hartley proposes it should be.

Back in 1994 both Houses of Parliament unanimously removed that provision from the State Constitution. The Constitution states:

> If any member of the Legislative Council [or the House of Assembly] takes any oath or makes any declaration or act of acknowledgment or allegiance to any foreign prince or power. . . his seat in the Council [or Assembly] shall thereby become vacant.

I do not have any difficulty with that provision being in our Constitution. I support it, and I am sure that the member for Hartley supports it, as do the people who back his Bill, because it states that, if you are of Australian citizenship—leaving aside the question of passports—and you look for citizenship of another country, you take active steps to bring yourself under the allegiance of a foreign prince or power, you will then be disqualified from sitting in Parliament.

I do not have a quarrel with that, and the Parliament was happy for that provision to remain, because a member would actively have to do something, and if you did that something you would be punished by Parliament. However, the difficulty I have with this clause is that it provides that if you are eligible, even without your knowledge and consent, for citizenship of another country, you will be disqualified from standing for Parliament 14 days after the writs are issued. The person who will have to take that decision is the Electoral Commissioner. I think that is an unworkable and silly provision.

I cite the case of the member for Elder, who was born in West Belfast. Currently, he is a citizen of the United Kingdom; that is, he is a subject of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth in right of the United Kingdom. The member for Hartley says that, unless the member for Elder writes to the same Queen of whom he is a subject of the Crown in right of Australia and renounces his citizenship, he will be ineligible to stand for Parliament at the next election.

The member for Hartley goes further. He says there is a second ground on which the member for Elder is ineligible to stand for Parliament at the next election, and that is that, because the Irish Republic has a *de jure*, not a *de facto*, claim to the county in which the city of Belfast is located, the member for Elder, although he has never sought citizenship of the Irish Republic and has never lived within its boundaries, should also be ineligible to stand for the State district of Elder, which he currently represents, because a foreign country has a claim to him. These are questions which the member for Hartley has not adequately answered.

He has not adequately dealt with new countries which are coming into existence. We have seen the creation of many new countries in Europe in the past 10 years. I cite the example of Yugoslavia. Someone living in Australia might have a parent or a grandparent who was a citizen of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. I do not know this for a fact, but I surmise that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was not particularly nationalistic and had no wish to make the

grandchildren of its citizens living overseas citizens of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. That country has substantially ceased to exist owing to a civil war within its boundaries, and in its place a number of new countries such as the Republic of Croatia have sprung up.

I would think that the Republic of Croatia is more nationalistic than the former Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and may well seek to have its citizenship laws framed in different terms. That means that the children and grandchildren of people who lived within the boundaries of the former Republic of Yugoslavia—those grandparents and parents would have been born within the boundaries of the Republic of Croatia—have acquired citizenship rights of which not only are they unaware but which they have never sought.

Yet, it is on the basis of those rights that the member for Hartley would disqualify them from eligibility to stand for the South Australian House of Assembly and the South Australian Legislative Council. It is really quite an extraordinary law that we are bringing in. I do not think the proponents of this Bill have thought through what they are going to achieve.

The old provisions in the Constitution applied only to people who were already members of Parliament and, upon a contradiction being brought to their attention, they could then act to regularise their position.

Mr Condous: Bring it in line with the Federal Parliament.

Mr ATKINSON: It is not in line with the Federal Parliament. That is exactly my point and I thank the member for Colton for making it. It is not in line with the Federal Parliament. This is legislative innovation of a most risky kind. That is what is wrong with it.

The High Court in the Cleary case said that it would be reasonable conduct to renounce foreign citizenship to write to the country which had given you the citizenship and to renounce it. The member for Hammond is saying, 'You can just write something down on the electoral nomination form.' I am sorry, the High Court case says differently. If you are going to renounce citizenship, you have to write to the Government of the country that is giving you the citizenship. What I say is that you may not even be aware that you have the citizenship.

Bill Kardamitsis, the Labor candidate for Wills, was not aware he had that citizenship. John Delacretaz had left Switzerland in the 1950s and he had no idea that he was eligible for Swiss citizenship. They could not have regularised their position before the election was held because neither of them knew they had the eligibility. I urge the House to vote against this clause.

Mr SCALZI: The provision is quite clear that it is 14 days. Clause 3 provides that you must take 'reasonable steps'. The emphasis is on what an Australian citizen does here. Let us not deviate and talk about other claims. Australia is a country that is made up of a 150 or 160 different backgrounds. If the legislation is to take into account the 150 different backgrounds, then it will not work. If a member wants to stand for Parliament—

Mr Atkinson: A person, not a member.

Mr SCALZI: I thank the honourable member. If a person wants to stand for Parliament, all that he or she has to do is say, 'I want to be an Australian citizen only whilst I am a member of Parliament.' I am not talking about the general public. Parliament is the highest court of the land. We have privileges that the general public has not. Therefore, we have responsibilities that the general public has not. For the member for Spence to give examples—and all examples have been from members opposite—

Mr Atkinson: Dale Baker; Harold Allison.

Mr SCALZI: Yes, and, if the honourable member were here, I would say that he should have renounced his citizenship while he was a member of Parliament. What you do before Parliament is a different matter. I am not against dual citizenship for the general public, but members of Parliament are in a special place. They have privileges that the general public do not have and, therefore, I expect responsibility and duty to set an example to the general public.

Debate adjourned.

SPORTS FLAGS

Mr HILL (Kaurna): I move:

That this House calls on the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning to amend the Development Act 1993 and regulations to ensure that South Australians have the right to display sporting flags.

This motion is not just about flag flying but about an important matter of principle. It is about our right to do as we please on our own property for our own pleasure, without needing to seek the approval of a Government department, local council or some other bureaucrat. The facts of this case are fairly simple. My constituent, Mr Gerald Heymann, came to see me before Christmas with some concern because he had been to the local council to find out what permission he needed to erect a flagpole and he said in passing to them that he planned to fly his Crows flag on that pole once erected. He was proud that the Crows had won two premierships and he wanted to be there participating when they won the third.

The council told him of the requirements to construct a flagpole and what rules applied and said, 'If you comply with these rules you do not need to seek special permission—you can just put up the flagpole.' However, they said in passing, 'If you choose to fly the Crows flag, you may well be in trouble because under the Development Act and its regulations it may well be classified as an advertisement, and if you fly an advertisement you will be in breach of the Act and you may need to seek special permission from the council, which may or may not be given. If one of your neighbours complains the council can require you take have it taken down, and if you do not take it down you will be in breach of the law, presumably prosecuted, and subject to a fine and imprisonment if you do not pay the fine.'

So, from what appears to be a trivial matter, there could be dire consequences. Mr Heymann, expressing some outrage and concern, came to see me and I said I would follow it up and find out what was going on. I wrote to the council and asked it to put it in writing, which it kindly did, and for the benefit of the House I will read part of what the Onkaparinga City Council—an excellent council—had to say.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: Hear, hear!

Mr HILL: I am glad the member for Mawson agrees. The Development Services Officer wrote in part:

In relation to the type of flags which can be displayed on the flagpole we advise that if the proposed flag is not an 'advertisement'—

and that was defined as a 'recognised national flag'—

it would not need council's approval under the Act. However, we believe that the Crows flag may be able to be defined as an advertisement and may therefore need the approval of council prior to being displayed.

The letter continues:

If council received a complaint that an advertising flag is being displayed without the consent of council, council would require an

application to be lodged for the flag and/or require the removal of the flag. Failure to comply with the council's directives could result in the service of a notice under section 84 of the Development Act. Penalties apply for non-compliance with such notices. However, the recipient would have the right of appeal to the Environment, Resource and Development Court.

What stuff and nonsense! All that Mr Hammond wanted to do was fly his flag. The absurdity could be that if he did fly his flag and somebody across the road was a supporter of Port Power, Melbourne or another team, they could ring the council, complain about the advertisement, that is, the Crows flag flying in Mr Heymann's front yard, and the council would have to come out and be under obligation to tell him to pull it down. That is not what we want in terms of supporting our teams.

My motion calls on the Minister to clarify or amend the Act to ensure that it is absolutely certain that Mr Heymann and others who want to fly sporting flags can do so without any worry of a bureaucracy telling them that they cannot. When this was reported in the press, Minister Laidlaw, who is the responsible Minister, disagreed with the council's interpretation. The article refers to a spokesman, and it is interesting that the Minister for the Status of Women refers to her spokesperson as a 'spokesman'. I am sure members opposite will take up that matter with her. The article states:

But a spokesman for the Urban Planning Minister, Ms Laidlaw, said it was the council that defined what was an 'advertisement'. 'Under the Development Act, while an advertisement requires planning approval, there is no definition of an advertisement and that must be made by the councils,' the spokesman said.

If that is true, obviously there is some area of ambiguity as to what is an advertisement. In moving in this motion I ask that the Minister take it on board and amend the Act to make it very specific and clear that flying a football flag, or a flag of any other sporting team, be it an Olympic flag or whatever, is not an advertisement in terms of the Act. That will make it very clear for councils and no-one will have any opportunity to harass Mr Heymann and other football supporters.

In passing, I quote Rex Jory, the columnist in the *Advertiser* who also picked up this issue. I think he summarised the situation very well. In talking about this issue he said:

What a load of bureaucratic hogwash. Of course the flag is advertising. All flags are advertising. Flags are one of the first and most ancient forms of advertising.

If the good Mr Heymann wanted to fly the Australian flag it would be advertising his national pride. If he flew the flag of his native Holland it would be advertising the country of his origin.

If Mr Heymann puts a decorated Christmas tree in his front window in December and wishes everyone a merry Christmas it would be advertising his love for his fellow humans.

I certainly agree with that sentiment. In conclusion—and I am sure the House will accept this motion—the *Advertiser* states:

Mr Heymann said sports lovers should have a right to fly the flag of their favourite club, no matter what it was.

I certainly agree with him and I hope the House does as well.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

MURRAY RIVER

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Venning:

That this House recognises the importance of the River Murray to South Australia and is totally opposed to any attempt to lift the cap on water diversions from this major river system.

(Continued from 18 February. Page 850.)

Mr HILL (Kaurna): I am happy to speak briefly on this motion moved by the member for Schubert. I think it is very sensible that we express bipartisan support on this. In many ways, it is a motherhood statement. Everyone in South Australia would certainly agree that the Murray River is important to this State and its flow of water should be protected. It is important for economic reasons and also for environmental reasons. The proposition put by the National Party Leader in New South Wales in the current election campaign in that State is just outrageous and it shows a complete lack of understanding of the needs of the river and the needs of this State. If the National Party and the Liberal Party in New South Wales were to win Government, and the National Party was able to put its proposition into effect, it would have very disastrous effects on South Australia.

It is just totally unconscionable what is being proposed to win votes in the back blocks of New South Wales. I guess it shows how desperate the Conservatives are in that State, and I am sure Mr Carr and his team will be successful when the election is held in March. The Opposition supports the proposition and I sincerely hope it is passed unanimously by this House.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I also would like briefly to speak on this motion and bring to the attention of the House some of the problems in New South Wales, or the way in which the people of New South Wales believe the problems should be addressed. We are talking about water principally used for irrigation. Even though water from the Murray River is used for domestic and household use right along the Murray River, principally the bulk of that water is used for irrigation. We find ourselves at a point in history where we are moving from traditional irrigation methods, which can be anything from open channel flood irrigation to even quite inefficient overhead sprinkler irrigation—and I use the word 'inefficient' advisedly. In irrigation, as with all other pursuits, there are horses for courses, but I do believe that overhead sprinkler irrigation is quite inappropriate, particularly in hot, dry climates that are subject to windy conditions, and can be just as inefficient as open channel flood irrigation. One of the things at which we should be looking in this day and age is using our water much more efficiently and not just when we are irrigating the crops but greater efficiencies can be achieved in delivery systems as well.

In my role as a member of the Public Works Committee I was recently at Loxton in the Riverland in South Australia, where the Committee was looking at the rehabilitation of the Loxton irrigation scheme. The rehabilitation there was on the delivery system of water rather than the application systems which individual land owners were using. By rehabilitating and rebuilding the delivery system, by getting rid of open concrete line channels, which form a large part of the delivery system in the Loxton irrigation area, the proposal is to move to all pipe infrastructure to deliver the water. In that area the savings created purely by that measure and nothing else will allow for, I believe, close to 1 200 acres of land to be irrigated with the same amount of water. The other benefit is that it will reduce the daily inflow of salt laden water into the river and will, in fact, reduce the daily load of salt that is currently going into the river from that irrigation area.

I believe that the rehabilitation of the Loxton irrigation area is one of the last to be done in South Australia and it is my understanding that we are well ahead—way ahead, indeed—of the technologies being used by our neighbours in the upper reaches of the Murray River—in other words, by

rehabilitating the delivery systems that they are using in these other areas and moving to modern technologies. I point out to some of those people that one of the most wasteful uses of water that has been brought to my attention is cotton growing in parts of the Murray-Darling system. Recently, when I had the opportunity to look at irrigation systems in Israel, I was quite surprised to see that even field crops such as cotton were being grown using drip irrigation systems. So, there are places in the world where water is valued very highly, and people in those places have moved to very high technological solutions to their problems whereby they can still produce the same and use much less water.

I abhor the comments that have been made—hopefully in the heat of the election campaign—in New South Wales and I thoroughly support the motion of the member for Schubert. I think that this House should express in the strongest possible terms the sentiments of this motion to our colleagues upstream on the Murray River.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier): I have had the opportunity, when answering a couple of questions, to put down a position on the Murray River, so I will not go into detail about its importance (I think that we all understand that) for several uses. The New South Wales attitude is obviously what has prompted the member for Schubert to bring this motion forward, and I would like to restate the concerns about the attitudes which are coming out of New South Wales.

Over quite a while, New South Wales has been very slack in its operation of the system there. It has, to a large extent, taken it for granted. There is still have a lot of flood irrigation, a lot of inefficient infrastructure—and, as you know, Mr Deputy Speaker, from having looked through the system, some of the inefficiencies in the way people use water up there are almost archaic.

The member for Kaurna mentioned the National Party position up there, and that has been a matter of great concern to us—and I know the member for Chaffey has actively taken that up with her Federal colleagues as to what their attitude is and what effect that would have on South Australia. But I would also like to point out in this debate, as I did in reply to a question the other day, that my concerns do not stop with the National Party in New South Wales: the Government there has been a concern for quite a while with respect to this issue. It has been having two bob each way. When it is talking to its urban constituency it is saying one thing, whereas out in the bush it is saying something that is quite different as far as its attitude to the cap is concerned. When I answered that question I mentioned the fact that, at the last Murray-Darling Basin ministerial council meeting, New South Wales made some moves to bring in averaging of the cap over a number of years and a review, because the Government felt that the levels it was allowed were not appropriate any more.

That got quite a savage reaction from the others around the table—as to New South Wales, in our opinion, copping out of its responsibilities. At the end of that I was concerned about the issuing of a press release that said they had achieved a certain amount of change in terms of what was going on; but that was not the case. In the past couple of weeks I have seen press releases which confirm that they are saying they have achieved some change. So, I have some concerns not only with the National Party's position but with the New South Wales Government's position. New South Wales needs to get serious by well and truly looking at the allocations between its different sections of the Murray-Darling Basin. They need to have a good look at their infrastructure. The fact that they have handed out that many allocations as security is very low. They have a lot of work to do, and they need to do it in the light of some of the other issues, such as the Snowy River corporatisation, which is also in the wind. Over the next couple of days a number of the Ministers involved with the Murray-Darling will be in Adelaide for the ARMCANZ meeting. I will make sure that I raise our concerns, once again, and I hope that the collective backbone of the Parties in New South Wales is strong enough until the New South Wales State election is held.

Mrs MAYWALD (Chaffey): I rise to support this motion, and I commend the member for Schubert for introducing it. It is an extremely important issue to South Australia as a whole and to my electorate of Chaffey in particular. This matter is of grave concern to all Riverlanders, to all those who depend upon the Murray River for water for irrigation and domestic use and to metropolitan Adelaide in terms of the supply of our domestic water—

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mrs MAYWALD: And the Iron Triangle and, in fact, South Australia in general. South Australia has been the leader in Australia in relation to moving towards irrigation efficiencies. We have a very small portion of the water allocation from the whole Murray-Darling system, and we manage it extremely well. We in this State are able to work within the cap that was set in 1993-94, the same cap and the same conditions which applied in New South Wales at the time that the cap was set in that State. At this point, our allocations within that cap are not fully utilised. This has enabled us to free up excess water and use it for new development. So, new development has not been stifled in this State; in fact, it is going ahead in leaps and bounds.

We have also been able to utilise the water more efficiently by changing the culture within our growers in this State to the extent that there is an enormous move towards more efficient on-farm use of this valuable resource. This has not been an easy task: it has taken the past 20 years to bring about this evolution of thinking within country areas. In the past, if you were a farmer anything that was green was considered to be bad. Now, farmers work actively within conservation groups to ensure that this valuable resource and the Murray River itself are sustainable into the future and that we leave behind a resource to which future generations will have access. We have a long way to go, but we have made great inroads.

The State Government has transferred a lot of the State-owned irrigation systems to the growers, and the growers are now managing those. The Central Irrigation Trust is a very good example of that. The Central Irrigation Trust's policies—grower driven—are to improve efficiencies right across the board in respect of farm management. The Rural Partnership program, launched yesterday in the Riverland, looks at improving on-farm practices and at establishing quality assurance programs for farmers. The Horticultural Council is working very hard with training programs to improve irrigation management.

This is how you free up excess water for new development: you minimise the amount of water required to maximise production within the region, thereby enabling the best return per dollar unit of water. You do not just free up more water and willy-nilly take more water out of the river to provide new developers who will adopt exactly the same

practices as those who are currently there, because no management plan is in place to expect that those irrigators will do it any better than those who are currently drawing water from the river upstream. I believe that the policy platform of the New South Wales coalition parties, which includes the National Party, is grossly irresponsible—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs MAYWALD: —because it does not look towards the future generations of Australians that will be left this legacy. We have to decide to make it either sustainable or non-sustainable. When we talk about an historic occasion such as the setting of the cap initially, it was hard work for those involved to set that cap—very hard work. I know that our Minister for Primary Industries, now our Deputy Premier, worked extremely hard to ensure a fair deal for South Australia. He has the vision to see that sustainability of this initiative is maintained. There was also a very hard working Environment Minister at the time, and I know he is very passionate about this issue also.

From my perspective, the State Government in South Australia is supporting environmental rehabilitation in this State to the best of its ability within budget constraints. We would all like to see a lot more money going towards rehabilitation, but we are seeing some positive outcomes. The River Murray Water Catchment Board is also working very hard towards a more sustainable future for our irrigators. It is an exciting time to live in the Riverland. We are seeing an enormous amount of development, and it would be devastating to see the hard work that has gone in over the past five or 10 years thrown out the window because of irresponsible policies by our eastern neighbours.

It is purely political; it has nothing to do with future sustainability or good governance. It is about vote winning prior to an election. I am affiliated federally with the National Party, although I do not belong to the National Party in New South Wales; there is a difference. I find it appalling that the New South Wales National Party would take this course of action, particularly at this time for political point scoring prior to an election. However, the National Party is part of the Coalition federally, and prior to the election in 1998 it made a commitment in its policy platform as a Coalition. I would just like to put on the record what its policy was prior to the 1998 election in respect of the Murray-Darling Basin, as follows:

> The Murray-Darling Basin is Australia's largest river system. It has enormous significance as an environmental and economic resource for the agricultural industries within the basin.
>
> Prevailing dry conditions throughout the Murray-Darling Basin during the past three years have highlighted the importance of healthy ecological processes.
>
> During the last two years, the Howard/Fischer Government has supported the rehabilitation of the Murray-Darling Basin. It has:
>
> - committed $163 million to support the Murray-Darling 2001 Initiative in the first five years of the National Heritage Trust;
> - maintained the historic cap on water diversions from the basin, consistent with 1993-94 levels of consumption and development.
>
> The Coalition will continue to support the rehabilitation and protection of the Murray-Darling.

That is responsible policy. For the Coalition federally or in New South Wales now to determine that the historic cap of 1993-94 was wrong on any basis—apart from hard, scientific evidence to the contrary—is totally irresponsible. The Murray-Darling Basin Commission has worked very hard towards an equitable distribution of the resource amongst irrigators and users right across the Murray-Darling Basin, and that includes the environment. It is extremely important that all States, stakeholders and all players within this game—and it is hardly a game; it is far more serious than that—take a responsible view to the future and not short-term policy decisions for vote catching.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I thank members very much for their contributions and bipartisan support for this motion, particularly the Minister (the Hon. Rob Kerin), the member for Kaurna, the member for MacKillop and the member for Chaffey because the Murray River passes through her electorate. I also acknowledge the honourable member's affiliation with the National Party from which the comments originate. I appreciate the member for Chaffey's work in trying to convince her interstate colleagues that this policy is short-sighted and not in the best interests of our nation. I only hope that she is successful.

This is a very important issue for South Australia. Our 6 per cent share—because that is what we get of the total waters—must be protected because, as we have heard, not only is Adelaide dependent on the Murray River but so are the three Iron Triangle cities, as well as the Barossa and the Yorke Peninsula. Irrigators for the full length of the river are also affected and so it is grossly irresponsible of the New South Wales National Party and, indeed, the Government of New South Wales, as the Minister said, to be so tardy in allowing the current irrigation practices. The resource is regarded as not valuable: water is cheap; water comes from the sky.

New South Wales has not applied the same pressure to its irrigators as we have applied to ours to tidy up their act and it cannot continue. The New South Wales Government cannot cover this tardiness by grabbing an extra share. As I said, we need to encourage tradeable licences. Hopefully, we will see a freeing up of these licences across State borders. We are seeing it within the State but we are not seeing it across State borders as we would wish. If that were the case then, certainly, the marketplace would determine the share and where it goes, particularly in the higher priced irrigated areas and in relation to wine grapes.

We must encourage a more efficient and environmentally sustainable use of our water in South Australia and, indeed, encourage our interstate colleagues to do the same. Flood irrigation and open channels are not part of the future. The cap was a great milestone of cooperation between States in 1995. It was difficult enough to achieve that agreement but we cannot go back. If New South Wales wants more water, it means that either someone else down the river misses out or there is even less water available for use to sustain the river environment, via river flows, fish stocks, flushing and so on. It is, as the member for Chaffey said, a very short-sighted policy.

South Australia is very dependent on the Murray River. We need to consider our options if something did go wrong with the flow of the Murray River. We should really consider what Adelaide would do if, for a short time, it did not have access to the water. It is a very serious thought because the alternatives are not too plentiful. South Australia's share of this water and the quality of this water is paramount. We should not be arguing over our share: we should be cooperating to ensure the future of all who are dependent on it. I thank the Minister and members for their cooperation and support of this motion.

Motion carried.

COONGIE LAKES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hill:

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.

(Continued from 18 February. Page 851.)

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier): I wish to point out a few aspects about the process in relation to the Coongie Lakes at the moment. Certainly, the Government recognises the very high environmental values of the Coongie Lakes system, and we are as interested as anyone in ensuring that what is good in that area is protected. A public consultation process is presently under way to assess whether petroleum exploration will threaten the environmental values and, of course, we will look at that issue area by area. The Coongie Lakes reference group is studying all the issues and will not report before the end of September.

The group includes two representatives from industry, two from the mines and energy section of my department, and two from the Department of Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs. Two community conservation representatives are of some concern in that they recently walked out on a meeting. They have basically chosen to use the fact that they were not present and informed to put out a couple of misleading press releases in the last fortnight.

Santos originally submitted two PELs for assessment in that area, each of which concerned a small area which entered into the control zone. These have now been amended and each of the two has been split into two PELs, based on inside and outside the control zone to allow them to be assessed separately, which I think allays many fears for quite a few people. The outside applications will be assessed shortly, whereas those inside applications that fall within the control zone will not be assessed until the public consultation process is completed in September. We are certainly working to ensure that the environmental value is protected. The ACF was invited to be part of the Coongie Lakes reference group but at the moment has declined to be part of the process.

The claim in their media release that the Government has reneged on its 1988 mining agreement is false. I have gone back and checked that and there never was any mandatory requirement for an EIS. I replied to that on television the other day, and I hear they have come back this morning saying that I said there would not an EIS. That is not what I said: I said there was not a mandatory requirement, and as we go on with this we will see what is required to ensure that the environmental values up there are protected. While there is a push for something urgent to happen in other ways, I can assure the House that we are treating this extremely seriously, and absolutely no decisions will be made on any production licence within the Coongie Lakes control zone until we have an absolute all-clear that there will not be environmental damage.

Ms KEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

YOUNG MEDIA AUSTRALIA

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hanna:

That this House congratulates Young Media Australia, a national organisation based in Adelaide, for its continuous campaigning against media depiction of excessive violence and obscenity, with the aim of minimising undesirable influences on young people in our society, and recommends that the Government considers ongoing funding support for this organisation.

(Continued from 19 November. Page 324.)

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I support the motion regarding Young Media Australia based in Adelaide and its contribution against media depiction of excessive violence. I congratulate the honourable member on having moved the motion.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I thank members for their indications of support. I simply wish to wrap up with a view of the current situation for Young Media Australia, because its funding situation has not really been resolved. I am glad to say that, since this matter was first brought to the attention of Parliament in November, the Minister for the Arts has secured or offered an additional $10 000 worth of funding to assist Young Media Australia to keep its doors open for the remainder of this current financial year.

At the same time, however, the South Australian Film Corporation has reduced its ongoing funding from $27 000 to $18 000. Ultimately, I suppose, that money comes from the same budget line as the money which the Minister was offering to keep Young Media Australia going. I am not sure that it has benefited a great deal in that respect. However, it has also received generous support from the Myer Foundation. As some members would know, that is a very worthy philanthropic organisation. It has contributed $20 000 to keep Young Media Australia going. That will take it to the middle of this year, and then the organisation will be looking at closure again if it does not secure further funding.

I remind members that in Hindmarsh Square in Adelaide we have the national headquarters of this organisation which has a wide range of functions, including monitoring children's television, monitoring film and media of other kinds to assess their suitability for children and campaigning for more appropriate content in these various media forms. It also plays a valuable education role in terms of both young people and parents. It would be a very sad thing, really an indictment on our society, if we were to let such a valuable, efficient and lean institution go under. This motion is directed towards the Government to look at how this organisation might be funded on an ongoing basis, because that is what it deserves.

Motion carried.

SOUTHERN YOUTH WEEK

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Thompson:

That this House congratulates all those involved in the Southern Youth Week program for their successful showcasing of the positive contribution young people make to our community.

(Continued from 5 November. Page 218.)

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I support this commendable motion, which this House ought well to note with resolve. These groups of young people are out there on a day-to-day basis doing things for the community and actively contributing to the betterment of that community.

Ms KEY (Hanson): I also support the motion. However, I note that although the Government supported a good program in Southern Youth Week last year, its support for this motion has a note of hypocrisy. When we look at what

the Government is doing for youth in this State through the portfolio and in the programs it runs, we can see that cuts have been proposed in those programs for youth. While supporting this motion, I suggest that the Government needs to have a more comprehensive view about what is happening to youth in South Australia.

When we had our talkfest a couple of weeks ago with regard to the jobs workshops, the issue of youth employment and unemployment was not adequately addressed, and a number of the suggestions that were supposedly taken up have not seen the light of day since those jobs workshops. In this House I have raised issues with regard to the reviews that are currently going on in the youth sector. The most stunning is the review of the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia. I have asked a number of questions of the Minister and, so far, no satisfactory explanation has been given about this so-called arm's length review of the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia.

I support the motion but I say that the Government needs to pull up its socks and have a proper approach to youth employment and unemployment. Perhaps it should put away the ridiculous notion that it has been supporting for quite a long time to reintroduce junior wages in this State. Most employers and employees in the various industries in South Australia recognise that people should be paid for the work they do, not for the age they are or the gender they are, or any other discriminatory measure. However, that seems to be the signature of the industrial relations Bill that Minister Armitage is about to introduce into this House. So, as I said before, I congratulate the Southern Youth Week program and the other programs that are taking place in South Australia, but I think it is about time the State Government pulled up its socks in this area.

Mr HILL (Kaurna): I want to contribute briefly to this debate. I support the member for Reynell's motion. I congratulate everyone involved in Southern Youth Week, and I particularly want to refer to a couple of organisations which participated. I refer, for example, to the Southern Youth Theatre ensemble which, at the same time, conducted a successful performance called *DOME* at the South Adelaide Football Club, involving hundreds of young people and other members of the community.

Ms Thompson: And a few oldies.

Mr HILL: And a few oldies, as the member for Reynell says. It was a big and very successful theatrical event, which was well supported by the community, and I commend them for that. I point out to the House that I am a member of the board of that organisation, but I do not take any credit for the work that was done.

I also congratulate the Southern Youth Network, which is a group of people involved in youth affairs in the southern area. They meet regularly to coordinate activities, and they do a fabulous job. I also commend the work of the schools in the southern area, particularly the three high schools that service my electorate: Christies Beach High, Seaford (6-12) and Willunga. Christies Beach High School had an annual speech night at about the same time. It was an excellent evening, and many students were awarded prizes for academic excellence and other sporting achievements and creative work.

There is a problem in the southern area which I imagine is a problem all over the State, and I would be interested to hear the Minister for Education respond to the House as to how the Education Department is resolving this problem. One of the issues that came up during the week was the concern that people have for students who left school under the age of 17 but who from 1 January ceased to be eligible for an allowance. What has happened to these kids? How many of them have gone back to school and how many are still unattended in the community?

I heard last year that 108 people in that category had been identified as leaving school during the previous six to eight months but that only 17 had been discovered by the end of last year and provided with an exemption to allow them to keep their allowance. In other words, another 125 former students had not been discovered and on 1 January they would have experienced a nasty surprise when their Commonwealth allowance was cut off. The only way they could get the allowance was to go back to school or to some other authorised training institution.

I would be interested to know how many of those people went back to school, what sort of courses are being provided for them, and how many are hanging around at home without resources, imposing a financial burden on their family, or have taken up other options, some of which may be unsavoury.

In addition, I understand that 353 young people over the age of 18, who are similarly placed, have escaped altogether from the education system. No-one knew where they were. I would be interested how many of them came back into the system and what pressure their attendance is now placing on the school system in the southern suburbs. These young people left school because it was not providing them with what they wanted. If they are now obliged to go back to school to get an allowance it will cause considerable problems for schools unless they have been able to adapt their programs in such a way that those young people are satisfied.

The final point I make is one that I have made on several occasions. We are still awaiting an announcement from the Minister on the Southern Trades School. We are hopeful he will make this announcement relatively soon and that he will choose the Christies Beach West campus site, which would be ideal. The member for Reynell, the member for Mawson and I have been working cooperatively on this project. We eagerly await the Minister's announcement. I commend the motion to the House.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 12.45 to 2 p.m.]

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 22, 39, 43, 54, 55 and 72.

DRUGS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I wish today to address an issue which will be the topic of discussion by State Premiers in Melbourne tomorrow and at the Premiers' Conference next month. It is an issue which is a part of everyday life for thousands of South Australians. Drug use, and more specifically heroin addiction, is an issue that affects all of us in some way. Although many families have been touched by the

tragedy of drug dependency, those who have not still feel the effects. Drug addiction is a very complex problem with equally complex consequences, consequences that we all experience in some way as property crime, the provision of health services, the need for policing of drug users and drug pushers: all of these affect each member of our society.

Because heroin addiction is such a complex problem, the solutions necessarily are complex. There is no one-off magic formula, nor are there likely to be quick results and it must also be clearly recognised that Governments alone cannot solve the problem. We as a society must be mature enough to acknowledge that what we have tried so far has not for many people worked well enough. If our current strategies in the fight against drugs were working, why do we still have such a problem and what is the extent of this problem?

In South Australia approximately 60 people die from illicit drug use each year. Currently it is estimated that up to 15 000 South Australians use heroin. They are alarming statistics, but there is a human side to the alarming statistics. Earlier this week I received a letter, which tells the story far better than I think any politician or academic could. Simply it is a mother's story of how she and her family have been affected by heroin addiction. She has lost one son and her daughter and son-in-law are heroin addicts. She is scared for the future of her daughter, her son-in-law and their two grandchildren. She says—and I quote from her letter, with her authority:

> Surely every human life has some value and every human being makes some mistakes throughout their life. The drug issue has been in the too-hard basket for too long. Perhaps only families of victims, and especially when a loved one dies, have any idea how devastating this illness is. Most parents will try everything possible to help their children in trouble and I have never given up hope of my children eventually being cured.

That is a mother speaking from the heart and it is a sentiment to which we can all relate. Every single one of us here knows we would do what we could to protect our children. That is why I am determined, as is the Government, to tackle the issue.

The consequences of drugs in our community are alarming. Two-thirds of hepatitis C cases in South Australia are a result of injecting drug use. A large proportion of all property crime is related to drug dependency. These factors impact upon all of us. Unfortunately, despite a coordinated effort from the Federal police and our local police force, heroin is still cheap and easy to obtain. We need to accept that, despite educating our children through school on the dangers of drug abuse, especially of hard drugs such as heroin, there will be people who choose to use the drug and they will be able to get it.

This is the reality of the situation. It is our job as a Government, within the parameters of that reality, to work with the community to deal with the causes of drug addiction and to reduce to an absolute minimum the harm that drug addiction causes our society. To do this, we need a drug strategy that is comprehensive, and that offers a number of potential solutions, dealing with the beginning—that is preventing drug abuse in the first place—and the end—that is the results of drug abuse. As I said before, there is no magic formula. And there will not be overnight results. South Australia's drug strategy should have as its primary and ultimate goal—the pursuit of abstinence.

We also want those people whose experiments with drugs have led them to addiction to be helped to get off the drug. This starts with education, setting standards and providing a proper example, and encouraging family and community support. Our children, and all the young people of South Australia, must learn that drugs, especially those such as heroin, are lethal. Equally important must be the determination to restrict supply by catching the producers, suppliers and traffickers. Currently, supply of a large amount of heroin can lead to life imprisonment, and this Government wholeheartedly supports the efforts of law enforcement officers who work to keep these substances out of our country. Tough penalties and vigilant enforcement must be directed to keeping supply in check.

But what about those people addicted to drugs like heroin? In my view, it is primarily a health problem for those with that addiction. Although possession of drugs attracts criminal charges, and this I do not dispute, addiction to drugs of dependence is a health issue. We must acknowledge that fact, and work to get addicts off drugs. To do this, addicts must have access to appropriate health care and rehabilitation opportunities. We must provide a variety of opportunities for addicts to break the cycle. We need to look at the issue objectively and with an open mind. Currently in South Australia, we have a parliamentary select committee looking at that very issue. Until I see the recommendations of that committee, I certainly, as one, remain open minded about a number of issues which have been raised in the public arena, including heroin trials.

If we were to go down this path, any trial must be subject to strict conditions. The State's Drug and Alcohol Services Council has indicated that, if a heroin trial is to be adopted in the State, then it should be done as part of a rehabilitation program with a broad set of principles which include the following. As always, abstinence must be the primary aim of any program. It must be used to get the addict off heroin. Such a program should only be available to those addicts who have severe medical, social and/or psychological problems, and who have not been successful in previous attempts to break the habit. Heroin must only be administered within clinic facilities to prevent medically prescribed heroin leaking into the black market. The aim must be to reduce the harm to the drug addict, and to the community, of heroin addiction. It must be a means to an end—that of getting heroin addicts safely off drugs and back into society in a meaningful way.

There will be challenges presented to this sort of strategy and I realise that there will be differing views throughout the community, even within our own Parties, on such a trial. But I ask that we all keep an open mind on the best way to deal with this issue. I acknowledge that ultimate responsibility for a heroin trial lies with the Commonwealth Government, as it is Commonwealth legislation that governs the importation of pharmaceutical grade heroin. I would like to make very clear that this position should not, in any way, be seen as condoning the use of heroin. The complete opposite is true—it would be designed to prevent the spread of this drug in our society.

The community's response to drugs must be wide ranging and draw together all of our resources. An important component of a complete strategy to tackle the drug problem could be further investigation of the merits of the so-called drug courts in South Australia. New South Wales has recently begun work in this area, and I am keen to look at whether a similar scheme in South Australia may complement our work to combat drugs. In some drug courts people convicted of criminal charges relating to drug use are offered a choice—the choice between harsher penalties such as imprisonment or admission into a rehabilitation program. But there are many different forms of drug courts, particularly in the

United States. This issue is being looked at by the Government's Justice Strategy Unit and I know that the Attorney-General is examining the New South Wales experiment as well as looking at the experience overseas.

We do have a form of 'drug court' in South Australia and it has been operating for many years. Drug assessment aid panels, consisting of a legal practitioner and two members with extensive knowledge of drug problems, are established. These panels are, of course, not courts but their purpose is to divert people from the court system to a treatment phase. A goal of rehabilitation and abstinence is paramount, and it could be that a drug court for some addicts has merit because it requires a coordinated approach between all the services available to assist rehabilitation.

I have today written to the Australian Medical Association, as I understand that it is supportive of the concept of drug courts and sympathetic to the notion of a heroin trial, and we will be interested in its input. I do not think that any of us in this House or many people in the community can fully understand the effects of drug use on those who are addicted. That is why, to gain that greater understanding, I propose spending a night with the emergency ambulance services who deal with the life threatening effects of heroin addiction. I would like to see first-hand what this drug does to our community and to individuals within our community.

Tomorrow I will put forward to a meeting of Premiers in Melbourne on this issue our key objectives in relation to this insidious illness. I do not intend to pre-empt the current select committee inquiry into heroin trials in South Australia but, rather, to complement its effort. We need to work together on this to ensure the protection of our children, the safety of our community and the rehabilitation of those suffering from this addiction.

I think a reminder of how this can affect every single one of us is best summed up in the letter I referred to earlier, and I again quote from that letter:

> Drug addiction is an illness but unfortunately due to the stigma attached, the general public seem to believe that all addicts are scum and belong in the gutter not worthy of help. . . Contrary to popular belief most addicts do not come from unwholesome family backgrounds and I am sure most would never have become involved in drug use if they could have foreseen the horrendous consequences. I have always believed my own children were raised in a stable and loving family unit. They were both normal happy children and I would be devastated if I was judged to be an incompetent parent.

I bet none of us do not have some sympathy for a mother who clearly cares about her children. I think that that sentiment relates clearly to the effort that all of us need to make to address what is an insidious problem—illness within the broader community—which deserves the collaboration and cooperation of State and Commonwealth Governments in an endeavour to improve society for those individuals.

QUESTION TIME

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier accept the statements of the former Treasurer, and of two other experts, that the $100 million ETSA tax has been caused by the Olsen Government's own financial and political mismanagement? This morning's media quoted Stephen Baker, the former Treasurer and Deputy Premier, as stating:

> It might well be. . . [the Government's] new priority is to spend money, and if you decide to spend money you have to raise taxes or build up debt. It's a matter of priorities. . . levels of expenditure are significantly above what they were when we delivered the budget in 1997.

Mr Baker also said:

> If they have made that decision. . . it's their choice and they'll be judged on that choice.

Mr Graham Scott, Senior Lecturer in Economics at Flinders University and Deputy Director of the favoured South Australian Centre for Economic Studies, told the media yesterday that the new tax was not financially justified but (and I quote) 'the Government needs something to get itself out of its politically difficult corner that it's got itself into'. Mr Ray Regan from the National Tax Agents and Accountants Association stated that the Government spent money it did not have. He said:

> The citizens have been misled by the Premier, that they were expecting to get money when they never had any legal avenue or they didn't have the acceptance of Parliament to proceed with the sale.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Leader of the Opposition is wanting to shift the emphasis away from the circumstances he created for South Australia. As much as you might like to shift away the emphasis, the simple fact is that this State is labouring under a $7.5 billion debt. Whose work is it? It is the Labor Party's. It is the Labor Party that has shackled this State with unreasonable and unconscionable debt. For those members in this House and elsewhere who want to gloss over the ALP's mismanagement and try to refer it to current circumstance, I refer them to pages 54 and 55 of the Auditor-General's Report last year. It is not the mismanagement of issues in this past 18 months. They should look at the four year budget strategy, and I would ask members not to be selective. The Auditor-General's Report last year clearly identifies that in the four year budget strategy ahead of us $100 million was factored in as the benefit from the sale or lease of ETSA. It automatically follows that, if you do not have the sale or lease of ETSA, you are $100 million short. It was the Auditor-General saying that, and I will ensure that those members who have made public comment in the past 24 hours trying to shift this other than to the circumstances upon which the Labor Party has created in this State—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: It does not matter how often the Leader of the Opposition wants to shift the responsibility. We all know and the public of South Australia know that you created the problem, and they know you do not want to be part of the solution to the problem. We do not want to impose this impost on South Australians. Logically, what Government would? It is clear that we are doing this simply of necessity. I simply pose to the Leader of the Opposition this question: where is the money coming from? Let us look at the matter. I have two suggestions for the Leader of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: It was the member for Hart in his policy documents released before the 1997 election who said where the money would come from. Mr Foley had some plans. In the 1997 election campaign he said that he would increase the return on Government assets by at least $21 million. That means increasing water and power prices.

There is no other way to increase your return from your Government trading enterprises. Well done, Kevin! You have positioned the State so this impost will be put there. Given a stark choice, the people of South Australia want us to sell or lease ETSA; that is what is there.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: There is only one choice—

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the Leader.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: —before us at the moment: either we sell or lease ETSA—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: —or we have to raise the revenue. That is the stark choice before us. Why do we have to do that? It is because of the circumstances we inherited from the Labor Party. That is why this State is in this circumstance. As I have said, the Auditor-General has clearly indicated in the four year budget strategy that we have put down—and it is there in black and white—no less than the Auditor-General affirms, that there is a shortfall of $100 million.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The member for Hart is desperately trying to find another excuse. He just moved off the one put forward by the Leader. He is now moving into another area.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I refer the member for Hart to the answer given to questions yesterday in which the Minister for Government Enterprises told the House where the allocations were in the budget papers and identified those figures. The simple fact is that this impost need not be an impost. If you want to help the battlers and the people out in the community not to have this impost on their household budget—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Minister for Police for interjecting.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: If Labor Party members want to keep out of the household budgets of South Australians it is easy for them to do so. They should just implement the same policy now as they did at the time of the Bannon Government and lease the power utilities. You are hypocrites! In the time of the Bannon Government, you leased those facilities. It is okay for a Labor Government to lease them but it is not okay for a Liberal Government to lease them. That is the hypocrisy of members opposite. As the community analyses this, they will see who is to blame. The Labor Party has no policy, no idea and no backing.

Let me go on to pick up another aspect. The Leader of the Opposition, the shadow Minister for Health and other members constantly ask for more money for a range of things. The simple point is: where is the money coming from? It was the Leader of the Opposition who stood on the steps of Parliament House and accepted a petition from the firefighters union. The Leader of the Opposition was supporting something like an 18 per cent plus pay increase. The shadow Health Minister publicly campaigned for a 13 per cent to 15 per cent increase for health workers. The deal was closed off in a more reasonable, rational manner by the Minister without impacting on the bottom line of the taxpayer.

This Opposition is so irresponsible. It champions the cause of wage increases but it will not back any changes to avoid ETSA power bill increases for South Australians. Nothing can sum it up better than the response of the Leader of the Opposition to the *Advertiser* today when he was asked what he would do about debt retirement. The answer said volumes about Leader of the Opposition. It was three columns of rhetoric and not one policy idea and not one initiative. In other words, they have got no idea.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution a few members that the warnings given this morning during private members' time carry over to this afternoon.

PUBLIC SECTOR PAY CLAIM

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Premier inform the House what impact the public sector's unfair pay claims would have on the State's finances?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Once again the hypocrisy of members opposite, particularly the member for Hart, can be seen in this. The member for Hart has complained in recent days that we have to undertake this ETSA power bill increase because there has been a wages blow-out in claims by the Government. That is what the member for Hart said. He can go on radio and say one thing to that constituency, he can say another thing here and he can say another thing to the unions, but it will all be seen through in the end. The absolute hypocrisy will be seen through in the end.

We have put a fair, reasonable and equitable offer on the table before the Public Service Association. We have made an offer of 10 per cent over a two year time line. The union put to the Government initially that it wanted wages parity, and the Government took the view that wages parity was a reasonable request. Despite the fact that some costs would be associated with that, we put wages parity in place. The first request of the PSA has been met. We have increased our initial offer to the PSA to the current offer of 10 per cent. That means that some workers who will have wage parity adjustments in addition to the increase will secure an increase of something like 13 per cent. A lot of people in the broader community who would not mind a 13 per cent pay rise over the next two years. The simple fact is that, for every 1 per cent increase, there is a $14 million bottom line cost to the taxpayers of South Australia.

I repeat: we do not have a money tree. We do not pluck money out of the air to meet these requirements. We have a responsibility to deliver good, effectively managed Government to South Australians. The Opposition cannot tell us how to manage the debt; they cannot tell us how they will reduce the debt; they cannot tell us from where they will find the money for the current pay claims. As I have indicated to the House, clearly, the Opposition has championed the causes of the various unions. All I can say is, 'Well done!' You keep the red flag flying as union membership plummets and your Party is stuck on a primary vote similar to that of 1993 of some 30-plus per cent. That is okay by us; you keep going that way; that is fine by us. One thing that ought to be put clearly on the deck is that—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Well, they know the public do not believe the member for Hart. There is no doubt about that. When confronted with a stark choice, in a range of polls taken recently, when people have a choice of actually paying more or selling or leasing ETSA they take the responsible choice,

which is what we have before this House. As people debate this issue over the next few days, as it sinks in, it will clearly become apparent that the public of South Australia do not want to undertake further imposts. They need not undertake further imposts. All that is stopping them is the Australian Labor Party. The only people propping up an ETSA power bill increase—I should say the Rann power bill tax—are members of the Australian Labor Party, and their intransigent attitude to it.

As it relates to pay claims from the broader public sector in South Australia—in this instance the Public Service Association—a fair, reasonable and equitable offer has been put on the table. We have increased that offer to an average of 10 per cent, to some 13 per cent, and that is the limit. There has to be a limit sometime, and we simply cannot afford to increase it. Members opposite keep championing the cause of these pay increases, and it is very easy for the shadow Minister to go out on the steps and say, 'The fight has only just begun and if we stick in we will get more money out of the Government.'

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I ask the member for Hanson: if you are going to give them a 1 per cent pay rise and it will cost taxpayers $40 million, where is the money coming from? Silence. Listen to this. Silence from the Opposition. They have no answer. They do not want to have an answer, and what they do not understand—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Well, I think perhaps they might understand the reality: in Opposition they do not want to front up to any of these issues, but in Government you have to face the issues. This Government is doing so. It is maintaining budget integrity and strategy, and that is being demonstrated by the fact that for the first time in 50 years we are actually living within our means. When we came into Government we were spending $300 million a year more than we were earning. That is the performance of members opposite—$300 million a year more going out than was coming in.

Well, carefully over five or six years we have got to a position where on an annual basis we are living within our means, as compared to the economic strategy of members opposite, which was zilch. Not only are we living within our means on an annual basis, we now have a strategy to tackle the debt, the other great legacy they left to young South Australians, and, clearly, as it relates to the debt they want to walk away from it. Well, Mr Speaker, I can assure the members of the Opposition right through to the next election, to the next ballot box, we will not let them forget that they created this debt and that they are not prepared to be part of the solution to the problem.

ELECTRICITY, PRIVATISATION

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Given that the Premier's latest taxpayer funded advertising campaign in support of the privatisation of ETSA and the new Olsen $100 million ETSA tax says (and I quote), 'It is time for South Australians to make the choice', will the Government now give South Australians the real choice it has so far denied them and call a referendum on whether ETSA should remain the property of the South Australian public?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: It is the Labor Party and its lack of responsibility for what it delivered, that is the point. All of us are elected into this Parliament to make decisions on behalf of South Australians. That is why we are elected—to make judgments in this Parliament in the interests of all South Australians—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: —not to abdicate that responsibility, hide behind the responsibility but to face up to the responsibility. I have said on a number of occasions that by choice we would prefer not to have a $7.5 billion debt and prefer not to have to apply an ETSA power bill increase inflicted by the Australian Labor Party, but that is the reality of the circumstances created by the Australian Labor Party in this State. That Party might want to walk away from it, but I give the absolute guarantee that this Government will not walk away from its responsibilities.

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is directed to the Premier. What impact will the power bill increase announced by the Government this week have on South Australian families? Earlier this week the Government announced power bills will increase substantially unless the Opposition Parties allow us to sell or lease ETSA. Whilst many people have referred to the increase as the Rann power bill tax, I understand several community groups in South Australia are concerned at the impact this will have on households.

Mr CLARKE: On a point of order, Sir, this information is within the ambit of the public media. We have spent $220 000 on it—the member can easily consult his newspapers for that same information.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. It is a question within the responsibility of the Premier. I cannot put words into the Premier's mouth: it is up to him to answer it appropriately.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: As I have said on a number of occasions, this is a burden we do not want to apply to the household budgets of South Australians, but we simply have no choice. How will we meet the hospital needs of South Australians growing apace? How will we meet the growing and demanding needs of education in South Australia? How do we ensure our children maintain a standard of education in this State with back-up services equal to that of any other State in Australia and better than other States of Australia? We can only do that by allocating sufficient and appropriate funds to those social services. Meeting that need and the demand in the broader community is very important. It is an important need that we will not walk away from.

I was interested to hear on radio that the Leader of the Opposition was stuck on this no policy position. A very moderate interviewer, Ashley Walsh, kept saying to the Leader of the Opposition, 'Well, will you remove this tax?' I think it was seven or eight times he said to the Leader of the Opposition, 'If you disagree with what they are doing, will you give a commitment to remove this tax?' The Leader of the Opposition did not answer it: he ducked and weaved. You could tell that Ashley Walsh was getting rather frustrated: 'Just a simple answer will do, Mr Rann—yes or no.' There was no answer from this policy vacuum over the road, no answer at all—he ducked and weaved and walked away. Just look at that in contrast to an article in the *Advertiser* not so long ago when the Opposition Leader said, '1999 is the year of policy.' He forgot about it pretty quickly. The headline was

'Rann on the run'. I think he is, but it is not in relation to running to get policies but running away from the member for Hart and the member for Elder, the would-bes, could-bes and has-beens. He is not prepared to front up as the Leader of the Opposition with any plan.

Here is a Leader of the Opposition that said that 1999 would be policy year. The first time he gets an opportunity to put down a policy he walks away. There is no policy, no idea, no answer. It shows up the Leader of the Opposition for what he and the Labor Party are: just political opportunists who are not prepared to think about or look at what can be done—I am glad the member for Hanson has stood up.

Ms KEY: On a point of order, Sir, I understood that the question asked by the member for Waite related to how the tax would affect families. I am wondering what the ideas of the Premier with regard to the Labor Party have to do with the question.

The SPEAKER: I have heard sufficient explanation. Parts of the Premier's reply are debating the issue. I ask him to come back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I thank the member for Hanson for her point of order. It was only before Question Time on the steps of Parliament House that she said 'This is a mean Government—we ought to give the PSA what they want.' That equals $60 million over the next couple of years. So I ask the member for Hanson: where is the money coming from? Here is an Opposition that has created mayhem—

Ms KEY: On a point of order, Sir, first I did not say what the Premier has just outlined—

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order.

Ms KEY: Secondly, I still wonder what that has to do with the question asked by the member for Waite.

The SPEAKER: I am upholding the point of order being raised at the moment. I ask the Premier to get back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I can well understand the point of order that tried to get a retreat from the position. For 60 million reasons I suggest the member for Hanson wanted to retreat from that position. I hope that the PSA members understand that you say one thing on the steps and you retreat from the position in the House. How does it come back to the impost on families? It is clearly a demonstration of a Labor Party that is prepared to block, that has no policies and wants to force on South Australian households power bill increases that are totally avoidable. We could avoid this position. We could ensure that, by simply putting in place a policy that the Bannon Labor Government put in place, we lease the ETSA utilities and do not have to have a power bill increase. If we are forced to go down the power bill option, it is the Labor Party that has forced us to do so because it simply has no policy alternative.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): My question is directed to the Premier. Is the taxpayer paying for the push polling of people living in the seat of Mitchell last night? If so, how much is it costing and which other electorates have been targeted?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Bragg and I think the member for Schubert was involved also.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I do not need your assistance.

Mr HANNA: I was informed by constituents this morning that they received calls last night from a polling company that asked two questions on the privatisation of ETSA, among others. The first question asked of constituents was:

If you were given $1 000, what would you do with it: spend it, pay off debt or save it?

Another question was:

Would you be willing to campaign your local MP to sell ETSA?

How much is all this costing the taxpayer?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: To my knowledge, not a cent. To my knowledge no Government agency has commissioned the market research you are talking about. The member for Mitchell in great gusto gets up and asks his question. He said it was 'push polling'. When you are worried about the result you call it 'push polling'. The member is worried about what the result will be for whoever is doing the polling.

The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yes, the Minister suggested that, having given them encouragement to contact you to do something about your intransigence on this policy, he is worried about the number of electorate inquires he will now get in his office to get him to change their minds. I will be more than happy to make inquires of Government to find out whether anybody has commissioned market research. To my knowledge nobody has—nobody has raised it with me and to my knowledge not a cent has been signed off by anybody to do any market research. It might just happen to be some private sector organisation that would like to see this State break free from the shackles of debt of the past. I can well understand the sensitivity of the honourable member. He usual sleeps in that back corner. I am glad he is awake today to ask that question and clearly he is worried about the results of the poll.

ECONOMIC POLICIES

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Will the Minister for Industry and Trade advise the House of the impact of this Government's economic policies on the competitiveness of South Australia?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Members will remember that in the past year the Government has commissioned a study (as it always does) into the competitive position of the South Australian economy in relation to interstate and international competitiveness for South Australia as a business location. Again the overall conclusion of the study this year is that the South Australian policy direction by the Government is holding South Australia in good stead as a competitive business environment, both on a domestic and international competitive basis. The study certainly confirmed that, nationally, when we compared ourselves with some 14 other cities within Australia, we have a very strong competitive advantage in Adelaide and in South Australia.

The competitive advantages include things such as lower property and rental costs, general labour costs—our general work force costs are about 5 per cent or 6 per cent lower than the Eastern Seaboard—management costs (around 15 per cent lower than the Eastern seaboard), the quality of life that we know so well, telecommunication costs and the great advantages of our education system in South Australia. International relations also received a very positive tick under the report. Whilst multinational investors see Australia somewhat as a negative in relation to industrial relations, Adelaide is seen as the exception to the rule, with fewer days lost here than in other areas of Australia. In fact, we have one of the best records of industrial relations for the past 40 years.

What this underscores is that the Government policy is getting it right as far as economics are concerned within the

State; that is, its policies in relation to energy costs, a skilled work force, infrastructure improvements and business establishment costs are all providing the right environment for long-term economic growth. The policies will continue, but the question that other States will ask—and indeed we are asking it—is whether South Australia can do better? Other States will be asking whether they can do better and how they can improve their business competitiveness. One question they will be addressing is energy costs. In the past fortnight we have seen a company such as Western Mining starting to question very publicly the cost of electricity in South Australia and looking at purchasing its power out of South Australia, and other companies will do likewise.

For example, Email, under a possible amalgamation, could be looking at ramping up production from 200 000 units to about 500 000 units. If electricity costs add approximately $5 or $10 per unit to that company, that is a huge cost to that company. Obviously, it will look for the cheapest electricity costs within Australia, and that is why the competitive market is so important to a manufacturing base in South Australia. We know that the competitive market has produced significant results in Victoria. The Independent Regulator has already indicated that there have been significant savings to the small business enterprises in Victoria.

This leads on to the next point about business competitiveness in South Australia, and in particular when members compare it with what is happening in Queensland and New South Wales. Queensland has a budget surplus of approximately $1.1 billion, and indeed a $6 billion fiscal surplus overall. Compare that with South Australia with a debt of about $7.5 billion. That is a difference of some $13 billion between the Queensland economy and the South Australian economy. Once New South Wales sells its power assets, the difference will be about $19 billion.

The Opposition not only needs to address the question the Premier raised earlier about how it will reduce the debt, or how it will pay the extra $60 million for public sector salaries, but it also has to address how it will keep businesses competitive in South Australia in the long term. When we have a Queensland economy with a $13 billion advantage over South Australia and a New South Wales economy with a $19 billion advantage over South Australia, the question the Labor Party needs to address is not only how we reduce the debt and pay the public sector salary increases but also how we keep South Australia's businesses competitive. Given the jobs debate that occurred in the past month in this Parliament, the simple fact is it does not have a policy and it does not know how it will address the economy of South Australia.

Mr CONLON: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Standing Order 128 refers to members indulging in tedious repetition and allows you to call them to order. I would suggest that I have heard a great deal of tedious repetition from this Minister and he should be called to order.

The SPEAKER: Order! Did the Minister complete his remarks?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The only tedious repetition we have not heard is the member for Elder tediously repeating what his policy is in relation to debt reduction or tediously repeating what his policy—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is now straying into pure debate.

Mr Clarke: Standing Order 98, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I do not need the assistance on this occasion of the member for Ross Smith. Has the Minister completed his reply?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Yes.

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Does the Premier agree with comments by the member for Gordon that the ETSA tax proposal is 'blackmail'; and the member for Chaffey that your tax proposals have nothing to do with the sale of ETSA but are the result of your Government's budget mismanagement?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I answered that question first up.

The SPEAKER: The member for Goyder.

Members interjecting:

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

APPRENTICESHIPS AND TRAINEESHIPS

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Will the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training provide details to this House on the substantial increase in the number of people employed in traineeships and apprenticeships in South Australia?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: We have just heard from the Minister for Industry and Trade about the improving competitiveness of companies in South Australia. That is underlined even further in the number of traineeships and apprenticeships that have been undertaken in this State in 1998. It is a definite push of this Government to improve the training and improve the number of people undertaking training in South Australia. OECD reports highlight the fact that Australia is not undertaking enough training to ensure that our work force is suitably trained to meet the new millennium. However, I am pleased to say that recent figures from the Australian National Training Authority show that in 1998 some 17 530 apprentices and trainees started training in South Australia. That is excellent and I congratulate those young people on signing up and getting involved in apprenticeships and traineeships.

It is very interesting to look back—history is always interesting to look st. It is very interesting to look to the last year of the Labor Government and see how many apprenticeships and traineeship commencements there were.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: The honourable member asks, 'How many?' There were 3 772. I could see the question on the honourable member's breath, so I gave him the answer. That means that last year—in one year alone—there was more than a fourfold increase in the number of apprenticeships and traineeships compared with the last year of the Labor Government. That is an excellent result. What has happened is that a freeing up of the system has occurred. As from 1 January 1998, when private providers were able to give tertiary or further education, along with TAFE and our universities, no longer do employers have to send their apprentices and trainees into a specific training area; they can do a lot of it on the job. It means that they have flexibility and that is what it is all about.

During 1998, 120 funding agreements were executed and registered with training organisations for the delivery of apprenticeships and traineeships. That was a value of $15 million in traineeships and apprenticeships going through these companies. It is a clear indication that companies are supporting this particular form of flexibility with apprenticeships and traineeships. Gone are the days when they had to

link their apprenticeships into a certain number of days per week, lose the apprentices for those days per week and not be able to get productive work out of them because they were in classes for four days a week, or whatever. They are now able to train on the job. Not only does it free up the system but it reduces the amount of travelling time for the apprentices and trainees in terms of moving to those institutions to take up their traineeships and apprenticeships.

This is all about convenience and productivity. As the Minister for Industry and Trade said, we are interested and we are pushing for further competitiveness of this State. Training and more training of our apprentices and trainees will ensure that that competitiveness improves in the future.

LOUTH BAY TUNA FARMS

Mr HILL (Kaurna): Does the Deputy Premier agree with comments made today by Gary Morgan, Director of Fisheries, who said that penalising the developers of six tuna farms off Louth Bay could be likened to punishing a person for jaywalking? An application for the development of six tuna farms off Louth Bay near Port Lincoln is currently before the Government. While there is no approval currently for any such development, some cages have already been erected for the farming of tuna. I am told that, prior to such development, three approvals are needed: a land tenure lease is required from the Minister for Primary Industries, a power delegated to the Minister from the Minister for Transport; a fish farming licence is required from the Director of Fisheries; and development approval is required by the Development Assessment Commission. Development approval has not yet been granted.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: In relation to the first comment that the honourable member made about comments of the Director of Fisheries, last week we had the instance where several things that were attributed to people within that department were incorrect. So, I will take that question on notice and see what was actually said. As far as the tuna farms at Louth Bay are concerned, it was brought to my notice anecdotally yesterday and I followed it up this morning. There are a couple of applications which are to go before the Development Assessment Commission next week (I believe on 11 March). A couple of operators have shifted in early. Fisheries has warned them that they are not doing the right thing, and it is up to the Development Assessment Commission as to whether action is taken about their being in the incorrect position.

Regarding some of the comments that have been made on this issue over the last 24 hours, a couple of the campaigners against the tuna industry have come back out of the woodwork. It is funny how some of the people who jump up and down about some of these issues come out with whatever the issue is to do with aquaculture, particularly with tuna farming. I do not know whether people are worried about the site or the health of the resource, or whatever, but some of the people also have had things to say about pilchards.

One of the things with respect to pilchards that has become quite evident is that there have been some demands made of me that I should ban the import of pilchards to South Australia—which is tied up with this whole tuna farming thing. That shows considerable ignorance of the facts—and it was not the honourable member who made this accusation, but these accusations have been made. It is not up to me whether or not we import frozen pilchards into Australia. That is a Federal matter and then, again, it is a scientific matter for AQIS. Under the World Trade Organisation agreements, it is not an easy matter of someone just pulling the pin. I certainly would hate to go to Port Lincoln and stand up in front of about 800 people and say, 'I have a gut feeling there is something wrong here: we will close your industry down.' That would certainly be devastating for the people there.

I am very interested in the issue that the honourable member raises. I had some concerns myself this morning. We have followed it through, and I will continue to be updated.

ELECTRICITY, PRIVATISATION

Mrs MAYWALD (Chaffey): My question is directed to the Premier. Do the terms of appointment for the consultants and advisers employed by the Government for the sale of ETSA include a success fee and/or progressive payments; if so, how much has been paid to date and to whom; what is the total likely cost; and when does the Government's obligation for payment expire?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The honourable member has asked a detailed question and I would be happy to seek the details from the Minister with respect to the progressive payments and the time lines for that. I will come back to the honourable member with that information.

I will make one point, however. Previously the Government had advice in relation to Playford B station, I believe it was, at Port Augusta—that it was not in the interests of the Government to upgrade Playford B, that it would be too costly and we would not get an environmental sign-off. One of the benefits of the consultants, I hasten to add, is that they looked at that and came back with subsequent advice to the Government that said that we could bring on Playford B at Port Augusta for about a quarter of the price that we had previously been told about, and that we would get environmental sign-off for a number of years. I would suggest that that alone has more than paid the consultants for everything else they have done in the course of the last 18 months because, had the consultants not been here, we would have taken the advice that was simply on the table, and that was a far more expensive option—in the tens of millions of dollars. I am more than happy to get the information for the honourable member but I simply make the point—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The member—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Or the absent Leader. I notice we have the member for Hart not reading his *Financial Review* during Question Time, so we have had some improvement from the member for Hart as he tries to demonstrate his economic credentials by reading the *Financial Review*. But we have still lost the Leader of the Opposition in Question Time.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The interjection of the member for Stuart is a timely and appropriate one. Bringing on Playford B station will enable us to meet some of the peaking requirements that will be needed next summer. Without that we would have been in some degree of difficulty because, whereas in the past about 20 000 air-conditioners have been sold annually, at the moment the sale rate is about 45 000. The net effect of that is that, in peak demand, it is drawing down all the peak capacity in South Australia, creating a problem. We had—

Mr HANNA: Sir, I rise on a point of order relating to Standing Order 98. The Premier is clearly not answering the substance of the question, which was about the consultants and their cost.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. As I heard the Premier, he made a commitment to give a written considered reply to the member for Chaffey then went on to enlarge upon a few points. He is not technically debating: he is providing information at this stage.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I know that the member for Mitchell is not used to any information of any kind; he sort of has a vacuum on that. Let me go on to say that we have a customer of ETSA in this State that has an interruptable power supply agreement. That has been in place since 1958 and, for the first time since 1958, this summer they were contacted to interrupt the power supply. The reason for that is that we did not have sufficient generator capacity to meet their demands. With the growth of the number of air-conditioners for households in South Australia, given the renewed confidence in the broader community, that is bringing on additional demands.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: What is the relevance to this? It is quite a lot. First of all, it is the member for Hart's electorate: it is Pelican Point and National Power, and getting that on stream to meet the peaking demands in 2000-1.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Don't worry; there will be one at Pelican Point. And bringing on Playford B, which was a recommendation and suggestion of the consultants, has met a short-term generating need for peaking demand and, in addition, has more than paid, I am sure (whatever the figure is), the consultants' demand to date.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SCHOOL CARD

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Is the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training going ahead with the plan to treat parenting payments to some Health Care Card recipients as income for the first time when assessing School Card eligibility; if so, why; and how many lose School Card benefits as a result?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I thank the honourable member for her question.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: No, I am just looking at the news release, the member for Hart, that the member for Taylor put out last year regarding this matter, and a more misleading news article I have never seen, because—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Yes, we get used to this. The member for Taylor comes out and says that people will miss out on School Card, that the rules have been changed. Let me tell members that the rules for School Card have not been changed. All those people who received School Card last year are eligible for School Card this year. There has been a change. Last year people who wanted eligibility for School Card went to Centrelink and had their income looked at. They then received a letter from Centrelink which they took along to the school, and the school then approved the School Card. The problem was that many of them did not take the letter to the school. It costs the department $150 000 to chase up second letters, phone calls and so on to Centrelink to ensure that those who were applying for School Card were correct.

This year the system for identifying eligibility has changed. This year people who want to use School Card must bring along their health card—if they have one. Certain prefixes on that health card show that someone is either eligible or not eligible for School Card. If you do not fall into one of those prefixes, you fill out an income assessment form. They then fill that out, send it to the department and are assessed for School Card. With regard to the parenting payments to which the honourable member alluded, a question on top of the sheet asks, 'Are you in receipt of a parenting payment of some form or another?'

Ms White interjecting:

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: It is not.

The Hon. M.H. Armitage: Is she wrong again?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Wrong again! The member for Taylor has been scare mongering in the community, saying, 'You people will miss out on School Card this year.' That is what she has been saying. They are not; it is as simple as that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: When we came in, there were over 104 000 families on School Card. People who were not eligible were rolling up, making sure that they were rigging their income to benefit from School Card. As a result of that, this Government firmed up the rules on School Card. Some 95 000 families are now on School Card, compared with 1991-92—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: —yes, I am—when 55 000 people were on School Card under Labor. We are not walking away from those people who require help in the community. It is about time that the member for Taylor got her facts right.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the member for Elder and remind him that there are consequences of being named a second time in one session.

SMALL BUSINESS

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): My question is directed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: —to the Minister for Employment. Will the Minister outline the assistance the Government is providing to small businesses so that they can take on extra employees?

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I am glad to see that the honourable member who is leaving is so interested in small business in this State. He has gone out following his Leader, who I suspect is looking for a job himself this afternoon. This House will be aware that part of the State Government's small business employer incentive scheme was introduced as one of the many measures incorporated in the Premier's $100 million employment statement made last year. The scheme basically provides incentives of up to $4 000 payable over two years to small businesses that take on trainees or apprentices. The small business incentive scheme recognises that small companies have historically been reluctant to commit to full traineeships or apprenticeships and that small business has to be encouraged to employ such trainees.

Indeed, we particularly wanted to encourage those small businesses that had not previously employed a trainee or had not previously been prepared to commit to a contract of training.

It is considered that additional financial incentives and human resources assistance provided through the small business incentive scheme will result in contracts of training that would not otherwise have been created. This scheme is a direct response to calls for increased employment assistance to small businesses, and the program complements the Government's payroll tax rebate, which provides significant financial incentives to larger business enterprises. Figures supplied by the Department of Education, Training and Employment and Employment South Australia show that, of the original 2 500 incentives provided by the State Government since its introduction of the scheme on 1 January 1998, a total of 2 474 applications have been approved, with—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I do not need the help of the member for Peake. I am referring to my notes, member for Peake, so that I do not make a mistake—otherwise you will accuse me of misleading the Parliament, and that has dire consequences. I repeat that a total of 2 474 applications have been approved, with a total of 288 applications currently awaiting approval. If the member for Peake were to use his fingers, he could work out that already that exceeds the 2 500 places we have allocated, and that is in a scheme that has not yet even been publicly advertised. It is an outstanding success and it is a success on which we would like to build in the future. Further, 537 small business owners have chosen to engage a trainee specifically under the small business operations traineeships scheme. Everybody connected with this program, including previous Ministers, can be congratulated on an initiative which I have been fortunate enough to pick up.

Conversely, on the other side of the House, Labor did absolutely nothing for small business when it was in government. The best that it could come up with was an expensive report entitled 'New directions for the South Australian economy'. What did it do with the recommendation? It did nothing. What did it do for small business? It did nothing. Indeed, we heard the member for Hart yesterday talking about the Arthur D. Little report, which was tabled in 1992. Members who were present in this House at that time would remember the chest beating and bravado from the Premier down when that initiative was launched. However, the member for Hart admitted recently during the jobs debate that it lacked substance and was riddled with faults. The member for Hart also admitted to this House that his Labor comrades could not find the time to implement the Arthur D. Little report. It is little wonder that they, therefore, lost government approximately one year later.

It is interesting to observe that in this House today the member for Hanson apparently committed her future Government to the expenditure of $60 million on the Public Service. It is also interesting to note that the member for Hart says that he will find an additional $21 million for services. I do not know whether the Premier missed this point, but the member for Hart claims that he will not put up service charges at all: he will do it through efficiencies. Efficiencies means jobs: it means cutting back further ETSA and the Public Service.

The member for Hart cannot have it both ways. We have seen them today put on the table $81 million, again with no concrete ways of raising the money. It will be either $81 million in additional revenue with no taxation measures to back them up or $81 million worth of lost jobs to South Australians. I remind members opposite that the first priority of this Parliament—not only this Government—should be about jobs: sustainable, long-term jobs for South Australians. That is what this Parliament should be about. Members opposite should be concentrating on what the Government is concentrating on—creating long-term sustainable jobs—not, as they are, limiting themselves to one consideration only, that is, the perpetuation of their own jobs and their own relative position on their benches.

FINGERPRINT EVIDENCE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Can the Minister for Police explain why it has taken up to three months to process fingerprints lifted from a crime scene, and is reduced staffing the problem? What does he plan to do about this extraordinarily lengthy delay? I have been contacted by an irate constituent who suffered three break-ins in the last three months and who has been informed by police officers that fingerprint evidence is taking three months to process. As the break-ins were of a similar nature and pattern, my constituent believes that, if it were not for the delay, the offender might have been caught and the other break-ins might not have occurred.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: The honourable member has been around this place for some time now and I would have thought that she would realise that, in a specific case, the way to get an appropriate answer is to put it in writing. Therefore, I say to the honourable member that, if she puts it in writing, I will treat it as a matter of urgency and get back to her. It is a pity that Opposition members continually knock the police in South Australia, because our police do a very good job.

Mrs GERAGHTY: I rise on a point of order. I ask that the Minister withdraw the comment that my colleagues and I are knocking the police. That is just not the case.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order. The Minister has not said anything outside the range of Standing Orders.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Our Government appreciates the very fine work that the South Australia Police do and the new, local service area models will improve it further for the protection of the community in South Australia. I will get back to the member as soon as possible.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Can the Minister for Government Enterprises advise the House whether it is intended that there be a role for collective labour organisations in the Government's workplace reforms?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Heysen for this very important question. The Government's draft Bill, which is out for consultation, does not limit the industrial options available to and for the unions. The awards system and the collective agreements will continue to be available. All the Government wants to do is add to the options in terms of both mediation and individual workplace agreements. Given that that has quite clearly been stated in both the Bill and the information booklet, it was amazing to note that the member for Hanson was quoted on 12 January in the *Advertiser* as saying that the move towards private job

contracts was purely an ideological push by conservative movements. She went on to say:

> I think it's a political move to cut out awards and ultimately trade unions—it's as simple as that.

She said it again on 1 February 1999. Well may the Labor Party be worried. One wonders why, though, it is perturbed about that and it might be due to a report in the *Advertiser* on 2 February, headed 'Paying for politics', which deals with where the money comes from. I will read out the following donations to the Australian Labor Party, as follows:

ALH & MWU, $7,026.35; Australian Services Union, $2 000; Australian Workers Unions, Whyalla, $4 368; CFMEU, $3 000; Maritime Union, $1 500; Shop Distributive Association, Kent Town, $67 189.98; Textile, Clothing & Footwear Union $3 850; Transport Workers Union, Welland, $11 500; Shop Distributive Association, Kent Town, $73 488; Meat Industry Union, Adelaide, $1 952.50; United Firefighters Union, Torrensville, $2 634; Transport Workers Union, Welland, $18 000; Construction Forestry Mining Union F & FP, Adelaide, $3 550; Construction Forestry Mining Union FFTS, Adelaide, $2 124; Construction Forestry Mining Union P & P, Millicent, $1 170; CEP Union, Richmond, $23 000; Australian Liquor Hospitality & Miscellaneous Workers Union, $72 775; Actors Equity, $789.72; Maritime Union of Australia, Port Adelaide, $1 400; Textile, Clothing and Footwear Union, $6 656; Australian Workers Union, Adelaide, Medindie Gardens, $76 000; Australian Workers Union, $3 500; Australian Workers Union Glass Division, Welland, $931.86; Australian Services Union $14 600; Health Services Union $445.

On and on it goes, a total of nearly $400 000. Clearly with the shadow Minister and member for Hanson making such a ridiculously inane and inaccurate comment, completely in the face of all the information that is provided in the information booklet and in the face of the draft Bill that is now circulated, I wonder whether they are worried about the old axiom that industrial labour is the financial backbone of political Labor. They are worried that workers will think that it is not a bad idea to go into individual agreements, and they might just then decide of their own volition not to remain a member of a union. Perhaps some of these payments will not be made.

The really important point is that the ALP has seen the figures already because the *Advertiser* on 13 February 1999 revealed that union membership, without our legislation, was down by 75 000 members. The headline read, 'Unions on the slide'. What is happening is that individual members of unions are realising that unions are not doing what they should be doing for the membership. That is why people are leaving. Frankly, the ALP is perturbed that, under this legislation, with union membership having fallen by that amount without the legislation, once workers get the chance to move into individual agreements the Labor Party knows that it is facing financial oblivion as well as political oblivion.

SCHOOL CARD

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave has been granted. We will have silence for the member for Taylor.

Ms WHITE: Today in Question Time the Minister for Education accused me of scaremongering and spreading mistruths about School Card. I want to reply to that. After the Minister made those allegations, I went upstairs and made a phone call to his department and spoke to the School Card hotline. I asked the question that I had asked the Minister: would parenting payments to some Health Care Card recipients be treated as income for the first time in this year's assessment? The answer was 'Yes'. In fact, people on a sole parent benefit will have their parenting payments, according to the department—

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to come back to her personal explanation.

Ms WHITE: The name of the representative of the department on the hotline was Craig, and he said that sole parent benefit recipients would have their parenting payments treated as income. I ask that the Minister issue an apology to me.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Ms KEY (Hanson): My grievance speech today relates to International Women's Day which will be celebrated in South Australia on Saturday at a rally. A number of other events have been arranged in South Australia and around Australia to celebrate that event. It is important to remember that South Australia, in particular, has a very proud history with regard to rights for women, although it has been a long time coming in many respects and the struggle continues.

In 1894, South Australian women obtained the vote and were the first in the world to achieve the right to be elected to Parliament. We also achieved the vote for women in that year, and I believe that we were beaten just by a couple of months by New Zealand, where the right to vote for women in New Zealand was obtained. In 1896 the South Australian Married Women's Protection Act gave women legal protection against their husbands, and South Australian women voted for the first time.

In 1928 there was the first International Women's Day rally, held in Sydney on 5 March, where there were calls for equal pay for equal work, an eight hour day for shop girls, no piece work, a basic wage for the unemployed, and annual holidays on full pay. In South Australia, women formed a group called Wives of the Unemployed Workers of Port Adelaide to organise self help and help for distressed and poor families threatened with eviction and starvation in that area.

In 1930, International Women's Day events were held in Brisbane and Sydney, and in 1931 International Women's Day events were held in all the main centres, and I am pleased to say that Victoria joined in the celebrations, where there was a march led by a banner declaring 'Long Live International Women's Day'. In 1936 in New South Wales, in Sydney, a women's committee was formed for the unemployed and also the first International Women's Day committee was set up.

In 1937, in Sydney, the International Women's Day conference was held and was attended by 300 women representing various women's organisations. The theme then was: the dangers of war, the dangerously low standards of

living and the effects of low standards of living on women and children. In 1938 in this State the first meeting of the South Australian International Women's Day committee was held. It was held in the home of Isobel Drummond and was attended by women from many different women's organisations, including the Women's Peace Pledge Union, the Friends, the League of Women Voters, the Women's Welfare League, many unions and also political Parties. In 1939, International Women's Day Play in South Australia was organised by the Labor Youth Theatre. We go through to 1946 where the South Australian International Women's Day celebrations were held in the Adelaide Town Hall, where 800 to 900 women attended, and this was chaired by Dr Constance Davey.

There were big celebrations in 1965 where in South Australia the first female judge in the British Commonwealth was appointed, that being Dame Roma Mitchell. In 1967 we had a referendum that gave the very important right for Aboriginal indigenous people to vote, including women, of course. In 1966-67 there was the formation of the Council of Aboriginal Women, and also the formation of the National Council of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, including the Women's Council, and that was set up in 1967.

In 1969 the first Women's Liberation groups were formed, and by the 1970s Women's Liberation had set up groups throughout South Australia and also in both of the Territories. We had our first International Women's Day march, which we are going to celebrate again on Saturday. That was in 1972 where women first marched through the streets, and that march was organised by Women's Liberation. Some of the first meetings were held at Bloor House in the city, where there was also the setting up of the Women's Electoral Lobby.

Many of these events were before my time, but I am very pleased to report that it was certainly in the late 1970s, when I was a member of Women's Liberation and also the Women's Electoral Lobby, that many of the women who are today in Parliaments—certainly on our side of the House, and I believe some of the women from the other side—started to be politicised.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Last year the Minister for Human Services released a report: The Economic Cost of Child Abuse and Neglect in South Australia. It is a very well documented report, very well prepared jointly by the Office for Families and Children and the Australian Institute of Family Studies. In the five minutes that I have available to me today I will not be able to refer to as much of the report as I would like and I intend to further discuss this report on another occasion. However, I want to refer to some of the issues that are raised through the Executive Summary.

The primary objective of the report was to arrive at a valid account of annual fiscal and economic expenditure on child abuse and neglect in South Australia. We learnt from the report that the fiscal year for which expenditure on child abuse and neglect was calculated was 1995-96, this being the latest year for which the most complete data were available, at the time of the commencement of the project. With the exception of costs associated with the inter-generational transmission of child abuse and neglect, only expenditure incurred or likely to be incurred in the fiscal year under consideration was entered into calculation of the total cost of child abuse and neglect. This means, for example, that expenditure on services to adults necessitated by the experience of abuse as children does not feature in the final calculation.

We are told in the Executive Summary that instances of child abuse and neglect formally reported to the relevant agencies yielded an incidence of .8 and 1.6 per cent among children in South Australia. However, it is generally recognised that the real incidence of child abuse and neglect is considerably in excess of that represented by the number of cases subject to mandatory reporting. For the purpose of the present exercise, the real incidence of child abuse and neglect in the State was conservatively estimated to be 5 per cent, thus the majority of instances of child abuse and neglect do not become formally known as such.

Nonetheless, expenditure is incurred in providing services to unidentified victims as a consequence of their abuse, and such abuse must be estimated in any attempt to arrive at an appreciation of the total cost of child abuse and neglect to the State. What we learnt coming out of that is absolutely staggering and, in my opinion, quite frightening. For example, fiscal expenditure incurred during 1995-96 in responding to known instances of child abuse and neglect amounted to $41.41 million. Fiscal expenditure incurred during 1995-96 in responding to child abuse and neglect not reported as such to child protection services was calculated to be $10.18 million. Thus, the total fiscal expenditure associated with child abuse and neglect in South Australia during 1995-96 is conservatively estimated at $51.59 million. I find that quite incredible. But, of course, that does not cover the total picture, regrettably.

In addition to fiscal expenditure on child protection and related services further costs are incurred as a consequence of responding to abuse related child death, disability, injury and impairment, including impairment of the capacity to be able subsequently to parent. In the present instance, following consideration of international literature, the expenditure likely to be involved in so responding was calculated on the basis of a willingness to pay model on the related costs. The economic costs associated with child abuse and neglect were calculated to be $303.33 million on this basis.

Accordingly, the combined economic and fiscal expenditure incurred as a consequence of child abuse and neglect in South Australia during 1995-96 is conservatively estimated at $354.92 million. Because of a relative lack of specific information, largely a consequence of inadequacies in current recording systems, the reported calculations of fiscal and economic costs of child abuse and neglect rely heavily upon estimates both of actual expenditure and of the incidence and prevalence of child abuse and neglect in South Australia. Although the estimates arrived at are conservative and are based on transparent assumptions, the improved information gathering of course would eliminate much of the need for dependence on estimations of expenditure. Therefore, I strongly support the recommendation that came out of that report. The recommendation is:

> That arrangements be put in place as early as possible to ensure that appropriate accurate information is routinely recorded by all relevant agencies in South Australia on service demand and on expenditure attributable to child abuse and neglect and that regular reporting mechanisms are established.

It is my intention to speak at more length on this issue and to refer to other matters raised in this report. I encourage all members of the House to obtain a copy of the report through the office of the Minister for Human Services and study the

report and recommendations, which all South Australians should be aware of in this very important issue.

Ms BREUER (Giles): When I came into this Parliament nobody warned me about the drivel I would have to listen to from the other side about jobs in this State. Once again today we have had to listen to the Minister for Employment and the Minister for Industry and Trade talk about what a wonderful job they are doing for the economy and small business in this State. It makes my blood boil—it is bad for my blood pressure, because I get so angry. Perhaps this is the case in Adelaide, but what a joke it is in country South Australia. The Minister went on today about creating long-term sustainable jobs in this State. Why, with this so-called commitment to regional development and jobs in regional South Australia, is the Government allowing contracts in regional towns to go to Adelaide firms to the detriment of local employers and businesses and the loss of jobs in these centres?

In Whyalla in the past few months approximately $300 000 worth of roofing has been let out by the South Australian Housing Trust and it has all gone to out of town contractors. In these cases there is only something less than a 2 per cent margin in the tender price. One particular firm in Whyalla—a firm called Carlson & Sons—has just laid off four people as a result of losing out on Government contracts. One of those people was employed by that company for 20 years. The firm was established in Whyalla over 50 years ago as a plumbing and roofing firm and has done work for all those years for the South Australian Housing Trust since it started business. The past two years it has found it harder and harder to be competitive in its tenders. They have had staff on the payroll and have met Government requirements such as WorkCover, superannuation and long service leave payments. The trust tender documents put out clearly state under section 3.22, industrial relations:

> All workers are paid in accordance with the ward classification appropriate to the position of employment as well as all applicable award conditions and industry standards.

This is clearly not the case with contractors who have been successful over them in the tender process and there appears to be no monitoring of the conditions of the tender. Section 3.19 also states:

> All workmen are to be skilled tradesmen employed on a day labour basis.

In Whyalla the roofers working at present are receiving a set sum per roof. Section 3.12 states:

> Sunday work will not be permitted under any circumstances.

This is not the case, as they worked all day on 28 February. It is a catch 22 situation for these local firms. Unless they change their business structure to match the contractors from Adelaide, they will not be successful and in doing this they are then in breach of the contract conditions.

This is just an example of one company that has suffered in rural and regional South Australia, but it is happening all over the State. I have heard this same cry from so many different areas of the State. Hospitals are doing the same—they are letting out contracts to city firms. Schools are doing the same and their work is going to Adelaide firms. How can people in country South Australia possibly compete with the attitude of this Government that comes in here and tries to tell us that it is all about creating jobs, is opening up an Office of Regional Development but in practice is continuing to let our companies suffer in regional South Australia? That is the first point.

Secondly, I want some information from the Minister for Education, who had a lot to say today. I want to know what is happening in Whyalla. Is there to be a school review of the schools in Whyalla? Again jobs will be lost if we lose a school in Whyalla. There has been much discussion and rumours are rampant, to the detriment of school enrolments in one of the high schools in Whyalla. Principals have been asked to submit ideas on how schools can be managed or remanaged. What do they mean? It is all top secret, by the way. Nobody is saying anything publicly. Whyalla High School has been asked to move its AGM a week ahead in case a review is put in process. Nobody can find out why. Nobody has been told officially that a review is in process.

Principals met in the district office on Tuesday—why? I believe senior departmental officers have been in schools in Whyalla this week—why? Nobody is saying anything. Last year there was a letter from Dennis Ralph, who is now obsolete, saying that no review was planned in Whyalla. If there is to be a review all stakeholders would be involved. But it appears now that there will be a review process. If all stakeholders are involved, at what level will this occur? Will communities be brought in at the end when decisions have already been made, as in the past in a previous review of schools in Whyalla? I took part in that review. All the information is driven by the department and self-fulfilling prophecies come out of this. We want to know in Whyalla. It is affecting staff and student morale. It is a real problem in our city. We want to know what is happening. Is there a review of Whyalla schools?

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I rise to address the House on the proposed sale of ETSA and Optima. Yesterday I spelt out some important reasons why this sale must go ahead. I spoke of debt and the need to get rid of the debt we inherited from the Labor Party. I spoke of the risk, which the Labor Party, the Democrats and the Independents seem totally incapable of understanding. I spoke about the need for some common sense in regard to balancing the books in this State. I want to continue that argument and talk a little more about the Australian Democrats and the Independents because I accept that, although the ALP is making a major blunder in opposing the sale of ETSA and Optima, they are joined in this debacle by the Democrats and the Independents, particularly in the Upper House, the Hon. Nick Xenophon specifically.

The Democrats never cease to astound me. I referred to them yesterday as gnomes and fairies at the end of the garden. There they are with their scattergun approach: we like this policy; we like that policy; we will grab a bit of this and we will grab a bit of that, throw it in the cake tin, mix it up and chuck it in the oven. We are sitting back, wondering what on earth they will do next, so that we can be completely astounded at the direction they will take. The ETSA debate has been a good example of their total inability to grapple with any complex issue, their total irresponsibility in regard to fiscal management and their preparedness to make blind promises willy-nilly.

Mr ATKINSON: On a point of order, Sir, I understood that the ETSA privatisation legislation was still on the Notice Paper of both Houses of Parliament and the honourable member is canvassing that legislation. Secondly, he continues to make extensive reference to voting and debates in another place.

The SPEAKER: If the Chair was to curtail all discussion on ETSA, both sides would be stifled to an extent that is

probably unacceptable in this Chamber. However, I ask the honourable member to refrain from referring to anything that is to do with votes that are likely to be taken in the other place. On those grounds, I will let the honourable member proceed.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Speaker. I applaud the member for Spence for his point of order—one of thousands throughout this debate designed to interfere with the course of the discussion and addressing the real issues. We have the Democrats in the other Chamber—supposedly being independent—going along with the Labor Party on the blockage of the sale. We have the Hon. Nick Xenophon, who had an opportunity to do the right thing by his constituency, but chose to ignore it.

Moving along, the ultimate irony would be if, at some time in the future, the Australian Labor Party was to find itself, to everyone's total astonishment, in Government and faced with the debacle of what to do about a plunging ETSA and Optima—an ETSA and Optima unable to compete in a new competitive, deregulated marketplace and urgently requiring millions of dollars of capital investment simply to keep up. The ultimate irony would be if the Labor Party then turned around and said: 'Oh my gosh, people of South Australia, we have suddenly discovered that ETSA and Optima are a liability and we might have to sell them.' I have no doubt that sooner or later ETSA and Optima will be sold. A Government will have to do it because commonsense dictates that it be so. Would it not be funny if it is the Labor Party that has to inherit the mess, following the earlier State Bank success?

An even greater catastrophe would be if the people of South Australia elected yet another hung Parliament because, if there is one message from the ETSA/Optima debate it is this: if people want to elect instability and chaos, then vote Independent or vote Democrat: those who keep the bastards honest until they decide to become one of the bastards themselves by joining the Labor Party, as in the case of the great Cheryl Kernot. If the people of South Australia want indecisive Government, they know how to go about it: simply avoid voting for one of the major Parties. Only they can deliver competent and sensible Government to the State.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I wish to speak today about children with special learning needs and about their teachers and their parents who also experience great frustration and difficulty as they try to provide an education and a future for children, who, for some reason, do not learn the way most of us learn. There are many forms of learning needs, whether these be academic learning or behavioural learning. We all know that, if a child has difficulty conforming to normal classroom behaviour, they have even greater difficulty learning the disciplines of various academic subjects that we set for them. There has been a tendency recently to focus on medical needs, things such as ADHD and sometimes brain damage at birth.

I do not want to in any way detract from the importance of these difficulties. Certainly, in my own family experience, we have dealt with and are still dealing with the frustrations and the need for support of children whose brain was damaged at birth and who have ADHD. We also need to look at the social and cultural factors involved in supporting people whose academic potential is not high (as currently defined) and who have difficulty conforming to normal classroom behaviour. There are just too many indications at the moment that would tell us that poor parents equal dumb children. Now, I have absolutely no reason to believe that brains are distributed by local government area. We are all born with different potentials and different abilities, but the bit in our brain that says that we will do well in terms of what pays money in the labour market these days is not determined by where you are born and where your parents live.

However, in western society there is too much evidence that would suggest it is the case. While enjoying the luxury of browsing the Internet the other night, I noticed a hierarchy of achievement for the United Kingdom educational system. The *London Times* published a ranking of achievement for educational authorities. I consulted someone who has local knowledge about the poverty rates associated with these areas and, lo and behold, I was assured that, if anyone gave a table of average incomes of the areas concerned, the ranking would be almost identical to that of the educational achievements of the children. We have indications that this is the case here with previous rankings that have been published and also information about access to tertiary education being very limited for children who come from areas where their parents are poor.

It distresses me greatly that when we have these situations we end up with the recent events of the flexible resources being a bargaining chip in an industrial dispute. This means that the most vulnerable children, parents and teachers in our community, those who have need for special emphasis in their education and special support, were put at risk as part of the bargaining process about what pay teachers deserved. I think this is an absolute scandal. The *London Times* article was accompanied by another which indicated that some of the State run schools—I need to be careful with my terminology here—are imitating the private schools (what they call public schools) in trying to achieve the same results as the private schools. What are they doing? They are having smaller class sizes, specialist subject teachers and they are using a system known as setting, which, I am assured by educational authorities around here, is well-known in South Australia, too.

It involves allowing children with similar learning levels to learn in a group of about 15 to 20 so that they are all able to achieve, so that none is being bored and none is feeling unduly challenged. Apparently simple methods are known for how we can achieve—

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

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): I am delighted to follow the member for Waite, who is obviously suffering a huge dose of self-denial—

Ms Thompson: You followed me.

Mr McEWEN: On this side I followed the member for Waite—and have more respect for yourself madam—who is obviously tilling the soil for a Democrat in his electorate after the next election. What I would like to do is very briefly attempt to reconstruct the ETSA/Optima debate in the hope that we can stop this culture of blame and accept some sort of mutual responsibility for resolving the impasse. What we ought to at least be doing is accepting that we have to find an alternative, rather than simply oppose this ill-conceived proposition. It was interesting that prior to 17 February last year, the day on which the Premier started down this path, we all accepted that we did have a cost price squeeze in this State, that there were undue pressures on the expenditure side—a whole lot of unexpected consequences as part of the High Court decision and other matters on the revenue side—

and we did have over $7 billion worth of debt, of which about half is State Bank debt and no more. We continue to talk about the State Bank debt, but it is a lot more than that. There was residual debt. It is interesting to observe that we are back to pre State Bank debt levels as a State, so some good was done in the first term of the Liberal Government.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

Mr McEWEN: As a per cent of revenue we are. Minister, you might like to check that out. The other thing was that the national electricity market created some risk exposure to this State that had not existed before. There we were with a couple of pressures on us—a revenue pressure and a risk pressure—and suddenly someone has a bright idea. They jumped too quickly from problems to an over simplistic solution. The light goes on: let us sell ETSA and Optima. Yes, let us sell ETSA and Optima, for a number of reasons, and reduce the risk exposure and redress the debt component of this cost price squeeze about which we are talking. Suddenly, we saw the $2 million a day, which again was not particularly honourable because it was presented in terms of a $2 million a day interest payment on State Bank debt. Again that was not true because less than half of that interest component was State Bank debt. The rest of it was a residual debt, that debt that we obviously carry—and there is nothing wrong with some debt.

But the bright idea itself was a gross oversimplification, because there are at least seven entities within ETSA-Optima. There are three generation entities; a transmission entity; what I call a poles and wires business; a distribution entity; and, obviously, a retail business. If the Government had approached them differently in terms of both risk and the fact that they could be used in some way to address debt, it would have come up with quite a different matrix and quite a complex response instead of this bland generalisation: sell the lot. So, we got ourselves into a trap.

Of course, the wheels fell off totally when we moved from failure to move that agenda to the threat. So we had the carrot: now comes the stick. I believe that the final insult to the electorate was to say, 'If you will not wear this grossly over-simplistic approach to debt reduction and risk reduction, we will belt you over the head with a tax.' That is politics of the 1980s: that is not recognising that the Government of the day does not have the numbers in either place, so it just cannot ram through Kennett style bland over-simplistic approaches to difficult complex questions.

However, I accept that we have a responsibility not just to criticise but also to say that there is an alternative and to ask where we move, which means we have to come back to say that there are some issues with respect to revenue and service delivery, and one of the fundamental questions is, 'What is the Federal-State taxing relationship at the moment?' Here we are moving towards the centenary of Federation. We have the opportunity to again ask the Federal Government, 'Where do you sit in this relationship?' and 'Why have you pushed too many service responsibilities to the States without the cash for them?' And we might have to make a couple of very bold statements, one of which might be, 'Give health back.' Health and education account for close to 70 per cent of the total expenditure of this State. So much of that has been pushed onto us from the Federal Government without the appropriate resources to service it. Its bickie bin is overflowing. There are plenty of our tax dollars in that bickie bin. They are still our dollars. Bring some of those dollars back or shift some of those services in the other direction.

MEMBERS' COMMENTS

Ms KEY (Hanson): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Ms KEY: During Question Time today the Premier and the Minister for Local Government attributed words, reason and intent to my address outside the House to the PSA members who were assembled, and I would like to give an explanation as to where I differ. At about 1.30 p.m. today I was asked to speak to the PSA members who were outside Parliament House not as a result of a wage claim, which was reported in the House today by Minister Armitage, Minister Brindal and the Premier, but because a junior member of staff of the Department of Lands—it may even be two members of staff—had been instantly dismissed. I understand that they had been dismissed because (and it is not clear whether they were or they were not), allegedly, they have been involved in industrial action with regard to the wage claim.

I believe that my address was misinterpreted by the three members opposite. What I discussed was the draft industrial relations Bill and the issue of unfair dismissal. I did not talk about the wage claim: I talked about the merits of dismissal and unfair dismissal in this State. I believe that the Premier, the Minister for Government Enterprises and the Minister for Local Government have misrepresented what I said.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON WATER ALLOCATION IN THE SOUTH-EAST

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): By leave, I move:

That the committee have leave to sit during the sitting of the House today.

Motion carried.

LIVESTOCK (COMMENCEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for Act to amend the Livestock Act 1997. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: 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.

Current provisions within the *Livestock Act 1997* provide for the commencement of provisions dealing with apiaries and brands as of the 20th March 1999.

The proposed amendment will ensure that the *Apiaries Act 1931, Brands Act 1933* and the *Branding of Pigs Act 1964* will continue to regulate apiaries and brands beyond that date.

This is seen to be necessary for the following reasons. The Government, through ARMCANZ, has recently committed to the introduction of a National Livestock Identification Scheme for the livestock industries of this State. This initiative substantially changes the perspective and context of the regulations necessary to underpin the provisions in the *Livestock Act 1997* relating to branding of livestock. Extensive industry consultation will therefore be necessary for these regulations. The identification of pigs, an essential component of disease control, will also be brought within the scope of any new regulations.

The apiary industry in this State is currently considering recommendations on a future disease control strategy developed in 1998 by a Ministerial Apiary Industry Task Force. New regulations will be developed after this consultative process has been completed.

The new regulations will be made under the *Livestock Act 1997* and, at the time that the regulations are made, Parts 6 and 7 of that Act and the provisions for repeal of the relevant Act will be brought into operation.

I commend the Bill to honourable members.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 2—Commencement

This clause ensures that Part 6 relating to apiaries, Part 7 relating to brands and Schedule 2 providing for repeal of the relevant Acts governing those matters will not be subject to the provisions for automatic commencement in section 7(5) of the *Acts Interpretation Act 1915*.

Clause 3: Amendment of Sched. 2—Repeal and Transitional Provisions

This clause removes clause 3 of Schedule 2 which excludes the Schedule from the application of section 7(5) of the *Acts Interpretation Act 1915*. Under the measure the matter is dealt with in the new section 2(2) in a comprehensive manner that extends to the substantive provisions of the *Livestock Act* that will be used to replace the Acts repealed by Schedule 2.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (INTOXICATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Industry and Trade): 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.

The current law on the effect of intoxication by drink or drugs in South Australia is the common law. The common law is determined by the courts. In this instance, the law is contained in the decision of the High Court in *O'Connor* (1979) 146 CLR 64. The general principles involved can be stated quite simply, but they have complex ramifications.

Serious crimes require the prosecution to prove criminal fault as well as the behaviour forbidden by the law. For example, the crime of murder requires proof beyond reasonable doubt, not only that the accused caused the death of another human being in fact, but also that he or she did so with 'malice aforethought': that is, an intention to kill or cause grievous bodily harm, or was reckless about it. If, for any reason, the prosecution cannot prove that intention or recklessness, the accused cannot be found guilty of murder. The operative question is always what did the accused—the individual before the court—know or intend. It is not what he or she ought to have known or intended. *O'Connor* decided that intoxication can be relevant evidence, like anything else personal to the accused, that the accused did not have the required intention or knowledge.

The position can be summarised as follows. Drunkenness is not a defence of itself. There is, it must be emphasised, no such thing as the 'Drunk's Defence' It does not exist. Its true relevance by way of defence is that when a jury is deciding whether an accused has the intention or recklessness required by the charge, they must regard all the evidence, including evidence as to the accused's drunken or intoxicated state, drawing such inferences from the evidence as appears proper in the circumstances.

It should be made clear at this point that, in order to rebut the inference of intention or knowledge that you and I, and juries, normally draw from what an accused said or did, what is involved in these cases is not mere intoxication, but very severe intoxication indeed; usually very high degrees of alcohol consumption and quite often a combination of alcohol and other drugs. What is necessary is not a drink or two, but a degree of intoxication at which the defendant is barely conscious or has such a severe degree of intoxication that his or her ability to act intentionally is or may be compromised. This is a very uncommon situation.

Although this has been the common law in Australia for nearly 20 years, the recent and much publicised acquittal in *Nadruku* has provoked some outrage, principally because there is, understandably, a deal of misunderstanding of the principles at stake. The Opposition has seized upon this case as a political issue without any regard for its legal or ethical ramifications. The Shadow Attorney-General introduced a Private Members' Bill into the Parliament to reverse the general principles involved and overrule the *O'Connor* principles. In the meantime, the Attorney-General released a Discussion Paper for public comment. The Discussion Paper included the contents of and commentary on three possible models for changing the *O'Connor* principles, including that espoused by the Shadow Attorney-General. In the event, the Shadow Attorney-General successfully moved to amend his Bill so that it incorporated another option for change, one of those set out in the Discussion Paper. The irony of that sudden change of heart is that his Bill now leaves the *O'Connor* position in place, despite the fact that he deplores it, and distorts the trial process instead. The Bill passed this House. I will return to that Bill in a moment.

This issue, or rather set of issues, goes to the very heart of the criminal justice system and to the central basis on which society attributes criminal responsibility. It is not clear that any reform is needed at all. There are three main reasons for saying so.

First, the general criminal law requires proof by the Crown beyond a reasonable doubt that the accused not only did what was prohibited, but also did so voluntarily and had the fault required by the offence. It has done so for very sound reasons based on the personal responsibility of the individual for the crimes that he or she has committed, and has done so for the past 50 years at least. In serious crimes, that fault will usually take the form of intention, recklessness or knowledge. Intoxication, self-induced or not, can in fact be evidence which is capable of denying that the act was voluntary or was done with the requisite fault.

The logic and rectitude of the general principles is sufficiently compelling to have persuaded the highest courts in Australia, New Zealand and Canada that the common law rule is right. Any exception to that general rule must be carefully thought through. Any exception to that general rule will be an exception to the general rules that our society has developed to attribute criminal responsibility justly.

The public debate in this State seems to have proceeded on the assumption, and, sometimes, the assertion, that the so-called 'drunk's defence' is only a problem for South Australia and Victoria. Everywhere else, it is said, does not have this alleged problem. This is not true. In Australia, for example, intoxication can be used to lower criminal liability in all States and Territories. It is true that other States and territories have special legislation on the subject—but none of them say that intoxication is not relevant to criminal liability. The same is true, for example, for the United Kingdom. In Canada, the law is the same as it is in South Australia.

Second, there is no evidence that *Nadruku* is anything but an isolated instance. A study of South Australian records by the Director of Public Prosecutions has revealed that the only instance of an outright acquittal on the grounds of lack of intention caused by self-induced intoxication was one decision of a District Court Judge without a jury and that decision was very dubious indeed. (As an aside, this may be the one case which could persuade the Opposition to support the Government's Bill to give the DPP a right of appeal against an acquittal where the trial is by Judge alone in order to ensure that such a decision can be challenged in future).

If intoxication has any legal effect on criminal responsibility, it will be that the accused is acquitted of a more serious charge because of intoxication and convicted of a less serious charge. This is due to the differing fault structures of more serious and less serious offences. For example, while murder requires proof of intention or recklessness, manslaughter does not and the intoxicated killer is caught by the manslaughter offence. There are sound reasons why there are so few such acquittals. It is notorious that arguing intoxication as a defendant can be a two edged sword—for juries, like anyone else, are likely to see in the intoxication of the accused the reason why he or she did something out of the ordinary rather than as a reason for acquittal. Common experience says, rightly, that people under the influence of alcohol become less inhibited by social norms and more likely to commit anti-social behaviour. Juries apply common-sense.

Third, any 'solution' may well be as bad as or worse than the problem it seeks to cure. This problem in the law is not new—it has been the subject of constant discussion in courts and law reform bodies and among commentators for a century or more. There have

been many reports devoted to it. The inescapable fact is that all that time and energy has not produced a 'solution' to the 'problem' which is satisfactory and works, let alone works simply. Previous options for change are complicated and require a great deal of explanation to juries and will lead to more appeals and more retrials. Previous options for change will lead to results which are, according to the general principles of the criminal law, unjust to some degree and which derogate from the purpose of the criminal offence concerned by including within its range of penalties people who have not committed the relevant offence at all.

It is therefore with the greatest of reluctance and extreme caution that legislation on this subject should be introduced at all.

What is wrong with current South Australian law? The main objection appears to be that it leads to what are seen to be undeserved acquittals. Some would say that it does not matter if the general principles are right if they get to the wrong result—or that the judgment that the principles are right is in itself shown to be wrong by their results. Mr Nadruku, it is said, should be convicted. The principal reason for such an argument, aside from unreasoned and primitive reliance upon the fact that he did the act alone and that should suffice, appears to be that his fault lay in the fact that he voluntarily allowed himself to become so intoxicated in the first place. That is, his fault in becoming so drunk replaces and stands in for the fault that should lie at the heart of his conviction for assault.

There is a clear collision of principles at work in this debate. On the one hand, we have the general principles of criminal responsibility based on the exercise of personal autonomy in the choice to act badly in a way prohibited by the criminal law under criminal sanction. We do not punish people just for what they do, we punish them for what they choose to do. On the other hand, we have the perception that if people choose to become intoxicated, that is their choice—and they cannot be heard to say that the drink (or the drug or whatever it is) made me do it; they should not be able to avoid the criminal consequences of their actions in the much wider sense.

The Opposition's Bill would not be a good development. The form of the Bill at the moment is that of the creation of a new offence of causing harm through criminally irresponsible drug use. The essence of the scheme is that, where a person is found not guilty of an offence because of the effects of self-induced intoxication, they would be found guilty of this offence instead, and be subject to major penalties amounting in most cases to two-thirds of the maximum prescribed for the offence of which he or she was acquitted.

The first official suggestion of this kind was made by the (English) Butler Committee in 1975. Most recently, it was initially favoured by the English Law Commission, before being rejected after consultation. The proposal has also been rejected by the Victorian Law Reform Commission, the Review of Commonwealth Criminal Law, and the New Zealand Criminal Law Reform Committee. It has not been adopted in any jurisdiction, although it was advocated by the Law Reform Commission of Canada.

The reasons for its failure as a general model for reform may be summarised as follows:

1. it would encourage compromise jury verdicts;
2. it is impossible to properly align any appropriate penalty with any rational scale of offending;
3. it would engender more trials and more issues at trial;
4. it would lead to increase in the necessity for expert evidence on behalf of the prosecution and hence the defence;
5. it would be likely to require the prosecution to prove a causal link between the intoxication and the crime; and
6. it lacks any coherent penal rationale because self induced intoxication is simply not a reliable index of criminal blameworthiness.

The Bill produced by the Opposition has several specific flaws:

First, the provision sets the penalty for the alternative offence by reference to the criminal offence which the accused did not commit. There is an obvious logical flaw in this form of reasoning. That aside, however, there is the practical problem of determining *which* offence it was that the accused did *not* commit. For example, a physical attack on the victim might be charged as attempted murder, malicious wounding or assault occasioning actual bodily harm, depending on the intent with which it was done. But with this alternative offence there is no intent. The facts could fit any of the three. Which is the right one? It could make a major difference in penalty.

Second, the intoxicated defendant is to be convicted of the alternative offence provided that the harm done was foreseeable. The possible maximum penalties range up to 20 years. Apart from cases involving vehicular accidents, which have always been regarded as an exception, liability for crimes against the person have always required at least proof of criminal negligence, which is a far more exacting standard than mere foreseeability. There is simply no justification for singling out states of intoxication—which can be mild, moderate or severe—the Bill does not specify—for the imposition of this draconian imposition of criminal punishment.

Third, the result of the width of the provision, both in terms of its definition of intoxication and the very low standard of fault required, will be that in any prosecution in which there is any evidence that the accused had even one drink, it will be in the interests of the prosecution to prove that the defendant was intoxicated and in the interests of the defendant to prove that he or she was not. This anomalous position will complicate many more trials than is now the case and will lead to long and confusing jury directions, more appeals and more retrials.

Fourth, where the defendant is charged with the alternative offence directly, the prosecution would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that (a) the defendant caused injury, damage or loss to person or property; (b) the defendant is not guilty of some other criminal offence; (c) because the defendant suffered from a "suppression, impairment or distortion of consciousness" and (d) this was a consequence of self induced intoxication. Apart from the fact, noted above, that the Bill does not provide any guidance on how the more serious offence is to be identified, the bizarre consequence is that the prosecution is required to prove beyond reasonable doubt that the defendant is *innocent* of that unspecified offence before the alternative applies.

Fifth, where the alternative offence arises because it may be that the defendant will be acquitted of the more serious charge because of the effects of intoxication, the situation is different. In such a case, acquittal means that there is a reasonable doubt that the prosecution has made out its case. Presumably, the jury will be invited to state whether they have come to that conclusion because they have a reasonable doubt that the defendant had the required intention or knowledge because of intoxication. At that point, however, no one has proved anything about intoxication. It is simply that the accused has raised a reasonable doubt. The proposed Bill appears to require conviction of the alternative offence in that situation. It is to say the least odd that the effect of raising a reasonable doubt as to the existence of the fault required by the offence is a ground for a conviction of a serious offence.

Sixth, the alternative offence applies to cases in which the defendant caused injury, damage or loss to another but not to any of the offences of endangerment contained in the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act*. It is also arguable that it cannot apply in relation to any attempted offence or conspiracy to commit an offence. The possible complexities involved in relating the alternative offence sensibly to the law of complicity—that is, the law of participation in crime—are technical and forbidding.

It might be possible to reconstruct the basic idea of an alternative offence along the lines formulated by the United Kingdom Law Commission so that these obstacles could be minimised, should the basic concept prove appealing. But the Law Commission did abandon it and no other jurisdiction which has considered the model has proceeded with it.

There is good reason for that. It is simply that the solution proposed by the Opposition will make the law dealing with the intoxicated offender worse rather than better. The Director of Public Prosecutions, in his letter to all Members of Parliament made this point when he said:

> 'It will also result in juries opting for an alternative when the reality of the situation is that had that option not been available they would have convicted of the principal offence.'.

He also referred to the 'real spectre of inappropriate alternative verdicts'. This has been a consistent reason for the failure of any State or country to implement this kind of solution.

In short, the Opposition's Bill means that intoxicated offenders may stand a good chance of being treated more leniently than they are at present.

There was outcry when *O'Connor* was decided in 1979. It was the same then as now. This was going to be a 'Drunkard's Charter'. *O'Connor* was going to be the cause of lots of drunks being let off when they did not deserve it. The 'drunks defence' was going to be the cause of unchecked drunken violence in our community and the courts were going to let them get away with it. Of course, it did not happen. Offenders were punished as they deserved. Justice was done. The moral panic had no foundation. The predictions were false.

Nothing of the kind happened. And it is not happening now, despite the pretences and misleading information peddled by the Opposition.

These are difficult issues to explain to the general public or to most people who do not have an understanding of the underlying principles of the criminal law and how it works—and aims at justice based on individual responsibility. That is not their fault. This is not simple or easy. The basis on which society labels people as criminals and sends them to jail justly (or imposes any lesser sanction) has never been an easy or simple question. It is the subject of perennial debate.

But there is community concern about the perceived problem, in part because of the determined and irresponsible desire of the Opposition to keep fanning the flames. So the Government has decided to address two issues surrounding the issue of intoxication and criminal responsibility which would benefit from clarification by this Bill. The debate has identified these two issues which, if addressed as proposed in the Bill, particularly the issue relating to the address to a jury, should provide positive outcomes and reduce the 'games' that may be played.

To that end, the Bill has two purposes.

First, it makes it clear that the common law principles do not apply if the person became intoxicated in order to strengthen his or her resolve to carry out the conduct constituting the offence. A similar rule was stated in *Gallagher* [1963] AC 349, as follows:

> 'If a man, while sane and sober, forms an intention to kill and makes preparation for it, knowing it is a wrong thing to do, and then gets himself drunk so as to give himself Dutch courage to do the killing, and whilst drunk carries out his intention, he cannot rely on this self-induced drunkenness as a defence to a charge of murder, nor even as reducing it to manslaughter. He cannot say that he got himself into such a stupid state that he was incapable of an intent to kill.'.

The second thing that the Bill does is procedural rather than substantive, but it is likely to have a powerful effect. It is well known amongst criminal legal practitioners that running an intoxication argument is very much a two-edged sword. Quite apart from the obvious risk that the jury is more likely to ascribe responsibility on the basis that the intoxication did not prevent the formation of the required fault, but rather inspired it, it is also the case that on questions of credibility as to the facts, the jury is likely to discount the evidence of a person who was self-admittedly intoxicated as opposed to the evidence of a sober witness. That being so, defence counsel tend to lead evidence of intoxication without making too much of it, or let the prosecution lead it, and rely on the established law that, if there is a reasonable possibility that intoxication could have affected the fault of the accused, the trial judge must give a full direction on it. If the result is an acquittal, well and good. If there is a conviction, then it can all be ventilated on appeal and a new trial may be had. This is not only a waste of resources, it is also the source of the decisions which cause public misunderstanding. Therefore the Bill contains a provision that says that the trial judge should only direct the jury on the effects of intoxication on fault where the defence specifically requests it to be done. This is designed to ensure that if the defence wants to deny guilt because of intoxication, the case has to be run on that basis the first time and not on appeal.

For these reasons, I urge the House to support the Bill introduced by the Government.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of heading

Clause 2 renumbers Part 8 of the Act (a short Part dealing with accessaries) as Part 7A. This allows for the inclusion of the new Part dealing with intoxication in a logical sequence.

Clause 3: Enactment of new Part 8

Clause 3 enacts new Part 8 dealing with intoxication. New section 267A contains the definitions required for the purposes of the new Part. New section 268 provides that, if the objective elements of an alleged offence cannot be established against a defendant because the defendant's consciousness was, or may have been, impaired to the point of criminal irresponsibility at the time of the alleged offence, the defendant is nevertheless to be convicted of the offence if it is established that the defendant formed an intention to commit the offence before becoming intoxicated and consumed intoxicants in order to strengthen his or her resolve to commit the offence. New section 269 provides that the question whether a defendant's consciousness was, or may have been, impaired to the point of criminal irresponsibility is not to be put to the jury and, if raised by the jury itself, is to be withdrawn from the jury's consideration unless the defendant specifically asks the judge to address the jury on the question.

Mr ATKINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

EVIDENCE (CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Industry and Trade): 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.

In recent years, the law of sexual assault, be it substantive, procedural or evidentiary, has been changed by Parliaments and, to a lesser degree, the judiciary, to provide more protections for the complainants of sexual assault. Statutory provisions have precluded the use of evidence of general sexual reputation and restricted greatly the use of evidence of prior sexual history in particular, extended the notion of consent, protected complainants from extended and exploratory cross-examination in preliminary hearings, abolished the legal requirement of corroboration of the complainant's story, and modified the strict common law on the doctrine of recent complaint. In addition, in the area of law dealing with child complainant, the Parliament has substantially widened the ability of children to give sworn evidence, provided for the ability of children to give evidence while screened from the accused or via closed circuit television and created a wholly new offence of maintaining a sexual relationship with a child.

These reforms have, in many ways, changed the face and the balance of the criminal trial for sexual offences. Of course, they were designed to do that, but these charges are invariably serious and most often highly contentious. They go to the heart of the gender debate in this society, as well as to individual justice to the complainant and the accused. There are some who doubt the fairness and justice of them taken as a whole. Often, the trial will come down to the word of the complainant against the word of the accused and the presumption of innocence, and that is a highly subjective balance in any individual case. Nevertheless, Parliaments across the common law world, including the South Australian Parliament, have decided, in effect, to enact a wide range of measures, many of which are designed to greatly restrict the traditional ways in which the defence can seek to undermine the credibility of the complainant in cases of sexual assault allegations. Not surprisingly, defence counsel have sought ways in which to circumvent these restrictions. One of the main ways in which that has been done in recent times is for the defence to seek to undermine the credibility of the complainant by gaining access to the psychiatric or treatment history rather than the sexual history of the complainant. The point is to get hold of material which may be used to undermine the credibility of the complainant as a witness. These may be records made either before or after the alleged incident which is the subject of the charge.

The general legal technique involved in the defence attempt to gain access to the counselling or medical records of the complainant is the use of the legal order known as the *subpoena*. The *subpoena* is an order of the court directing the person or persons named in the *subpoena* to deliver the documents or things named in the *subpoena* to the court. It is issued on application by a party to an action or criminal matter, but it is vital to note at this point that the *subpoena* does not authorise the delivery of the documents or things named in the *subpoena* to the party who is the applicant for the *subpoena*. The *subpoena* is an order of the court and failure to comply with it is a contempt of the court. It is therefore an order with a sanction, disobeyed at peril.

The test for the issue of a *subpoena* is relatively clear in law. In order to justify this legal intrusion on the rights of a third party, the applicant for the *subpoena* has the onus of showing that they have a legitimate forensic purpose in the production of the documents or things which includes the notion that the applicant must show that access would materially assist the accused in his or her defence. The applicant does not have access to inspect the documents or things in order to get the *subpoena*. It follows, therefore, that the applicant

must have some external information demonstrating the worth of the *subpoena*. Otherwise the application will be dismissed as what is technically known, in graphic terms, as a "fishing expedition". It is, therefore, usually necessary for the applicant to disclose, at least to some extent, its case to the court in order to get the order.

The documents produced in compliance with the *subpoena* are produced to the judge. The judge then examines them. Under South Australian law, the court must then rule whether the documents produced are 'relevant'. It is clear that does not mean that they are admissible in evidence. It does mean that there must be an assessment by the court that the documents in question must be capable of assisting in the proof or denial of some issue relevant in the proceedings. The test of relevance is evidentiary value not admissibility. For example, the documents may well be inadmissible of themselves but provide a basis on which a witness may be cross-examined as to credit. If the documents are relevant in that sense, or any part of them is, the court will release the whole or that part to the party for that purpose.

The specific problem in question is that some of those accused of sexual offences are employing the device of the *subpoena* to try to obtain copies of notes made during the counselling or treatment of the complainant or another person related in some way to the trial. This practice is causing serious concerns among the sexual assault counselling services and their staff and other concerned members of the community.

Their argument is to the effect that access to these records should be very tightly controlled. Some would have it prevented altogether. The substance of the arguments in favour of this general direction in the law are as follows. First, breach of the confidential relationship between client and counsellor would be detrimental to the effectiveness of counselling because the client would be likely to be less than full and frank in dealing with the counselling process Second, if the counselling records are made available to defendants, and that fact was known, there would be a substantial disincentive for victims to use counselling services or to report the assault at all. Third, disclosure of the records to the accused may lead to the granting of access to information which may place the complainant at risk or in fear of being at risk from retributive action, or may contain personal information, irrelevant to the case, which would lead to that result. Fourth, knowledge that the records could be disclosed will inhibit the rehabilitation of the victim and the effectiveness of the healing process generally.

In short, it is argued that if complainants are not guaranteed confidentiality within the counselling relationship, they will be inhibited in their discussions and unable to receive the full benefit of the counselling. Indeed, they may be deterred from seeking counselling at all. These are powerful arguments. But they do not stand alone or without contrary forces.

On the other hand, considerations of fundamental fairness and the right to a fair trial will sometimes dictate that any just system of law should grant access to counselling notes. The treatment to which the complainant has been exposed before trial may have had the effect of contaminating her memory to such a degree that her evidence, while genuine to her, is utterly unreliable. For example, the recollections that the complainant recounts and in which she firmly believes may have been obtained by hypnosis. There is a considerable body of very cautionary law about the admissibility of such evidence and the use to which it can be put. But there may be even more doubtful procedures. In, for example, *Cooper* (1995) 14 WAR 416, the complainant based her account on 'recovered memory' retrieved by Eye Movement Desensitisation and Reprocessing Treatment (EMDR). There was a wealth of expert evidence that this treatment was 'in an enthusiastic period of evaluation' and was not only unreliable, but could not be described as an established scientific body of knowledge. This information would be crucial to the case for the defence.

This is not a simple policy issue. Nor is it a simple legal issue. So far as policy is concerned, the general existing law designed by judges for ensuring a right to a fair trial for an accused charged with very serious offences collides with the equally compelling public interest in protecting victims from undue harassment and further victimisation and the public interest in the effective minimisation of harm to those who have suffered a traumatising experience. So far as the law is concerned, if action is to be taken, it must traverse with the most technical areas of law dealing with exclusionary rules of evidence, relevance, privilege and immunity and procedural laws such as those governing *subpoenas* in a specific area.

In the current environment, it is clear that action by Parliament is needed in order to make the rules clear for everyone—but the parameters of change require careful management as do the policy values in conflict—and the options for dealing with them.

In general terms, there are five alternatives that could be adopted. They are:

- Do nothing and rely on existing common law;
- Enact a complete and total prohibition on the release of counselling records;
- Enact a privilege in the counselling records similar to legal professional privilege;
- Enact an unstructured judicial discretion whether to admit the records or not; or
- Enact a structured judicial discretion whether to admit the records or not.

It seems clear that the first option is not tenable. The proponents of various possible positions are in conflict and it is up to parliament to resolve the conflict and clarify the position. The second option is equally untenable, despite the fact that it has some strong advocates. Not only will the taking of this position lead to unjust convictions and stayed trials, but also it ignores the fact that there is no established counselling profession with disciplinary procedures and an enforceable code of ethics. No-one wants an increased number of convictions overturned as unsafe and unsatisfactory because of a legal technicality, but that is precisely what has happened a number of times when the tabling of victim impact statements at sentence have revealed sufficient information about the counselling process to lead to a finding that the verdict is unsafe and unsatisfactory and warrants a new trial.

Equally, the unstructured judicial discretion is not tenable. This is not all that much different from the status quo, which is not satisfactory. It will not go far enough to satisfy those who desire change, and experience in jurisdictions across Australia shows that it leaves too much discretion in a highly sensitive area to the individual views and proclivities of the judge who happens to be presiding at the trial.

The analogy with legal professional privilege is not sustainable on a number of grounds. Legal professional privilege is based on two vital factors. First, lawyers are "officers of the court" and second, they are bound by complex and strict rules of professional practice. Sexual assault counsellors have neither characteristic. Indeed, the lack of any recognisable professional body capable of setting and enforcing professional standards in the industry was a matter of adverse comment by the Wood Royal Commission in New South Wales. In addition, it should be noted that the lack of *both* characteristics has been the basis for the refusal to grant an analogous privilege to the priest/penitent, doctor/patient and journalist/source relationship. Any or all of these people would feel rightly aggrieved if an exception was made in this case. More importantly, the fundamental moral basis for legal professional privilege is that, in its absence, the operation of the rule of law itself is jeopardised. That is not so if the client/counsellor privilege does not exist—indeed the converse may be true—albeit that some negative consequences may flow to the relationship itself. Further yet, the notion of a privilege goes too far. It would not allow discretionary admissibility in cases in which gross injustice would result.

The only appropriate way to proceed is via structured judicial discretion. This is the path that has been taken in Victoria and New South Wales. The legal form which this should follow is public interest immunity. Public interest immunity protects information from being disclosed if, in the opinion of the court, the disclosure would injure an identifiable public interest. The immunity is most often used in cases involving confidential government documents when it can be shown that it is in the public interest for the information not to be disclosed, but there are instances where it can be invoked by private citizens. In such cases, the court is required to balance the public interest in the administration of justice in the particular proceedings against whatever public interest may be injured by the disclosure of the material. The fundamental principle is that the material may be withheld from disclosure only to the extent that the public interest renders it necessary.

The Bill before the House seeks to enact a specific public interest immunity model appropriate to the category of information with which it deals. The Bill enacts a two stage process for considering applications by anyone in litigation, civil or criminal, for access to what the Bill calls a 'protected communication'. In the first stage, the person making the application must seek leave of the court and show that the he or she has a legitimate forensic purpose for seeking access and that there is an arguable case that the evidence will materially assist the presentation or furtherance of the applicant's case. This test is very similar to the more familiar and colloquial judicial test for a *subpoena* where the court assesses whether or not it is 'on the cards'

that the evidence sought will materially assist the applicant in his or her case. If that first stage of the test is not passed by the applicant, the matter should rest there.

If the test is passed, however, the court then has a discretion about what to do next, according to the case for leave made out by the applicant. The court can require the holder of the information to answer questions, produce the records to the court, or as a last resort, appear before the court to give evidence. At this stage, the question for the court is whether, despite the success of the argument for the applicant on the first stage, whether the evidence should be produced. The answer to that question depends upon a balancing test, and that is the second stage. At this point, there must be an assessment of the conflicting aims of public interest in the light of the particular circumstances of the case which will, of course, vary in individual cases.

The general balancing test is set out in what is proposed to be s 67f(5) and the balance is to be informed by the explicit listing of relevant factors in what is proposed to be s 67f(6). The general test is the balancing of the public interest in preserving the confidentiality of protected communications against the public interest in preventing a miscarriage of justice in the circumstances of the case. The list of relevant factors informs one side or the other of that balance. The onus to show the need to access the protected communication is to be placed on the party seeking access to that communication.

It is clear, therefore, that the definition of protected communication is important. Honourable Members will note that it extends to oral as well as written communication and that it extends beyond professional relationships to volunteers who work as counsellors. It should also be noted that the protection does not extend to a communication made for the purposes of or in the course of a physical examination of the victim or alleged victim by a registered medical practitioner, communications made for the purposes of legal proceedings and, importantly, communications as to which reasonable grounds exist to suspect that the communication will provide evidence of a criminal offence, such as fraud, perjury or an attempt to pervert the course of justice. This last is significant. It cannot be the case that the law of public interest immunity will operate in order to shield a person who is reasonably suspected of having committed a criminal offence from investigation and, if thought desirable, prosecution.

The Bill as a whole represents a reasoned attempt to reconcile what may seem to some irreconcilable forces and positions. It sets out a comprehensible middle ground, and articulates the policies which must be argued, contemplated and decided. It sets out the rules so that all who are involved know where they stand.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3: Insertion of headings

Clause 3 divides Part 7 into separate divisions in view of the proposed insertion of a new division dealing with protected communications.

Clause 4: Insertion of Division 9

Clause 4 inserts new division 9 dealing with protected communications.

67d. Interpretation

New section 67d contains definitions required for the purposes of the new division.

67e. Certain communications to be protected by public interest immunity

New section 67e provides that a communication relating to a victim or alleged victim of a sexual offence is, if made in a therapeutic context, protected from disclosure in legal proceedings by public interest immunity. However, the public interest immunity will not extend to a communication made for the purposes of, or in the course of, a physical examination of the alleged victim of a sexual offence by a registered medical practitioner or registered nurse, a communication made for the purposes of legal proceedings or a communication as to which reasonable grounds exist to suspect that it evidences a criminal fraud, an attempt to pervert the administration of justice, perjury or another offence. New subsection (3) provides that the public interest immunity cannot be waived.

67f. Evidence of protected communications

New section 67f provides that evidence of a protected communication cannot be admitted in committal proceedings for an indictable offence and can only be admitted in other legal proceedings if the court gives leave to a party to adduce the evidence and the admission of the evidence is consistent with any limitations or restrictions fixed by the court. It also provides that evidence of a protected communication is not liable to discovery or any other form of pre-trial disclosure. Subsections (2), (3) and (4) provide for a preliminary examination of evidence of protected communications by the court. The new section goes on to provide that the court can authorise the admission of the evidence if satisfied that, in the circumstances of the case, the public interest in preserving the confidentiality of protected communications is outweighed by the public interest in preventing a miscarriage of justice that might arise from suppression of relevant evidence.

Mr ATKINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD TRAFFIC (MISCELLANEOUS NO. 2) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

SUPREME COURT (RULES OF COURT) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 February. Page 822.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): The Opposition is wholeheartedly in favour of the Bill. It tries to put beyond doubt the authority of the Supreme Court to make rules of court regarding disclosure and exchange before trial of experts' reports and other relevant material. In the years to come, the Government and the Opposition will find themselves agreeing about the need for more pre-trial disclosure in court cases in order to minimise costs, and this is one—

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: —small step. The Government makes the point that it is important that parties know what case they must meet at trial and that they ought to focus on the matters genuinely in dispute. The member for Elder interjects that an exception ought to be made for the defence in criminal cases. I suppose, as a practising solicitor, what he is saying is that the defence should continue to be able to ambush the prosecution and the prosecution should be required to prepare for a dispute about any possible fact in issue at the trial, including the name and address of the defendant. With respect, I cannot agree with the member for Elder on that point.

The Government tells us that there was a challenge to the ability of the District Court to make a rule on pre-trial disclosure and that that challenge was upheld. So the District Court Act needed to be amended to put beyond doubt the court's rule making authority in this area. Out of an abundance of caution, the Government is now amending the Supreme Court Act to put beyond doubt the Supreme Court's authority to make rules regarding pre-trial disclosure. The authority of the Supreme Court to make rules of court is contained in section 72 of the Supreme Court Act, and there are 10 heads of power for making Supreme Court rules listed alongside Roman numerals in that section, and this Bill adds an eleventh. However, the paragraph concerned would be marked IIaa, and it would provide:

Rules of court may be made under this Act by any three or more judges of the Supreme Court for any of the following purposes:

. . . For imposing mutual obligations on parties to proceedings in the court to disclose to each other the contents of expert reports or

other material of relevance to the proceedings before the proceedings are brought to trial.

This is a worthwhile change and the Opposition endorses the Government's Bill.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Industry and Trade): I thank the Opposition for its support.

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

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Industry and Trade): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): I wish to finish my thoughts on the speech that Don Dunstan gave last year entitled, 'We intervene or we sink.' A great deal of this speech is already in *Hansard*, and there is only a short portion left. In it, Mr Dunstan deals with the MAI. It continues:

Investment related payments including capital, profits and dividends must be freely permitted to and from the host country. Investors and key personnel must be granted permission to enter and stay to work in support of the investment. Requirements for foreign investors to do and achieve certain things not required of local investors would be prohibited. The OECD gives as an example of a prohibited requirement a minimum target of export goods and services. It does not mention that a requirement of job creation would also be prohibited, but that is the proposal. There will be an international tribunal which will be able to enforce the treaty, which allows an investor to sue a State or one State to sue another but before which no State can sue an investor.

While it is possible under negotiations for the treaty to make reservations from its provisions, the treaty requires these to be rolled back over a limited period and so eliminated. Once in the treaty we are in for at least five years but if we then withdraw the effects of the treaty in respect of dealings in the five year period will be in force for another 15.

As to exceptions, the Howard Government has made an exception in respect of indigenous persons: whether in fact that can cover the range of Aboriginal rights is unclear. It typically has opposed legal enforceability of labour rights in the treaty, and in respect of the environment the treaty has no legally enforceable provisions. It is carrying out what the President of the United States Council for International Business has claimed for it: 'The MAI is an agreement by Governments protecting international investors and their investments and to liberalise regimes. We will oppose any and all measures to create or even imply obligations by Governments or business related to environment or labour.'

Mr Howard and his Government are already about demolishing protection checks and balances against marketplace injustice in Australia. In the MAI they will cast us into a position where there are no internationally enforceable means to limit marketplace injustices, no representative or accountable body with any power, no protection of any kind. This proposal will hand us over to the international financial marketplace with no recourse and no say in what happens. We have already seen that the IMF has pursued in relation to developing countries a demand that, to be in receipt of continuing support for their loan structures, they must institute economic rationalist policies which have abolished help for the poor and the underprivileged, downsized Government services, abolished redistributive taxation and imposed flat rate value added taxes.

Only the prospect of a total breakdown in society in Indonesia has forced them to modify their demands there, and eventually admit reluctantly that a problem is created by the selling down of the currencies of South-East Asia. The rupiah has, in this uncontrolled marketplace, clearly been sold down to way below its real value—with dire results to the lives of ordinary people in Indonesia. But it is into this uncontrolled environment that it is proposed that we move the Australian economy. It would be a total abdication of democratic rights to the manipulators of the marketplace.

Mr Howard is inviting us to pursue the policy of lemmings—to rush over a cliff and find ourselves free in a marketplace sea in which we will drown. We must reply. We will intervene—we will intervene to retain our right to a say in our own future, to temper the marketplace by action, to provide services and social justice, to retain institutional safeguards and to provide needed development in the community interest, for we know that we intervene or we sink.

Of course, the MAI is off the agenda at present but it lurks in the background and has not been completely forgotten. Regarding Don's remarks on the Asian economy, we are seeing that the implications of the Asian economy's position are becoming more apparent.

As I said during the condolence motion on 9 February, Don's speech was attended by 6 000 people, all of whom paid money to hear a political speech. I have never seen anything like that in South Australia before and I imagine we will not see anything like that again for quite some time. It is fitting to point out that at the celebration of Don's life, held in the Festival Theatre the week after his death, many prominent figures from Australia spoke warmly of Don—both by way of message and in person—referring to his life achievements and his aims. His family was present, and his son Andrew gave a moving speech. He said that the best way to honour Don's memory would be to ensure that the things that were important to him actually happened. I agree with Andrew's sentiments. We need to re-examine what parts of Don's life we admired and aspire to, and reaffirm our commitment to making those things happen.

Don's legacy to South Australia will live on, because many will remember all he achieved, fought for and stood for. That will carry on his work, trying to recreate the opportunities we have all taken for granted for so long. There have been attacks on education and on health, and we see problems with sharing within the community. We should work so that people who have little enjoy the same degree of comfort that many of us take for granted.

These sorts of things need to be chased up continually. We need to unite behind the concept of full employment and the pursuit of seeing that everybody has the ability to feed and clothe themselves and attain a decent education for their children. These are the things that Don stood for—that we have to pursue and keep alive—within the Labor Party especially. We have to renew our zeal in pursuing these goals and make the Labor Party the open forum that it needs to be so that everyone can contribute to those ends. It has been a real honour to read this speech into *Hansard*, which was the wish of Don's family, and I thank the House for the opportunity to do so.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): World Health Day is coming up at the beginning of June. Therefore this is an appropriate time to look at one of the many good things that the Government is doing in health. I refer to an innovative program being undertaken by South Australian Health Plus in conjunction with doctors, almost all of whom are general practitioners, and care givers. The coordinated care trial is operating in four divisions of general practitioners in South Australia—three in the city and one rural—and deal with specified chronic illnesses. The trial aims to demonstrate that coordinated care and greater involvement by patients and their families or carers in their own health care reduces the incidence of crisis and complications.

One of the projected outcomes was to improve the health of those with chronic illness and to lessen the demands on existing health resources, in particular hospitals. I am delighted that Eyre Peninsula is actively involved in the trial and I am further delighted that the preliminary results show that the aim and the outcomes are being met. The Eyre

Peninsula section of the trial is managed by the Eyre Regional Demonstration Unit under the chairmanship of Dr Peter Morton, with Peter Harvey as regional manager and Jim Collins in charge of service coordinators. To begin the trial, the unit established a care model, gained support from most general practitioners in the region and established a service coordination process. The patients enrolled in the trial suffer from diabetes, cardiac, respiratory or back pain conditions.

The project was developed initially from the nationally recognised diabetes project developed by Dr David Mills. A defined population of patients with the specified illnesses mentioned were enrolled in Port Lincoln and Whyalla. Service coordinators were recruited and trained. By early 1998 enrolments ended and full-time care planning and data monitoring of 1 350 patients on Eyre Peninsula began. In addition, 510 control patients were located on Yorke Peninsula.

A care plan encompassing best practice protocols for each participant's physical condition was implemented with the intention of reducing the need for medical and hospital services and enhancing daily life. The care plan detailed clinical services needed by the patient and allowed the patient to set themselves achievable goals over a specific period of time. Patients also completed a preliminary questionnaire that allowed them to rate the impact of their illness on their life and work. Service coordinators have contacted patients at a determined frequency depending on the severity of their problem. The care coordinators have ensured that care plans were adhered to and that patients were supported in their efforts to meet their specified goals and targets.

After less than one year of intervention, patients were reporting that they felt much more in control of their condition and that they felt more confident in their dealings with their doctor, who is the care coordinator. The control group, when scaled to match the intervention profile, was found to be hospitalised at a higher rate and to use medical benefits scheme services at a much higher rate when compared with the intervention group. The trial set out to establish an integrated data network through which service use, medical and pharmaceutical information, and community health service provision would be linked to enable total coordination of services according to need. That was designed to reduce service duplication and to ensure that best practice protocols were followed in caring for patients. State and Commonwealth funding was pooled to purchase relevant services as defined by patients' care plans.

The South Australian Health Plus central office developed a data repository to house comprehensive patient data to involve all providers, carers and coordinators to view care plans on-line and to make appropriate decisions about patient care. Service provision was principally the same as it was prior to patient enrolment, so the only new factors in the patient care program were the involvement of patients in a formal goal setting and care planning process and the extended involvement of the general practitioner through regular contact with service coordinators.

In place of the routine, general practitioner visits, patients received ongoing contact, support and encouragement from their service coordinators who worked in teams based in Port Lincoln and Whyalla. The team approach was adopted because of the need for collaborative and group support. An additional benefit of the program is that service coordinators have supported patients to make the best of the community health services in Eyre Peninsula. That is, service coordinators, in addition to their defined role, became de facto service providers as a way of compensating for limited service available in rural centres.

Initial trial outcomes suggest that social intervention and support for patients with chronic and complex illnesses reduces the incidence of health crisis leading to hospitalisation and visits by general practitioners. The reason for this may be that, since the majority of patients are elderly, retired and living reasonably confined lives, the regular visits from service coordinators and the interest shown in patients through this process has triggered a more positive approach to self-management amongst trial patients.

Currently the Eyre Peninsula trial is showing significant savings against hospitalisation and this saving, if it were capitalised upon, would provide the majority of funds needed to fund service coordination for the trial group. It is expected that the current trend of savings, against hospital admissions from which preventive activity is at least theoretically funded, will continue as the trial progresses.

The introduction of other major elements such as the general practitioners' IT network, the advent of education programs and the establishment of new purchasing arrangements for services should mean that the Eyre Peninsula component of the trial could achieve even greater efficiencies in the longer term. This would enable the region to provide an even more comprehensive primary health support program for patients with chronic illnesses and to permanently shift resource allocation from the acute section to the primary health sector.

These tentative and early indications of a successful outcome of the coordinated care trial in regional South Australia suggest that significant outcomes can be achieved for patients as a result of well planned and coordinated service provision, but this does not necessarily require more medical services. Quite the contrary! The implication is that consistent and caring social support and encouragement of patients to learn about and manage their own illness will lead to even better outcomes than are currently achieved through a more medical approach to illness management.

These early findings are significant for rural South Australia. In a community where informal networks exist but where traditional extended family structures are breaking down people feel better and more confident and positive about their health if they have the reassurance of regular human contact and support.

It is clear from those involved in the trial that many patients with chronic conditions are living in less than satisfactory social situations and, as a result of these conditions, may tend to neglect their health. When the basic human networks fail, patients suffer a loss of direction and motivation. They allow their health to deteriorate and, ultimately, rely on medical intervention to help them once their potentially manageable condition progresses beyond their control.

The South Australian HealthPlus service coordinators appear to have compensated for a lack of social support for patients with chronic illness, giving people back their dignity and their will to help themselves rather than relying on external intervention once essentially preventable crises have occurred. Trial outcomes are positive. They include:

- Full participation of the intervention target group.
- Demonstrated improved participation rates and improved patient motivation to manage their condition through care planning and positive self-help.
- Demonstrated reduced hospitalisation for intervention patients against the control group.

- Demonstrated savings in the use of medical benefits services.
- Significant general practitioner involvement in the trial and in the potential of coordinated care to provide an ongoing solution to improving services and health outcomes for patients with chronic illness.
- Established and tested new service delivery purchasing and delivery processes.
- Modelled and tested new organisational structures.
- Collected valuable data on patient utilisation trends.
- Influential in modelling change management within health.
- Established the potential for coordinated care processes to work across all Department of Human Services divisions, and not only in health.
- Introduction of general practitioners to information management, which has an enormous potential benefit for quality of practice beyond the trial.

Other States are observing the South Australian trial with a view to implementing similar programs in their health services.

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

Motion carried.

At 4.20 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 9 March at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 2 March 1999

QUESTION ON NOTICE

SCHOOLS, NON-GOVERNMENT

5. **Ms RANKINE:** What payments were made by the Government to non-Government schools under the Swimming and Aquatics Program during 1996-97 and 1997-98, how were these funds distributed and for what purposes and how much did each participating non-Government school receive?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Prior to 1998-99, the formula for the calculation of the total State per capita grant for non government schools included a deduction which reflected the total utilisation of the Swimming and Aquatics Program by the non government schools' sector.

A 'user pays' system now operates, with the grant of an individual school being reduced by the actual cost incurred by that school, and the department being reimbursed for that cost.

The non government schools' sector has always reimbursed the government for the total cost incurred through its use of the Swimming and Aquatics Program.

Whilst no payments were made by the government to non government schools under the Swimming and Aquatics Program, the following information is provided on the utilisation by the non government schools' sector of the department's Swimming and Aquatics Program:

Program	1996-97			1997-98		
	Schools	Hours	Cost $	Schools	Hours	Cost $
Swimming		13 402	495 304		6 487	273 570
Aquatics		7 243	267 668		5 059	214 026
Surf Education		65	2 378		510	20 808
Total:	149	20 710	765 350	114	12 056	508 404

As shown by the above figures, utilisation of the department's Swimming and Aquatics Program by the non government schools' sector has reduced since the introduction of the 'user pays' system (replacing the former 'system pays' solution). This does not necessarily reflect an equivalent reduction in the services being provided to non government students. Under the new system, schools are assessing the alternatives for best value now that the programs have to be paid for by each school.

A full list of schools by program is attached for 1996-97 and 1997-98.

Swimming and Aquatics Program 1996-97
Non Government Schools

	School	Program	Year Group	Hours	Cost $	School Cost
1	Antonio School	Swimming Program	3-5	44.25	1 637.69	
		Swimming Program	R-2	18.00	666.18	
		Swimming Program	SD	16.75	619.92	
		Swimming Program	SD	21.25	783.49	3 707.28
2	Bethesda Christ Coll	Aquatics Program	11-13	12.00	444.12	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	18.00	666.18	
		Aquatics Program	SD	2.75	101.78	
		Swimming Program	SD	2.25	82.96	1 295.04
3	Blackfriars Priory	Aquatics Program	8-10	50.50	1 869.01	
		Swimming Program	3-5	67.50	2 488.73	
		Swimming Program	8-10	3.00	111.03	4 468.76
4	Cabra Dominican Coll	Aquatics Program	8-10	36.00	1 327.32	
		Swimming Program	3-5	3.75	138.79	
		Swimming Program	8-10	0.75	27.76	
		Swimming Program	SD	23.25	860.48	2 354.35
5	Calvary Luth Pri Sch	Aquatics Program	6-7	90.00	3 330.90	
		Swimming Program	3-5	5.25	194.30	
		Swimming Program	3-5	30.00	1 106.10	
		Swimming Program	6-7	3.75	138.79	
		Swimming Program	R-2	30.00	1 110.30	
		Swimming Program	SD	9.75	360.85	
		Swimming Program	SD	1.95	71.90	6 313.13
6	Cardijn College	Aquatics Program	11-13	42.00	1 554.42	
		Aquatics Program	11-13	90.00	3 318.30	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	217.00	8 031.17	
		Aquatics Program	SD	6.00	221.22	
		Swimming Program	3-5	4.00	148.04	

Swimming and Aquatics Program 1996-97
Non Government Schools

	School	Program	Year Group	Hours	Cost $	School Cost
		Swimming Program	6-7	0.75	27.76	
		Swimming Program	8-10	0.75	27.76	
		Swimming Program	SD	16.50	610.67	
		Swimming Program	SD	6.50	239.66	14 178.99
7	Caritas College	Swimming Program	3-5	89.75	3 321.65	
		Swimming Program	6-7	69.75	2 581.45	
		Swimming Program	R-2	48.75	1 804.24	7 707.33
8	Catherine McAuley S	Aquatics Program	6-7	18.00	663.66	
		Swimming Program	3-5	18.00	663.66	
		Swimming Program	R-2	15.00	553.05	1 880.37
9	Christ The King Schl	Swimming Program	3-5	45.00	1 665.45	
		Swimming Program	R-2	26.25	971.51	2 636.96
10	Christian Bros' Coll	Aquatics Program	11-13	46.25	1 711.71	
		Aquatics Program	11-13	34.00	1 253.58	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	90.75	3 358.66	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	16.00	589.92	
		Swimming Program	8-10	36.75	1 360.12	
		Swimming Program	8-10	16.00	589.92	8 863.91
11	Concordia College	Aquatics Program	11-13	41.00	1 511.67	1 511.67
12	Craigmore Christn SC	Aquatics Program	11-13	24.00	884.88	884.88
13	Dominican School	Aquatics Program	6-7	24.00	888.24	
		Swimming Program	3-5	24.75	916.00	
		Swimming Program	6-7	1.50	55.52	
		Swimming Program	R-2	60.00	2 220.60	
		Swimming Program	SD	23.75	878.99	4 959.34
14	Emmaus Catholic S	Swimming Program	3-5	37.50	1 382.63	
		Swimming Program	6-7	37.50	1 382.63	
		Swimming Program	R-2	30.00	1 106.10	
		Swimming Program	SD	11.25	414.79	4 286.14
15	Faith Lutheran Sec S	Aquatics Program	11-13	84.00	3 108.84	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	150.00	5 530.50	8 639.34
16	Gleeson College	Aquatics Program	11-13	123.50	4 570.74	
		Aquatics Program	11-13	36.00	1 327.32	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	240.00	8 882.40	14 780.46
17	Glendale Christ Sch	Aquatics Program	SD	6.00	222.06	
		Swimming Program	3-5	53.50	1 972.55	
		Swimming Program	6-7	53.50	1 972.55	
		Swimming Program	R-2	53.50	1 972.55	
		Swimming Program	SD	48.00	1 776.48	
		Swimming Program	SD	5.00	184.35	8 100.53
18	Good Sh Luth Angastn	Swimming Program	3-5	26.40	973.37	
		Swimming Program	6-7	13.20	486.68	
		Swimming Program	SD	30.00	1 110.30	
		Swimming Program	SD	10.90	401.88	2 972.24
19	Good Sh Luth Para V	Swimming Program	3-5	28.25	1 045.53	
		Swimming Program	R-2	28.25	1 045.53	
		Swimming Program	SD	3.75	138.26	2 229.33
20	Heritage College	Swimming Program	3-5	25.00	925.25	
		Swimming Program	6-7	15.00	555.15	
		Swimming Program	R-2	18.75	693.94	2 174.34
21	Holy Family Cath Sch	Swimming Program	3-5	120.00	4 441.20	
		Swimming Program	6-7	44.00	1 628.44	
		Swimming Program	R-2	68.25	2 525.93	8 595.57
22	Immanuel College	Aquatics Program	8-10	172.00	6 365.72	
		Aquatics Program	SD	2.00	74.02	

Swimming and Aquatics Program 1996-97
Non Government Schools

	School	Program	Year Group	Hours	Cost $	School Cost
		Swimming Program	8-10	65.00	2 405.65	8 845.39
23	Immanuel Luth Gawl E	Aquatics Program	6-7	22.50	829.58	
		Swimming Program	3-5	52.50	1 935.68	
		Swimming Program	R-2	22.50	829.58	3 594.83
24	Immanuel Primary	Aquatics Program	6-7	75.00	2 775.75	
		Swimming Program	6-7	20.00	740.20	3 515.95
25	Kalori School	Swimming Program	3-5	30.00	1 106.10	
		Swimming Program	6-7	15.00	553.05	
		Swimming Program	R-2	15.00	553.05	2 212.20
26	Kilmara PS	Swimming Program	3-5	6.75	249.82	
		Swimming Program	SD	10.25	379.35	629.17
27	King's Baptist Sch	Aquatics Program	11-13	66.00	2 433.42	2 433.42
28	Lindisfarne Ang PS	Swimming Program	3-5	15.00	553.05	
		Swimming Program	R-2	12.00	442.44	
		Swimming Program	SD	7.50	276.53	1 272.02
29	Lobethal Lutheran S	Swimming Program	3-5	48.50	1 794.99	
		Swimming Program	R-2	49.00	1 813.49	
		Swimming Program	SD	14.25	527.39	4 135.87
30	Loreto College	Swimming Program	3-5	123.00	4 535.01	
		Swimming Program	R-2	22.75	838.79	5 373.80
31	Loxton Lutheran Sch	Aquatics Program	6-7	10.00	370.10	
		Aquatics Program	6-7	20.00	737.40	
		Swimming Program	3-5	42.00	1 548.54	
		Swimming Program	R-2	11.25	416.36	
		Swimming Program	R-2	15.00	553.05	
		Swimming Program	SD	18.00	666.18	
		Swimming Program	SD	18.50	682.10	4 973.73
32	Maitland Lutheran S	Swimming Program	3-5	5.00	185.05	
		Swimming Program	3-5	4.00	147.48	
		Swimming Program	6-7	2.00	74.02	
		Swimming Program	6-7	2.00	73.74	
		Swimming Program	R-2	3.00	111.03	
		Swimming Program	R-2	2.00	73.74	665.06
33	Maranatha Chrstn S	Swimming Program	3-5	22.00	814.22	
		Swimming Program	6-7	6.00	222.06	
		Swimming Program	SD	30.75	1 138.06	
		Swimming Program	SD	26.50	977.06	3 151.39
34	Marbury School	Swimming Program	SD	8.25	305.33	305.33
35	Mary MacKillop Coll	Aquatics Program	8-10	2.50	92.18	
		Surf Safety	11-13	14.50	534.62	626.79
36	Mary MacKillop Mem S	Swimming Program	8-10	16.00	592.16	
		Swimming Program	R-2	13.00	481.13	1 073.29
37	Marymount College	Aquatics Program	8-10	13.50	499.64	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	18.00	663.66	
		Swimming Program	6-7	97.50	3 608.48	
		Swimming Program	SD	5.00	185.05	4 956.82
38	Mercedes College	Aquatics Program	6-7	50.00	1 850.50	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	157.50	5 807.03	
		Swimming Program	3-5	37.50	1 387.88	
		Swimming Program	6-7	42.00	1 554.42	
		Swimming Program	R-2	11.25	416.36	
		Swimming Program	SD	15.00	555.15	11 571.33
39	Mt Barker Waldorf S	Aquatics Program	6-7	42.00	1 548.54	
		Swimming Program	3-5	60.00	2 212.20	3 760.74
40	Mt Carmel College	Aquatics Program	8-10	10.00	370.10	

Swimming and Aquatics Program 1996-97
Non Government Schools

	School	Program	Year Group	Hours	Cost $	School Cost
		Swimming Program	SD	66.00	2 442.66	
		Swimming Program	SD	25.00	921.75	3 734.51
41	Mt Carmel Prim SC	Aquatics Program	6-7	60.00	2 220.60	
		Swimming Program	3-5	52.50	1 943.03	
		Swimming Program	R-2	45.00	1 665.45	
		Swimming Program	SD	3.00	111.03	5 940.11
42	Murray Bdge Luth Sch	Aquatics Program	6-7	30.00	1 106.10	1 106.10
43	Our Lady Help of Chn	Aquatics Program	6-7	50.00	1 843.50	
		Swimming Program	3-5	76.00	2 812.76	
		Swimming Program	6-7	55.75	2 063.31	
		Swimming Program	R-2	56.25	2 081.81	
		Swimming Program	SD	8.40	310.88	
		Swimming Program	SD	2.25	82.96	9 195.22
44	Our Lady of Grace	Swimming Program	6-7	60.25	2 229.85	
		Swimming Program	R-2	33.75	1 249.09	
		Swimming Program	SD	11.25	416.36	3 895.30
45	Our Lady of Manger S	Aquatics Program	6-7	73.50	2 720.24	
		Swimming Program	3-5	60.00	2 220.60	
		Swimming Program	R-2	18.75	693.94	5 634.77
46	Our Lady of Sacrd Ht	Aquatics Program	8-10	22.50	832.73	832.73
47	Our Lady of the Rivr	Swimming Program	3-5	66.50	2 451.86	
		Swimming Program	6-7	15.00	553.05	
		Swimming Program	R-2	15.00	553.05	3 557.96
48	Our Lady of the Vist	Aquatics Program	6-7	112.50	4 163.63	
		Swimming Program	3-5	105.33	3 898.26	
		Swimming Program	R-2	75.00	2 775.75	
		Swimming Program	SD	5.25	193.57	11 031.21
49	Our Lady Queen Peace	Swimming Program	3-5	6.75	249.82	
		Swimming Program	SD	8.75	323.84	573.66
50	Our Saviour Luth Sch	Swimming Program	SD	27.25	1 008.52	
		Swimming Program	SD	3.75	138.26	1 146.79
51	Pedare Christ Coll	Aquatics Program	11-13	20.00	737.40	
		Aquatics Program	6-7	60.00	2 212.20	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	168.00	6 217.68	
		Swimming Program	3-5	67.50	2 488.73	
		Swimming Program	R-2	45.00	1 659.15	13 315.16
52	Pembroke S	Aquatics Program	11-13	6.00	222.06	
		Swimming Program	3-5	129.00	4 756.23	
		Swimming Program	6-7	22.50	832.73	
		Swimming Program	R-2	36.00	1 327.32	7 138.34
53	Pilgrim School	Aquatics Program	6-7	75.00	2 765.25	
		Swimming Program	SD	113.00	4 182.13	
		Swimming Program	SD	7.50	276.53	7 223.91
54	Portside Christian S	Aquatics Program	6-7	36.00	1 332.36	
		Swimming Program	3-5	36.00	1 327.32	
		Swimming Program	6-7	36.00	1 327.32	3 987.00
55	Prescott PS-Southern	Aquatics Program	6-7	22.50	829.58	829.58
56	Prince Alfred Coll	Aquatics Program	11-13	36.00	1 327.32	1 327.32
57	Pulteney Grammar	Aquatics Program	11-13	54.00	1 990.98	
		Surf Safety	8-10	18.00	663.66	2 654.64
58	Redeemer Luth School	Swimming Program	3-5	52.50	1 935.68	
		Swimming Program	6-7	30.00	1 106.10	
		Swimming Program	R-2	26.25	967.84	
		Swimming Program	SD	24.65	912.30	4 921.91
59	Riverlnd Chrstn Schl	Swimming Program	3-5	10.50	387.14	

Swimming and Aquatics Program 1996-97
Non Government Schools

	School	Program	Year Group	Hours	Cost $	School Cost
		Swimming Program	R-2	7.50	276.53	663.66
60	Rosary School	Swimming Program	3-5	10.50	387.14	
		Swimming Program	6-7	30.50	1 124.54	
		Swimming Program	R-2	15.00	553.05	2 064.72
61	Rostrevor College	Aquatics Program	11-13	4.50	165.92	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	60.00	2 212.20	
		Swimming Program	3-5	66.00	2 433.42	
		Swimming Program	6-7	60.00	2 212.20	7 023.74
62	Sacred Heart C (Mid)	Aquatics Program	8-10	43.00	1 585.41	
		Surf Safety	8-10	14.00	516.18	
		Swimming Program	6-7	150.00	5 551.50	
		Swimming Program	8-10	10.00	370.10	8 023.19
63	Sacred Heart C (Sen)	Aquatics Program	8-10	21.00	774.27	774.27
64	Saint John's College	Swimming Program	11-13	1.50	55.52	
		Swimming Program	SD	13.50	499.64	
		Swimming Program	SD	13.50	497.75	1 052.90
65	School of Nativity	Aquatics Program	6-7	67.50	2 498.18	2 498.18
66	Scotch College	Aquatics Program	11-13	15.00	555.15	
		Aquatics Program	6-7	37.75	1 397.13	
		Aquatics Program	6-7	48.00	1 769.76	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	12.00	444.12	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	45.00	1 659.15	
		Swimming Program	3-5	16.00	592.16	
		Swimming Program	R-2	12.00	444.12	6 861.59
67	Seymour College	Aquatics Program	6-7	2.00	74.02	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	2.00	74.02	
		Swimming Program	3-5	18.25	675.43	
		Swimming Program	R-2	11.25	416.36	1 239.84
68	Siena College	Aquatics Program	11-13	18.00	666.18	
		Aquatics Program	11-13	56.00	2 064.72	
		Surf Safety	11-13	18.00	663.66	3 394.56
69	Southern Montessori	Swimming Program	3-5	15.00	555.15	
		Swimming Program	6-7	3.37	124.72	
		Swimming Program	R-2	14.25	527.39	
		Swimming Program	SD	2.62	96.97	
		Swimming Program	SD	17.75	654.44	1 958.67
70	Southern Vales Ch CS	Aquatics Program	11-13	12.00	442.44	
		Aquatics Program	6-7	54.00	1 990.98	
		Swimming Program	3-5	58.50	2 165.09	
		Swimming Program	3-5	30.00	1 106.10	
		Swimming Program	6-7	9.75	360.85	
		Swimming Program	R-2	13.50	497.75	
		Swimming Program	SD	93.67	3 466.73	
		Swimming Program	SD	55.25	2 037.07	12 066.99
71	Spring Head T Luth S	Swimming Program	3-5	22.50	829.58	
		Swimming Program	6-7	15.00	553.05	
		Swimming Program	R-2	15.00	553.05	1 935.68
72	St Albert's School	Aquatics Program	6-7	20.00	740.20	
		Swimming Program	3-5	7.50	276.53	
		Swimming Program	6-7	7.50	276.53	
		Swimming Program	R-2	7.50	276.53	1 569.78
73	St Aloysius' College	Aquatics Program	11-13	47.50	1 751.33	1 751.33
74	St Ann's Special S	Swimming Program	3-5	101.00	3 738.01	
		Swimming Program	SD	203.00	7 513.03	
		Swimming Program	SD	252.25	9 300.46	20 551.50

Swimming and Aquatics Program 1996-97
Non Government Schools

	School	Program	Year Group	Hours	Cost $	School Cost
75	St Anthonys Cath PS	Swimming Program	R-2	15.00	553.05	553.05
76	St Anthonys Edwdston	Swimming Program	3-5	20.00	740.20	
		Swimming Program	3-5	17.50	645.23	
		Swimming Program	6-7	17.50	645.23	
		Swimming Program	R-2	20.00	740.20	
		Swimming Program	R-2	15.00	553.05	
		Swimming Program	SD	10.00	370.10	3 694.00
77	St Augustine's Par S	Swimming Program	3-5	142.50	5 273.93	
		Swimming Program	6-7	78.00	2 886.78	8 160.71
78	St Brigid's Kilburn	Swimming Program	3-5	52.50	1 943.03	
		Swimming Program	6-7	22.50	832.73	
		Swimming Program	R-2	30.00	1 110.30	3 886.05
79	St Catherine's Sch	Swimming Program	3-5	15.00	553.05	
		Swimming Program	6-7	15.00	553.05	
		Swimming Program	R-2	12.00	442.44	1 548.54
80	St David's Parish S	Aquatics Program	6-7	34.00	1 258.34	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	34.00	1 258.34	
		Swimming Program	R-2	35.00	1 295.35	3 812.03
81	St Dominics Pr Coll	Aquatics Program	8-10	18.75	693.94	
		Swimming Program	3-5	17.00	629.17	
		Swimming Program	3-5	33.00	1 216.71	
		Swimming Program	6-7	37.50	1 382.63	
		Swimming Program	R-2	15.00	553.05	
		Swimming Program	SD	11.00	407.11	4 882.60
82	St Francis De Sales	Swimming Program	3-5	60.00	2 220.60	
		Swimming Program	6-7	37.50	1 387.88	
		Swimming Program	R-2	33.75	1 249.09	4 857.56
83	St Francis of Assisi	Swimming Program	3-5	112.50	4 147.88	
		Swimming Program	R-2	67.50	2 488.73	6 636.60
84	St Francis Sc-Lcklys	Swimming Program	3-5	97.50	3 594.83	
		Swimming Program	6-7	46.50	1 714.46	
		Swimming Program	R-2	41.50	1 535.92	
		Swimming Program	R-2	22.50	829.58	7 674.77
85	St Francis Xavier's	Aquatics Program	6-7	201.00	7 439.01	
		Swimming Program	3-5	20.00	740.20	
		Swimming Program	8-10	22.00	814.22	
		Swimming Program	R-2	53.00	1 961.53	
		Swimming Program	SD	2.00	74.02	11 028.98
86	St Gabriel's School	Swimming Program	3-5	54.00	1 990.98	
		Swimming Program	6-7	22.50	829.58	
		Swimming Program	R-2	37.50	1 382.63	4 203.18
87	St George College	Swimming Program	3-5	46.00	1 702.46	
		Swimming Program	6-7	46.00	1 702.46	
		Swimming Program	R-2	52.50	1 943.03	5 347.95
88	St Ignatius' College	Aquatics Program	6-7	67.50	2 488.73	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	152.50	5 622.68	
		Swimming Program	3-5	112.50	4 147.88	
		Swimming Program	R-2	65.75	2 424.20	
		Swimming Program	SD	9.00	333.09	15 016.57
89	St Jakobi Luth Sch	Swimming Program	3-5	22.50	829.58	
		Swimming Program	R-2	11.25	414.79	1 244.36
90	St James' School	Swimming Program	3-5	30.00	1 106.10	
		Swimming Program	6-7	15.00	553.05	
		Swimming Program	R-2	15.00	553.05	2 212.20
91	St John the Apostle	Swimming Program	3-5	69.00	2 553.69	

Swimming and Aquatics Program 1996-97
Non Government Schools

	School	Program	Year Group	Hours	Cost $	School Cost
		Swimming Program	R-2	15.00	555.15	
		Swimming Program	R-2	23.25	857.23	
		Swimming Program	SD	2.25	83.27	
		Swimming Program	SD	8.50	313.40	4 362.74
92	St John's Grammar	Aquatics Program	6-7	75.00	2 765.25	
		Swimming Program	SD	37.25	1 378.62	
		Swimming Program	SD	10.25	377.92	4 521.79
93	St John's Luth PS-Eu	Aquatics Program	6-7	72.50	2 673.08	
		Swimming Program	3-5	52.00	1 917.24	
		Swimming Program	R-2	15.00	553.05	5 143.37
94	St John's Luth PS-Hi	Swimming Program	3-5	37.50	1 387.88	
		Swimming Program	R-2	7.50	277.58	
		Swimming Program	R-2	18.75	691.31	2 356.76
95	St Joseph's—Clare	Swimming Program	3-5	30.00	1 110.30	
		Swimming Program	R-2	33.75	1 249.09	
		Swimming Program	SD	8.25	305.33	2 664.72
96	St Joseph's Mem Sch	Swimming Program	SD	9.50	351.60	
		Swimming Program	SD	6.50	239.66	591.25
97	St Joseph's-Barmera	Aquatics Program	6-7	11.25	416.36	
		Swimming Program	3-5	7.75	286.83	
		Swimming Program	6-7	3.75	138.79	
		Swimming Program	R-2	3.75	138.79	980.77
98	St Josephs-Flndrs Pk	Swimming Program	3-5	12.00	444.12	
		Swimming Program	SD	18.00	666.18	1 110.30
99	St Josephs-Hectorv	Swimming Program	3-5	185.25	6 856.10	
		Swimming Program	6-7	27.75	1 027.03	7 883.13
100	St Josephs-Hindmarsh	Swimming Program	3-5	6.00	222.06	
		Swimming Program	6-7	0.75	27.76	
		Swimming Program	SD	8.50	314.59	564.40
101	St Josephs-Kingswo	Aquatics Program	6-10	90.00	3 330.90	
		Swimming Program	3-5	7.50	277.58	
		Swimming Program	R-2	30.00	1 110.30	
		Swimming Program	SD	6.00	221.22	4 940.00
102	St Josephs-Murray Br	Aquatics Program	6-7	25.00	921.75	921.75
103	St Josephs-Ottoway	Aquatics Program	6-7	72.00	2 664.72	
		Swimming Program	3-5	60.00	2 220.60	
		Swimming Program	R-2	33.75	1 249.09	6 134.41
104	St Joseph's-Payneham	Aquatics Program	6-7	3.00	111.03	
		Aquatics Program	6-7	48.00	1 769.76	1 880.79
105	St Josephs-Pt Lincln	Aquatics Program	11-13	48.00	1 776.48	
		Aquatics Program	11-13	18.00	663.66	
		Aquatics Program	6-7	52.50	1 935.68	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	8.25	304.18	
		Swimming Program	3-5	56.25	2 081.81	
		Swimming Program	8-10	16.50	608.36	
		Swimming Program	R-2	56.00	2 072.56	
		Swimming Program	SD	25.25	934.50	
		Swimming Program	SD	39.00	1 437.93	11 815.15
106	St Josephs-Renmark	Swimming Program	SD	63.00	2 331.63	2 331.63
107	St Josephs-Richmond	Swimming Program	3-5	2.25	83.27	
		Swimming Program	6-7	1.50	55.52	
		Swimming Program	SD	4.75	175.80	
		Swimming Program	SD	3.00	110.61	425.20
108	St Josephs-Tranmer	Swimming Program	3-5	67.50	2 488.73	
		Swimming Program	6-7	15.00	553.05	

Swimming and Aquatics Program 1996-97
Non Government Schools

	School	Program	Year Group	Hours	Cost $	School Cost
		Swimming Program	R-2	18.75	691.31	3 733.09
109	St Mark's College	Aquatics Program	6-7	72.00	2 654.64	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	270.00	9 992.70	
		Aquatics Program	R-2	54.25	2 007.79	
		Aquatics Program	SD	38.25	1 415.63	
		Swimming Program	SD	209.50	7 753.60	23 824.36
110	St Marks Luth PS	Aquatics Program	6-7	40.00	1 474.80	
		Swimming Program	3-5	60.00	2 220.60	
		Swimming Program	R-2	33.75	1 249.09	
		Swimming Program	SD	10.50	388.61	5 333.09
111	St Martin de Porres	Swimming Program	3-5	114.00	4 219.14	
		Swimming Program	8-10	0.75	27.76	
		Swimming Program	R-2	67.50	2 498.18	
		Swimming Program	SD	10.75	397.86	
		Swimming Program	SD	0.25	9.22	7 152.15
112	St Martin's Luth PS	Swimming Program	3-5	22.25	820.36	
		Swimming Program	6-7	43.25	1 594.63	
		Swimming Program	R-2	49.25	1 815.85	4 230.83
113	St Martin's Parish P	Swimming Program	3-5	6.75	249.82	
		Swimming Program	6-7	0.75	27.76	
		Swimming Program	SD	259.33	9 561.50	9 839.07
114	St Mary Magdalenes	Aquatics Program	6-7	10.00	370.10	
		Swimming Program	3-5	5.25	194.30	
		Swimming Program	6-7	0.75	27.76	
		Swimming Program	SD	5.25	194.30	
		Swimming Program	SD	6.75	248.87	1 035.34
115	St Mary's College	Aquatics Program	11-13	32.50	1 198.28	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	38.50	1 424.89	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	36.00	1 327.32	
		Swimming Program	3-5	37.50	1 387.88	
		Swimming Program	6-7	40.00	1 474.80	
		Swimming Program	8-10	4.50	166.55	
		Swimming Program	R-2	22.50	832.73	7 812.43
116	St Mary's Mem School	Swimming Program	R-2	22.50	832.73	832.73
117	St Michael's College	Aquatics Program	11-13	79.50	2 942.30	
		Aquatics Program	11-13	41.00	1 511.67	
		Aquatics Program	3-5	12.50	462.63	
		Aquatics Program	6-7	25.00	925.25	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	107.50	3 978.58	
		Swimming Program	3-5	49.50	1 832.00	
		Swimming Program	3-5	67.50	2 488.73	
		Swimming Program	6-7	67.50	2 488.73	16 629.86
118	St Michael's Luth PS	Aquatics Program	6-7	72.00	2 664.72	
		Aquatics Program	6-7	81.00	2 986.47	
		Swimming Program	3-5	71.25	2 636.96	
		Swimming Program	R-2	21.75	804.97	9 093.12
119	St Monica's Parish S	Aquatics Program	6-7	31.50	1 165.82	
		Swimming Program	3-5	37.50	1 387.88	
		Swimming Program	R-2	33.75	1 249.09	3 802.78
120	St Patrick's School	Swimming Program	3-5	45.00	1 665.45	
		Swimming Program	6-7	45.00	1 665.45	
		Swimming Program	R-2	33.75	1 249.09	
		Swimming Program	SD	68.83	2 547.40	
		Swimming Program	SD	42.00	1 548.54	8 675.93
121	St Patrick's Spec S	Swimming Program	SD	284.50	10 529.35	

Swimming and Aquatics Program 1996-97
Non Government Schools

	School	Program	Year Group	Hours	Cost $	School Cost
		Swimming Program	SD	174.75	6 443.03	16 972.38
122	St Pauls College	Aquatics Program	11-13	49.50	1 832.00	
		Aquatics Program	11-13	34.00	1 253.58	
		Swimming Program	3-5	20.00	740.20	
		Swimming Program	8-10	12.00	442.44	4 268.22
123	St Paul's Parish PS	Swimming Program	3-5	105.00	3 871.35	
		Swimming Program	6-7	75.00	2 765.25	
		Swimming Program	R-2	48.00	1 769.76	8 406.36
124	St Peters Coll Girls	Aquatics Program	8-10	27.00	995.49	995.49
	St Peters Glg Anglcn	Aquatics Program	6-7	8.00	296.08	
		Swimming Program	6-7	67.50	2 498.18	
		Swimming Program	R-2	33.50	1 239.84	4 034.09
125	St Raphaels-Parksi	Swimming Program	SD	8.25	304.18	304.18
126	St Teresa's-Brighton	Swimming Program	3-5	30.00	1 110.30	
		Swimming Program	6-7	30.00	1 110.30	
		Swimming Program	R-2	33.75	1 249.09	3 469.69
127	St Teresa's-Whyalla	Swimming Program	3-5	60.00	2 220.60	
		Swimming Program	R-2	75.00	2 775.75	
		Swimming Program	SD	10.45	386.75	
		Swimming Program	SD	9.00	331.83	5 714.93
128	St Therese School	Swimming Program	R-2	22.50	832.73	832.73
129	St Thomas More Sch	Aquatics Program	3-5	97.50	3 608.48	
		Aquatics Program	6-7	77.00	2 849.77	
		Swimming Program	8-10	3.00	111.03	
		Swimming Program	R-2	52.50	1 935.68	
		Swimming Program	SD	2.25	83.27	8 588.22
130	St Thomas' School	Aquatics Program	6-7	22.50	832.73	
		Swimming Program	3-5	45.00	1 665.45	
		Swimming Program	R-2	33.75	1 249.09	3 747.26
131	Star of the Sea Sch	Aquatics Program	6-7	98.50	3 645.49	
		Swimming Program	3-5	105.00	3 886.05	
		Swimming Program	R-2	75.00	2 775.75	10 307.29
132	Stella Maris Par Sch	Swimming Program	3-5	18.75	693.94	
		Swimming Program	6-7	60.00	2 220.60	
		Swimming Program	R-2	18.75	693.94	3 608.48
133	Suneden Special Schl	Swimming Program	3-5	141.00	5 218.41	
		Swimming Program	SD	285.50	10 566.36	
		Swimming Program	SD	178.25	6 572.08	22 356.84
134	Sunrise Christian S	Swimming Program	3-5	57.75	2 137.33	
		Swimming Program	6-7	7.25	268.32	
		Swimming Program	R-2	33.75	1 249.09	
		Swimming Program	SD	17.00	629.17	
		Swimming Program	SD	1.75	64.52	4 348.43
135	Tanunda Lutheran	Swimming Program	SD	7.50	277.58	
		Swimming Program	SD	3.75	138.26	415.84
136	Tatachilla Luth Coll	Aquatics Program	8-10	99.00	3 663.99	3 663.99
137	Temple Christian Col	Aquatics Program	11-13	16.00	592.16	
		Aquatics Program	SD	2.00	74.02	666.18
138	The Hills Chrstn C S	Swimming Program	3-5	75.00	2 765.25	
		Swimming Program	6-7	30.00	1 106.10	
		Swimming Program	R-2	25.50	940.19	
		Swimming Program	SD	13.50	499.64	5 311.17
139	The Hills Montess S	Swimming Program	3-5	30.00	1 110.30	
		Swimming Program	6-7	0.75	27.76	
		Swimming Program	R-2	30.00	1 110.30	

Swimming and Aquatics Program 1996-97
Non Government Schools

	School	Program	Year Group	Hours	Cost $	School Cost
		Swimming Program	SD	0.75	27.76	2 276.12
140	Thomas More College	Swimming Program	8-10	6.00	222.06	
		Swimming Program	SD	9.75	360.85	582.91
141	Torrens Valley Chrtn	Swimming Program	3-5	66.00	2 442.66	
		Swimming Program	3-5	16.88	622.37	
		Swimming Program	R-2	39.37	1 451.57	
		Swimming Program	SD	7.50	277.58	
		Swimming Program	SD	46.29	1 706.71	6 500.88
142	Trinity College Nth	Aquatics Program	11-13	18.00	666.18	
		Aquatics Program	11-13	90.00	3 318.30	
		Aquatics Program	3-5	60.00	2 220.60	
		Aquatics Program	6-7	18.00	666.18	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	31.00	1 147.31	
		Swimming Program	3-5	199.50	7 383.50	
		Swimming Program	8-10	0.75	27.76	
		Swimming Program	R-2	37.50	1 387.88	
		Swimming Program	SD	3.75	138.79	16 956.49
143	Tyndale Christn Sch	Aquatics Program	11-13	105.75	3 899.00	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	84.00	3 108.84	7 007.84
144	Walford Anglican Sch	Aquatics Program	6-7	27.00	995.49	
		Swimming Program	3-5	8.00	296.08	
		Swimming Program	R-2	7.50	277.58	1 569.15
145	Westminster School	Aquatics Program	11-13	40.00	1 480.40	
		Swimming Program	8-10	98.00	3 626.98	5 107.38
146	Whyalla Christian S	Swimming Program	3-5	7.50	277.58	
		Swimming Program	6-7	7.50	277.58	
		Swimming Program	R-2	11.25	416.36	971.51
147	Wilderness School	Aquatics Program	11-13	20.00	740.20	
		Aquatics Program	11-13	24.00	884.88	
		Aquatics Program	6-7	37.50	1 387.88	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	96.00	3 552.96	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	30.00	1 106.10	
		Aquatics Program	SD	2.00	74.02	
		Swimming Program	3-5	52.50	1 943.03	
		Swimming Program	6-7	22.50	832.73	
		Swimming Program	R-2	15.00	553.05	11 074.84
148	Woodcroft College	Aquatics Program	11-13	13.00	481.13	
		Aquatics Program	11-13	51.50	1 898.81	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	3.00	111.03	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	226.50	8 351.06	
		Swimming Program	11-13	3.00	110.61	
		Swimming Program	6-7	50.00	1 843.50	
		Swimming Program	8-10	18.00	663.66	
		Swimming Program	SD	2.25	82.96	13 542.75
149	Woodlands CEGGS	Aquatics Program	8-10	112.50	4 163.63	
		Swimming Program	3-5	12.50	462.63	
		Swimming Program	6-7	12.50	462.63	
		Swimming Program	8-10	112.50	4 163.63	9 252.50
		TOTAL:		20 710	$765 350	$765 350
				20 710	$765 350	

Notes:
1. Rate for period 1 July 1996 to 31 December 1996 was $37.01 per hour.
2. Rate for period 1 January 1997 to 30 June 1997 was $36.87 per hour.
3. SD = students with disabilities

Swimming and Aquatic Program 1997-98
Non Government Schools

	School	Program	Year Group	Hours	Cost $	School Cost
1	Annerley Col	Swimming Program	8-10	10.50	462.63	462.63
2	Antonio School	Swimming Program	SD	16.25	655.65	655.65
3	Bethesda Christ Coll	Aquatics Program	11-13	36.00	1 438.92	1 438.92
4	Blackfriars Priory	Surf Safety	3-5	10.00	399.70	
		Swimming Program	3-5	62.50	2 753.75	
		Swimming Program	6-7	62.50	2 753.75	5 907.20
5	Cabra Dominican Coll	Aquatics Program	6-7	54.00	2 379.24	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	36.00	1 586.16	3 965.40
6	Calvary Luth Pri Sch	Aquatics Program	6-7	90.00	3 597.30	
		Swimming Program	3-5	28.50	1 255.71	
		Swimming Program	R-2	30.00	1 199.10	
		Swimming Program	SD	39.10	1 616.00	7 668.11
7	Cardijn College	Aquatics Program	11-13	144.00	6 289.43	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	3.00	124.00	
		Aquatics Program	SD	12.00	528.72	
		Swimming Program	8-10	4.00	159.88	
		Swimming Program	SD	55.60	2 256.07	9 358.10
8	Catherine McAuley S	Aquatics Program	6-7	15.00	660.90	
		Swimming Program	3-5	22.50	991.35	
		Swimming Program	R-2	22.50	991.35	2 643.60
9	Christian Bros' Coll	Aquatics Program	11-13	109.00	4 577.59	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	69.75	2 860.51	
		Swimming Program	8-10	60.50	2 489.76	
		Swimming Program	R-2	7.50	330.45	
		Swimming Program	SD	1.00	39.97	10 298.28
10	Concordia College	Aquatics Program	11-13	72.00	3 172.32	3 172.32
11	Craigmore Christn SC	Aquatics Program	11-13	30.00	1 272.72	1 272.72
12	Dominican School	Aquatics Program	6-7	108.00	4 316.76	
		Surf Safety	3-5	28.00	1 119.16	5 435.92
13	Faith Lutheran Sec S	Aquatics Program	8-10	156.50	6 895.39	
		Swimming Program	11-13	37.50	1 498.88	
		Swimming Program	SD	3.75	165.23	8 559.49
14	Gleeson College	Aquatics Program	11-13	67.50	2 845.22	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	240.00	9 592.80	12 438.02
15	Glendale Christ Sch	Aquatics Program	6-7	45.00	1 982.70	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	58.50	2 577.51	
		Aquatics Program	SD	3.00	132.18	
		Swimming Program	3-5	117.75	5 188.07	
		Swimming Program	6-7	54.75	2 412.29	
		Swimming Program	SD	37.00	1 552.51	13 845.25
16	Good Sh Luth Angastn	Swimming Program	3-5	22.50	991.35	
		Swimming Program	6-7	15.00	660.90	
		Swimming Program	SD	21.75	875.48	2 527.73
17	Immanuel College	Aquatics Program	8-10	39.00	1 558.83	1 558.83
18	Immanuel Luth Gawl E	Aquatics Program	6-7	22.50	991.35	
		Swimming Program	3-5	30.00	1 321.80	
		Swimming Program	R-2	15.00	660.90	2 974.05
19	Immanuel Primary	Aquatics Program	6-7	100.50	4 231.71	
		Surf Safety	3-5	24.00	959.28	5 190.99
20	Loreto College	Surf Safety	R-2	10.00	399.70	
		Swimming Program	3-5	101.25	4 461.08	
		Swimming Program	6-7	75.00	2 997.75	
		Swimming Program	R-2	18.75	826.13	8 684.65
21	Loxton Lutheran Sch	Aquatics Program	6-7	40.00	1 680.60	
		Swimming Program	3-5	45.00	1 982.70	

Swimming and Aquatic Program 1997-98
Non Government Schools

	School	Program	Year Group	Hours	Cost $	School Cost
		Swimming Program	R-2	45.75	1 951.33	
		Swimming Program	SD	48.00	2 038.19	7 652.82
22	Maitland Lutheran S	Aquatics Program	6-7	45.00	1 982.70	1 982.70
23	Maranatha Chrstn S	Swimming Program	SD	43.50	1 793.91	1 793.91
24	Mary MacKillop Coll	Surf Safety	11-13	22.00	969.32	969.32
25	Marymount College	Surf Safety	6-7	36.00	1 438.92	
		Swimming Program	6-7	60.00	2 398.20	3 837.12
26	Massada College Adel	Surf Safety	3-5	2.00	79.94	79.94
27	Mercedes College	Aquatics Program	8-10	150.00	6 609.00	
		Surf Safety	11-13	26.00	1 145.56	
		Surf Safety	6-7	31.00	1 239.07	8 993.63
28	Mt Barker Waldorf S	Swimming Program	3-5	74.25	3 271.46	3 271.46
29	Mt Carmel College	Surf Safety	SD	10.00	399.70	399.70
30	Mt Carmel Prim SC	Aquatics Program	6-7	24.00	959.28	959.28
31	Murray Bdge Luth Sch	Aquatics Program	6-7	30.00	1 321.80	1 321.80
32	Our Lady Help of Chn	Surf Safety	3-5	10.00	399.70	
		Surf Safety	6-7	10.00	399.70	799.40
33	Our Lady of Grace	Swimming Program	3-5	36.00	1 438.92	
		Swimming Program	R-2	27.00	1 079.19	
		Swimming Program	SD	3.00	119.91	2 638.02
34	Our Lady of the Rivr	Swimming Program	3-5	72.00	3 172.32	
		Swimming Program	R-2	18.75	826.13	3 998.45
35	Our Lady of the Vist	Aquatics Program	6-7	105.00	4 196.85	
		Swimming Program	SD	9.75	389.71	4 586.56
36	Our Lady Queen Peace	Swimming Program	SD	13.50	594.81	594.81
37	Our Saviour Luth Sch	Swimming Program	SD	10.50	432.98	432.98
38	Pedare Christ Coll	Aquatics Program	11-13	18.00	793.08	
		Aquatics Program	6-7	45.00	1 982.70	
		Swimming Program	3-5	75.00	3 304.50	
		Swimming Program	R-2	37.50	1 652.25	7 732.53
39	Pembroke S	Swimming Program	3-5	91.50	4 031.49	
		Swimming Program	6-7	30.00	1 321.80	
		Swimming Program	R-2	51.75	2 280.11	7 633.40
40	Pilgrim School	Aquatics Program	6-7	67.50	2 974.05	
		Swimming Program	3-5	52.50	2 098.43	
		Swimming Program	R-2	30.00	1 199.10	
		Swimming Program	SD	6.50	263.90	6 535.47
41	Portside Christian S	Swimming Program	3-5	33.75	1 487.03	
		Swimming Program	R-2	33.75	1 487.03	2 974.05
42	Prescott PS-Southern	Aquatics Program	6-7	29.25	1 288.76	
		Swimming Program	3-5	22.50	991.35	2 280.11
43	Prince Alfred Coll	Aquatics Program	11-13	54.00	2 379.24	2 379.24
44	Pulteney Grammar	Aquatics Program	11-13	54.00	2 379.24	
		Swimming Program	3-5	30.00	1 321.80	
		Swimming Program	R-2	15.00	660.90	4 361.94
45	Redeemer Luth School	Swimming Program	3-5	45.84	2 019.71	
		Swimming Program	6-7	30.00	1 321.80	
		Swimming Program	R-2	26.25	1 156.58	4 498.09
46	Riverlnd Chrstn Schl	Swimming Program	3-5	3.75	165.23	
		Swimming Program	6-7	3.75	165.23	
		Swimming Program	R-2	3.75	165.23	495.68
47	Rosary School	Swimming Program	3-5	50.00	2 203.00	
		Swimming Program	6-7	30.00	1 321.80	
		Swimming Program	R-2	37.50	1 652.25	5 177.05
48	Sacred Heart C (Mid)	Surf Safety	8-10	17.00	749.02	749.02

Swimming and Aquatic Program 1997-98
Non Government Schools

	School	Program	Year Group	Hours	Cost $	School Cost
49	Sacred Heart C (Sen)	Aquatics Program	8-10	3.00	119.91	119.91
50	Saint John's College	Swimming Program	SD	9.75	389.71	389.71
51	Scotch College	Aquatics Program	6-7	40.50	1 716.95	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	97.75	4 257.79	
		Surf Safety	R-2	28.00	1 119.16	7 093.89
52	Seymour College	Swimming Program	8-10	96.00	3 837.12	3 837.12
53	Siena College	Aquatics Program	11-13	16.50	726.99	
		Surf Safety	11-13	36.00	1 586.16	2 313.15
54	Southern Montessori	Swimming Program	SD	7.50	299.78	299.78
55	Southern Vales Ch CS	Aquatics Program	11-13	13.00	572.78	
		Aquatics Program	11-13	1.50	59.96	
		Aquatics Program	3-5	30.00	1 199.10	
		Aquatics Program	6-7	67.50	2 974.05	
		Aquatics Program	SD	6.00	239.82	
		Swimming Program	R-2	15.00	660.90	
		Swimming Program	SD	24.62	1 084.76	
		Swimming Program	SD	45.00	1 798.65	8 590.01
56	St Albert's School	Swimming Program	3-5	7.50	330.45	
		Swimming Program	6-7	7.50	330.45	
		Swimming Program	R-2	15.00	660.90	1 321.80
57	St Aloysius' College	Aquatics Program	11-13	60.00	2 643.60	2 643.60
58	St Andrew's School	Swimming Program	3-5	133.50	5 882.01	
		Swimming Program	6-7	43.50	1 916.61	
		Swimming Program	R-2	22.50	991.35	8 789.97
59	St Ann's Special S	Swimming Program	SD	280.25	12 347.82	
		Swimming Program	SD	291.25	11 641.26	23 989.08
60	St Anthonys Edwdston	Surf Safety	3-5	19.00	759.43	
		Surf Safety	R-2	19.00	759.43	
		Surf Safety	SD	8.00	319.76	1 838.62
61	St Columbas Memorial	Swimming Program	R-2	8.00	319.76	319.76
62	St Dominics Pr Coll	Aquatics Program	11-13	13.50	539.60	
		Aquatics Program	SD	1.00	44.06	
		Aquatics Program	SD	3.75	149.89	
		Surf Safety	3-5	12.00	479.64	
		Swimming Program	SD	5.00	220.30	
		Swimming Program	SD	1.00	39.97	1 473.45
63	St Francis of Assisi	Swimming Program	6-7	60.00	2 398.20	2 398.20
64	St Francis Sc-Lcklys	Swimming Program	3-5	84.00	3 701.04	
		Swimming Program	R-2	18.08	796.60	
		Swimming Program	R-2	30.00	1 199.10	5 696.74
65	St Francis Xavier's	Aquatics Program	6-7	90.00	3 597.30	
		Surf Safety	3-5	50.00	1 998.50	
		Surf Safety	R-2	46.00	1 838.62	7 434.42
66	St George College	Surf Safety	3-5	14.00	559.58	559.58
67	St Ignatius' College	Aquatics Program	8-10	204.50	9 010.27	
		Swimming Program	R-2	71.25	3 139.28	12 149.55
68	St Jakobi Luth Sch	Aquatics Program	6-7	71.00	2 837.87	
		Swimming Program	3-5	15.00	660.90	
		Swimming Program	6-7	15.00	660.90	
		Swimming Program	R-2	7.50	330.45	4 490.12
69	St James' School	Swimming Program	3-5	30.00	1 321.80	
		Swimming Program	6-7	15.00	660.90	
		Swimming Program	R-2	15.00	660.90	2 643.60
70	St John the Apostle	Swimming Program	3-5	52.50	2 098.43	
		Swimming Program	SD	6.50	259.81	2 358.23

Swimming and Aquatic Program 1997-98
Non Government Schools

	School	Program	Year Group	Hours	Cost $	School Cost
71	St John's Grammar	Aquatics Program	6-7	92.00	4 053.52	4 053.52
72	St John's Luth PS-Eu	Swimming Program	3-5	15.00	660.90	
		Swimming Program	R-2	15.00	660.90	1 321.80
73	St John's Luth PS-Hi	Aquatics Program	6-7	120.00	5 287.20	
		Surf Safety	3-5	10.00	399.70	
		Swimming Program	3-5	18.75	826.13	
		Swimming Program	3-5	37.50	1 498.88	
		Swimming Program	R-2	11.25	495.68	
		Swimming Program	R-2	11.50	459.66	8 967.23
74	St Joseph's—Clare	Aquatics Program	6-7	45.00	1 798.65	
		Swimming Program	3-5	45.00	1 798.65	
		Swimming Program	R-2	28.50	1 139.15	
		Swimming Program	SD	7.50	299.78	5 036.22
75	St Joseph's Mem Sch	Swimming Program	SD	4.00	159.88	159.88
76	St Josephs-Gladstone	Swimming Program	3-5	7.50	299.78	
		Swimming Program	6-7	7.50	299.78	
		Swimming Program	R-2	3.75	149.89	749.44
77	St Josephs-Kingswo	Aquatics Program	6-7	22.50	899.33	
		Swimming Program	SD	12.00	479.64	1 378.97
78	St Josephs-Murray Br	Aquatics Program	6-7	27.00	1 189.62	1 189.62
79	St Joseph's-Payneham	Aquatics Program	6-7	67.50	2 974.05	
		Swimming Program	3-5	42.00	1 850.52	
		Swimming Program	R-2	24.00	1 057.44	5 882.01
80	St Josephs-Pt Lincln	Aquatics Program	11-13	18.00	793.08	
		Aquatics Program	11-13	7.00	279.79	
		Aquatics Program	6-7	243.00	10 706.58	
		Surf Safety	8-10	10.25	409.69	
		Swimming Program	SD	21.50	947.29	
		Swimming Program	sD	33.00	1 319.01	14 455.44
81	St Josephs-Renmark	Swimming Program	3-5	45.00	1 982.70	
		Swimming Program	3-5	39.00	1 558.83	
		Swimming Program	R-2	30.00	1 321.80	
		Swimming Program	R-2	15.00	599.55	5 462.88
82	St Josephs-Richmond	Swimming Program	SD	4.75	209.29	
		Swimming Program	SD	8.50	339.75	549.03
83	St Josephs-Tranmer	Aquatics Program	6-7	9.00	396.54	
		Swimming Program	3-5	45.00	1 982.70	
		Swimming Program	R-2	26.25	1 156.58	3 535.82
84	St Mark's College	Aquatics Program	8-10	108.00	4 316.76	
		Swimming Program	R-2	30.00	1 199.10	5 515.86
85	St Marks Luth PS	Aquatics Program	6-7	35.00	1 542.10	1 542.10
86	St Martin de Porres	Swimming Program	3-5	45.00	1 798.65	
		Swimming Program	R-2	45.00	1 798.65	3 597.30
87	St Martin's Parish P	Swimming Program	SD	16.50	726.99	
		Swimming Program	SD	12.41	496.03	1 223.02
88	St Mary Magdalenes	Aquatics Program	6-7	6.00	239.82	
		Swimming Program	SD	3.75	149.89	389.71
89	St Mary's College	Aquatics Program	8-10	36.00	1 586.16	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	32.00	1 279.04	
		Swimming Program	3-5	25.00	999.25	
		Swimming Program	8-10	3.00	132.18	
		Swimming Program	8-10	5.00	199.85	
		Swimming Program	R-2	18.75	749.44	4 945.92
90	St Michael's College	Aquatics Program	11-13	36.00	1 586.16	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	133.50	5 336.00	

Swimming and Aquatic Program 1997-98
Non Government Schools

	School	Program	Year Group	Hours	Cost $	School Cost
		Swimming Program	3-5	45.00	1 798.65	8 720.81
91	St Michael's Woomera	Swimming Program	R-2	5.00	220.30	220.30
92	St Patrick's School	Swimming Program	SD	181.50	7 996.89	
		Swimming Program	SD	281.90	11 267.54	19 264.43
93	St Paul Lutheran S	Surf Safety	3-5	12.00	479.64	479.64
94	St Pauls College	Aquatics Program	11-13	46.50	2 048.79	
		Aquatics Program	6-7	24.00	959.28	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	6.00	264.36	
		Swimming Program	3-5	12.00	479.64	
		Swimming Program	8-10	14.00	616.84	
		Swimming Program	8-10	81.00	3 237.57	7 606.48
95	St Peters Coll Girls	Aquatics Program	11-13	22.00	969.32	969.32
96	St Peters Glg Anglcn	Aquatics Program	6-7	28.50	1 139.15	1 139.15
97	St Pius X School	Swimming Program	3-5	52.25	2 088.43	
		Swimming Program	6-7	52.50	2 098.43	
		Swimming Program	R-2	51.75	2 068.45	6 255.31
98	St Raphaels-Parksi	Swimming Program	SD	15.00	599.55	599.55
99	St Teresa's-Brighton	Swimming Program	3-5	54.00	2 158.38	
		Swimming Program	R-2	24.00	959.28	3 117.66
100	St Teresa's-Whyalla	Aquatics Program	6-7	229.50	9 173.12	
		Swimming Program	3-5	45.00	1 798.65	
		Swimming Program	R-2	49.50	1 978.52	
		Swimming Program	SD	12.00	528.72	
		Swimming Program	SD	15.75	629.53	14 108.53
101	Suneden Special Schl	Swimming Program	SD	248.00	10 926.88	
		Swimming Program	SD	256.75	10 262.30	21 189.18
102	Sunrise Christian S	Swimming Program	3-5	60.00	2 643.60	
		Swimming Program	3-5	52.50	2 098.43	
		Swimming Program	R-2	30.00	1 321.80	
		Swimming Program	R-2	33.75	1 348.99	
		Swimming Program	SD	2.75	121.17	
		Swimming Program	SD	5.75	229.83	7 763.81
103	Tanunda Lutheran	Aquatics Program	6-7	25.00	999.25	
		Swimming Program	3-5	67.50	2 974.05	
		Swimming Program	6-7	45.00	1 982.70	
		Swimming Program	R-2	33.75	1 487.03	7 443.03
104	Torrens Valley Chrtn	Swimming Program	3-5	7.50	330.45	
		Swimming Program	3-5	45.00	1 798.65	
		Swimming Program	6-7	22.50	899.33	
		Swimming Program	R-2	22.50	991.35	
		Swimming Program	SD	3.30	131.90	4 151.68
105	Trinity College Nth	Aquatics Program	11-13	99.00	4 361.94	4 361.94
106	Tyndale Christn Sch	Aquatics Program	11-13	80.00	3 524.80	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	37.50	1 498.88	5 023.68
107	Walford Anglican Sch	Aquatics Program	6-7	36.00	1 586.16	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	96.00	3 837.12	
		Surf Safety	3-5	10.00	399.70	
		Swimming Program	R-2	7.50	299.78	6 122.76
108	Westminster School	Aquatics Program	11-13	12.00	479.64	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	30.00	1 199.10	1 678.74
109	Whyalla Christian S	Swimming Program	3-5	7.50	299.78	
		Swimming Program	6-7	7.50	299.78	
		Swimming Program	R-2	11.25	449.66	1 049.21

Swimming and Aquatic Program 1997-98
Non Government Schools

	School	Program	Year Group	Hours	Cost $	School Cost
110	Wilderness School	Aquatics Program	11-13	30.50	1 343.83	
		Aquatics Program	11-13	13.00	519.61	
		Aquatics Program	6-7	27.00	1 079.19	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	45.00	1 982.70	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	64.50	2 578.07	
		Swimming Program	R-2	14.25	627.86	8 131.25
111	Willunga Waldorf S	Aquatics Program	6-7	21.00	925.26	925.26
112	Woodcroft College	Aquatics Program	11-13	31.50	1 387.89	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	19.50	859.17	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	5.00	199.85	
		Swimming Program	3-5	52.50	2 098.43	
		Swimming Program	R-2	41.25	1 648.76	6 194.10
113	Woodlands CEGGS	Aquatics Program	8-10	4.50	198.27	
		Aquatics Program	8-10	80.00	3 197.60	3 395.87
114	Xavier College	Aquatics Program	8-10	15.00	599.55	599.55
		TOTAL:		12 056	508 404	508 404

Notes:
1. Rate for period 1 July 1997 to 31 December 1997 was $39.97 per hour.
2. Rate for period 1 January 1998 to 30 june 1998 was $44.06 per hour.
3 SD = students with disabilities

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

22. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** What will be effect on the cost of car registrations under a GST or will this cost be exempt?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: The Commonwealth Government's tax reform proposals were outlined in the document 'Tax Reform: Not a New Tax, a New Tax System', published on 13 August 1998. The treatment of Government activities under the GST is discussed on page 98 of this document.

Inter alia, the document states that:

'The non-commercial activities of government will be outside the scope of the GST. . . 'Fines, penalties, and taxes are not usually commercial transactions. The range of taxes and charges that will not be subject to the GST is extensive . . .'

Examples are:

- income tax;
- Medicare levy;
- land tax;
- stamp duties;
- motor vehicle registration fees;
- water and sewerage rates and charges; and
- local government rates.

Therefore, the Commonwealth has clearly stated in its published document that motor vehicle registration fees will be GST-free.

KNIVES

39. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** What knives will be prohibited under the proposed legislation and how long will the amnesty apply?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I have been advised by the Attorney-General that the Summary Offences (Offensive and Other Weapons) Bill 1998 was passed in the Legislative Council on 27 November 1998, and by this House on 9 December 1998.

1. The Attorney-General has received many submissions from members of the public concerning the content of the Regulations that will be made to declare certain weapons to be prohibited weapons and the exemptions that may be declared by the Regulations. The preliminary draft of the Regulations, that was prepared before introduction of the Bill, will be revised and then sent to interested persons for further comment. Consideration will be given to any further submissions and comments received before the Regulations are completed.

2. Some knives are already declared to be dangerous articles by the Summary Offences (Dangerous Articles) Regulations 1998. It is proposed that they be declared to be prohibited weapons without change to the existing definitions. They are:

- flick knives—'a knife designed or adapted so that the blade:
  (a) is concealed when folded or recessed into the handle; and
  (b) springs or is released into the extended position by the operation of a lever or button on the handle.'
- ballistic knives—'a device or instrument designed or adapted to fire or discharge a knife, dagger or similar instrument by mechanical, percussive or explosive means.'
- knuckle knives—'an open or exposed blade or similar instrument attached to a handle that is designed or adapted to be held between the knuckles, including the device commonly known as the ''Urban Pal Knife''.'
- daggers—'a sharp, pointed stabbing instrument, ordinarily capable of being concealed on the person and having:
  (a) a flat blade with cutting edges on both sides; or
  (b) a needle-like blade the cross section of which is elliptical or has three or more sides.
- sword sticks—'a cane, stick or similar article designed or adapted to hold the blade or a sword so that it is concealed from view until withdrawn from the cane, stick or article.'

With the possible exception of knuckle knives, these weapons are also prohibited imports under the Commonwealth Customs (Prohibited Imports) Regulations.

3. In addition, it is proposed to declare the following knives to be prohibited knives:

- star knives—which it is proposed to define as 'a device consisting of a number of points, blades or spikes pointing outwardly from a central axis that is designed to spin around the central axis when thrown.'
- articles which have the appearance of being harmless, but which conceal a knife, blade or spike, for example an article which looks like a pen, but which is in fact a knife or stiletto. The definition for these has not been finalised. These are also prohibited imports under the Commonwealth Regulations.

4. It was proposed to declare bowie knives to be prohibited weapons and to define them as 'a long bladed knife having a cutting edge on each side of the blade at the point.' The definition and classification of these is being considered further.

5. The Act will not be proclaimed to come into operation until the Regulations have been finalised and a further adequate period of time allowed for citizens who wish to do so to apply for Ministerial exemption and have their applications considered. It has not been decided yet how long the amnesty will last.

MOVING ON PROGRAM

43. **Mr ATKINSON:**

1. Has the Government cut funding to the Moving-On Program of the Intellectual Disability Services Council and if so, why?

2. What Government assistance is available to parents of intellectually disabled youths who have left school?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:

1.There have been no funding cuts to the *Moving On* program of the Intellectual Disability Services Council (IDSC). The costs of day options programs has risen since 1997, and the Government has been able to maintain these services to families through the injection of new disability funding.

In 1997-98 the Government allocated $2.2 million of recurrent funds to this program. An initial $225 000 was announced in June 1998 and further funding was allocated when the exact numbers of eligible students had been identified.

2. The funding allocation for each individual client is determined on the basis of level of support needs and family circumstances. The assessments are administered by a project team from IDSC and completed with a small group of people who know the young person well.

These decisions were communicated to the families so they could make definite plans for their son or daughter in the 1999 school year.

In October 1998 a Service Providers Expo was held to assist students and families to choose post school options. A *Moving On* newsletter was distributed for distribution to families, schools, parent advocacy groups and service providers, providing information on progress and plans of the project.

In addition to the *Moving On* program, there are funds provided to post school programs run by organisations such as the Autism Association, Community Access Service, Community Living and Support Services, Diocesan Association for Intellectually Disabled Persons and Excel Enterprises.

WILDERNESS SOCIETY

54. **The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** What financial assistance and benefit is provided by the Government to the Wilderness Society SA Branch?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Any Government financial assistance or benefit to the Wilderness Society SA Branch would generally be provided through the Department for Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs. The Department for Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs has advised that no direct financial assistance is being provided to the Society in 1998-99.

CONSERVATION COUNCIL

55. **The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** What financial assistance and benefit is provided by the Government to the Conservation Council of South Australia?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: The Department for Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs provides annual grant funding to the Conservation Council of South Australia. The level of financial assistance to be provided to the Conservation Council in 1998-99 is $45 000.

ETSA, SUPERANNUATION SCHEME

72. **Mrs GERAGHTY:** What is the composition of the ETSA Division 4 Superannuation Board and in particular: their names and ages; whether they are past ETSA employees and, if so, details of the positions held; and whether they are current ETSA employees and, if so, details of the positions they currently hold?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: The ETSA Superannuation Board administers the various divisions of the ETSA Superannuation Scheme, including the Division 4 scheme.

The ETSA Superannuation Board membership comprises members appointed by ETSA Corporation as well as those appointed by contributors to the scheme.

The following members have been appointed by ETSA Corporation:

		Age:
Max Bray	Chairman (external)	58
John Barrett	Nominated by the Treasurer Actuarial Officer, State Superannuation, Department of Treasury and Finance	49
Brian Barker	Currently holds position of Chief Executive Officer Synergen Pty Ltd	51
David Lindh	Chairman of ElectraNet SA Pty Ltd	52

The following Board members have been appointed by contributors to the Scheme:

		Age:
Al Auliciems	(retired)	62
Lorraine Baker	Holds position of Career Transition Manager with ETSA Utilities Pty Ltd	46
Eric Lindner	Holds position of Executive Manager Corporate Affairs with ETSA Utilities Pty Ltd	51
Anthony Smith	Holds position of Transition Systems Auditor with ElectraNet SA	52